NatCen
Social Research that works for society

What works in tackling homophobic, biphobic and transphobic (HBT) bullying among school-age children and young people?

Evidence review and typology of initiatives

Authors : Martin Mitchell, Michelle Gray, Kate Green & Kelsey Beninger
Date : April 2014
Prepared for: Government Equalities Office

Glossary

DCSF	Department for Children, Schools and Families
DfE	Department for Education
EACH	Educational Action on Challenging Homophobia
GEO	Government Equalities Office
GIRES	Gender Identity Research in Education and Society
HBT	Homophobic, biphobic and transphobic
IGLYO	International LGB,T and Q Youth and Student Organisation
LGB & T	Lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender
LGB or T	Lesbian, gay, bisexual or transgender
Ofsted	Office for Standards in Education, Children's Services and Skills
PSHE	Personal, social and health education
SEAL	Social and emotional aspects of learning
SRE	Sex and relationship education

1   Key findings

- There were a vast range of anti-bullying initiatives being employed to tackle homophobia in schools, although fewer directly dealing with transphobia and none that addressed biophobia specifically. They could broadly be categorised as:

  - **Preventative or proactive approaches** focusing on addressing homophobia and/ or transphobia across the whole school and sometimes by involving parents and the wider community.
  - **Interactive classroom-based teaching** delivered by teachers or external providers that stood alone or that were part of a wider 'whole school' approach.
  - **'Playground' or school life approaches** aimed at addressing HBT bullying language or behaviour where and as it happened.
  - **Reactive and supportive approaches** focused on the recording of incidents, sanctions for the perpetrator, restorative justice approaches and the signposting of young people questioning their sexual orientation or gender identity to appropriate support.

- There was a lot of discussion about the nature and impact of bullying; case studies demonstrating the types of initiatives used to tackle HBT bullying; a good deal of guidance based on perceptions of what worked rather than systematic evaluation; and some qualitative insight into views about what worked among children, young people and teachers.

- While the evidence reviewed provided important insights and raised interesting questions, evidence of effectiveness of different approaches to tackling HBT bullying was not always transparent or robust. Much of it was based on the views of expert stakeholders about what underpinned effectiveness or acted as a barrier to best practice from their experiences.

- The views of teachers and pupils were less evident and sometimes based on problematic samples.

- The effectiveness of each approach and initiative was linked to the specific circumstances in which it took place and the quality and confidence of the teaching.

- Most evidence to date supported a whole school approach linked with interactive teaching methods as the best way to prevent HBT bullying.

- A combination of playground, reactive and support approaches were also seen as ways to deal with bullying as it happened, and with the negative effects on young people, although there wasn't always sufficiently strong evidence to support this.

2 Aims and method

Aims

This evidence review forms the first stage of research looking at, *What works in tackling homophobic, biphobic and transphobic bullying among school-age children and young people?*. The review was conducted in line with Government Social Research guidelines on conducting Rapid Evidence Assessments[1]. Further detailed information about the way in which the review was conducted and be found in the detailed method paper in Appendix A and in the full report that accompanies this review.[2]

The questions to be answered from the evidence review were:

1) What forms of HBT anti bullying initiatives exist in schools and/ or outside schools for school-aged children and young people, with specific reference to those aimed at reducing HBT bullying?
2) What specific factors are associated with effective initiatives and interventions?
3) How effective are these interventions in reducing the prevalence of HBT bullying and impact of bullying on LGB&T children and young people (and those perceived to be LGB T/ different)?
4) What evidence is there that these interventions are effective?
5) What examples are there of facilitators or barriers to effective programme?

Methods

From an initial list of over 140 articles identified through literature searches, 31 were systematically selected for more thorough review. They were selected in order to cover a range of issues and types of articles. *Issues* included:

- the legal and policy context in which anti-homophobic, biphobic and transphobic (HBT) bullying initiatives take place;
- existing knowledge on the effectiveness of anti-bullying activities/ initiatives, both general and specifically in relation to HBT bullying;
- anti-HBT bullying resources and the knowledge on which their effectiveness was based;
- any specific differences of approach related to cyber bullying;
- specific issues or approaches relating biphobic and transphobic bullying.

A range of different *types of articles* and the knowledge or methods of which they are based were also included and these are shown in Table 1 below. Articles were chosen to represent the range of evidence and literature available, including literature reviews, original research, consultations, case studies of initiatives, policy documents, guidance documents, toolkits and fact sheets. They were also chosen, where possible, to include information on initiatives to tackle transphobic bullying, cyber bullying and bullying reflecting difference and diversity among pupils who suffer HBT bullying.

---

[1] http://www.civilservice.gov.uk/networks/gsr/resources-and-guidance
[2] Mitchell, M., Gray, M. and Beninger, K. (2014) *Tackling homophobic, biphobic and transphobic bullying among school-aged children and young people: Findings from a mixed methods study of teachers, other providers and pupils*, London: Government Equalities Office.

Table 1	Types of articles included in the review
Literature or evidence reviews	• **Hardeep et al. (2013)** literature review on the nature and form of homophobic bullying with some discussion of how to address such bullying. • **Smith et al. (2004)** edited collection of anti-homophobic bullying initiatives and learning arising from them the point of view of academic experts and educationalists. • **Morillas and Gibbons (2010)** small-scale literature review in the USA, although incorporating reference to bisexuality and transgender in the review.
Evidence reviews combined with original research	• **O'Higgins et al. (2010)** a comprehensive evidence review of what were, or are considered to be, the most effective approaches in tackling homophobic bullying in Ireland and internationally. This was combined with case studies exploring initiatives to tackle homophobic bullying in six Irish schools, involving reviews of policies, interviews with teachers and other school staff and groups with pupils. The work was funded by the Equality Authority in Ireland. • **Warwick et al. (2004)** a comprehensive evidence review from 1997 to 2004 and 28 semi-structured interviews with expert stakeholders including the Department for Education, Ofsted, Health Development Agency, Qualifications and Curriculum Association and range of services working with LGB and/ or T young people. The work was conducted by respected academics and Schools Out, which promotes work to address homophobia in schools. It was funded by the then Department for Education and Skills. • **Tippet and Houlston (2010)** a comprehensive evidence review of identity-based anti-bullying approach, including sexual orientation and gender identity; a survey of local authorities on the perceived effectiveness of different ways of tackling identity-based bullying among anti-bullying coordinators in England, Scotland and Wales; and seven stakeholder interviews including Stonewall, the Welsh Anti-bullying Network and Respectme (Scotland). The work was funded by the Equality and Human Rights Commission**.
Original research or comprehensive local consultations	• **Formby (2013)** Mixed method case studies including self-completion survey, depth interviews and focus groups in three schools, three youth services and three LGB and T youth services in the North of England. The study compared the understandings and suggested ways of responding among staff and young people. • **Department for Education (2011)** a comprehensive evaluation and typology of initiatives for anti-bullying and their perceived effectiveness of anti-bullying initiatives in general. • **Formby and Willis (2011)** Original research in South Yorkshire that looked at the facilitators and barriers to conducting work with young people on homophobia and transphobia. The study used a self-completion questionnaire with 146 young people accessed via local stakeholders; 8 discussion groups with young people in schools or youth centres; and 9 depth interviews with teachers or youth workers.

	• **Daley (2007)** limited original Canadian qualitative research with nine professionals working with LGB and T young people, with some theoretical discussion of identities intersecting with sexual orientation such as race and in-comers (immigrants). • **Pescitelli (2011)** Masters work exploring homophobic and transphobic cyber bulling, its causes and what can be done about it. The study raises interesting questions and issues but the issues but is limited by the use of convenience sampling. • **Paul et al. (2010)** an evaluation using the Quality Circle approach to tackle homophobic bullying, involving 32 years 7, 8 and 9 pupils split into 6 groups. • **Marston (2002)** a conference summary on cyber bullying that built on findings of a survey of 2,000 young people. Includes discussion of what e-safety should look like for young people. • **Lewisham Safeguarding Children and Young People Strategic Partnership Board (2011)** survey of young people in the Borough showing low levels of desired info on gender and sexuality in PHSE.
Good practice case studies or minimum standards based on case examples of initiatives	• **Stonewall (2013)** Stonewall Equality Index documenting the top ten local authorities in celebrating difference and tackling homophobic bullying and the criteria against which the authorities were assessed. • **Warwick and Aggleton (2014)** three qualitative school case studies in South London using interviews with staff and pupils. • **Ofsted (2012a)** case study of the implementation and lessons learnt from an initiative to tackle homophobic bullying at Prince Henry Grammar School. The initiative was loosely based on Stonewall's *'Some People Are Gay, Get Over It!'* campaign, • **Ofsted (2012b)** case study of the implementation and lessons learnt from an initiative to tackle homophobic bullying at Stoke Newington Sixth Form College. The initiative approached tackling homophobic bullying by integrating information about LGB and T people through the whole curriculum and the whole school community.
Guidance to schools based to some extent on an evidential base, although the exact nature of the evidence or how it was assessed isn't specifically included	• **Stonewall (2014)** builds on their Stonewall's School Report in 2007 to look at the nature and impact of derogatory homophobic language. Case studies and guidance are used to highlight possible ways to respond to the use of homophobic language. • **Department for Education (2013)** guidance to head teachers, staff and governing bodies on how to help schools prevent and respond to bullying as part of their overall behaviour policy. It outlines the Government's approach to bullying, legal obligations and the powers schools have to tackle bullying, and the principles which underpin the most effective anti-bullying strategies in schools. It is reviewed annually. • **IGLYO (2014)** minimum standards for combating homophobic and transphobic bullying emerging from their *Stop H8: Tackling Bullying in Europe Conference* and supported by the European Commission. It was unclear from the document who specifically participated in the conference and contributed to the guidance.

	• **GIRES (2008)** a guide to gender identity terminology and transphobic bullying practical guidance aimed at school staff and covering pupils and staff, sponsored by the Home Office. • **Ofsted (2013)** briefing paper on how they will explore the action of schools to prevent homophobic bullying during inspections. • **Welsh Government (2011)** anti-homophobic bullying guidance with reference to key policies supporting such work and guidance on what schools can do. The document includes case studies on work that schools and local authorities are already doing. • **Tower Hamlets Council Communications Unit (2011)** guidance based on local consultation with young people, parents/ carers, school staff and local organisations. • **Department for Children, Schools and Families (DCSF)** (2007) guidance and practical information about how to deal with homophobic bullying in schools aimed at governors, senior managers, teachers and other staff. • **Learning and Teaching Scotland (date not given)** a comprehensive guide for teachers based on research with teachers, education authority, staff and young people. The toolkit was supported by the Scottish Government, LGBT Scotland and Learning and Teaching Scotland. • **Childnet International (2009)** policy guidance with practical tips for school on how to tackle cyber bulling in schools, supported by the Department for Children, Schools and Families
Toolkits, action points and factsheets with some evidence on which the views about effectiveness are based	• **Barrie (2013)** a practical toolkit based on a review of policies, some literature and the experiences of the author attempting to deal with homophobia as secondary school teacher in Birmingham. The toolkit was supported by Birmingham University, the National Lottery Fund and the Heritage Lottery Fund. • **EACH (2012)** a poster-style leaflet developed by Educational Action Challenging Homophobia listing ten things schools can do to challenge homophobia. • **Hinduja and Patchin (2011)** a fact sheet on cyber bullying and sexual orientation based on some research evidence about what works in preventing homophobic and transphobic cyber bullying, primarily in the USA.

As can be seen these sources varied from comprehensive literature or evidence reviews, through original research and consultations to good practice case studies, guidance and toolkits. There was a good deal of guidance on what schools should do. This included general guidance on addressing bullying with the suggestion or implication that this could also be applied in tackling HBT bullying. It also included specific guidance and toolkits local authorities and schools on ways to address HBT bullying specifically. However, the robustness of the reviews and research, the transparency and clarity on which good practice guidance was based, and the evidence of effectiveness varied from very good to very poor.

There were specific issues in relation to each of the type evidence reviewed, that included:

- **Literature reviews and evidence reviews** – there were some high quality reviews but they tended to focus on the nature and impact of bullying rather than the effectiveness of initiatives. Where effectiveness was discussed it was dependent on the quality of the literature being reviewed which varied from strong to very poor. Given the changing legal context relating to equality in Britain some of the literature was now out of date post the Equality Act (2010).
- **Evidence reviews combined with original research or comprehensive local consultations** – these tended to be the strongest of the articles reviewed, with the exception of some of the qualitative studies that used convenience samples. None of the studies by themselves enabled us to identify the most effective approach to tackling HBT bullying but collectively they provided important insights into what worked from the point of view of educationalists, teachers, young people and youth workers in relation to specific initiatives. None could be considered a systematic evaluation.
- **Good practice case studies, guidance and minimum standards** - these were most common types of documents and useful as examples of what key stakeholders in the field and government bodies felt worked. They provided case examples of what was considered by educationalists, experts and government to be best practice, although the exact reasons why this was the case wasn't always explicit. In some instances best practice was indentified by comparison between initiatives in schools. In others, however, there was a statement that the case studies or information provided was best practice without transparency about how evidence or case studies had been reviewed or the methodology used to collect information and views. There was scope, therefore, for information about case studies, guidance and minimum standards to be considerably improved in terms of its evidentiary base.
- **Toolkits, action points and factsheets** – by their nature these types of documents are designed to be practical and often provided helpful suggestions about what schools could do. The methodology used to arrive at the information wasn't always clear from an evidence-based point of view.

The best, most robust or insightful evidence of what does and doesn't work among that reviewed is drawn out throughout the discussion below based on the documents reviewed.

3 Typology of interventions

3.1 Introduction

Previous general research on anti-bullying strategies by the Department for Education (2011) found that school-based anti-bullying activities and initiatives could broadly be grouped into: whole school approaches, classroom strategies, playground strategies and reactive strategies. We have built on this typology but added the provision of support for pupils bullied because of their perceived sexual orientation or gender identity, those questioning their sexual orientation or gender identity or who identify as lesbian, gay,

bisexual or transgender (LGB or T). This provision is included under the reactive and supportive strategies heading. We therefore discuss four broad approaches.

- **Preventative or proactive approaches** focusing on tackling homophobic, biphobic and transphobic (HBT) bullying within the whole curriculum and within the wider community.

- **Interactive, discursive and reflexive teaching** by teachers or external providers that stood alone or was part of a wider 'whole school' approach.

- **Playground or school life approaches** aimed at addressing HBT bullying language or behaviour where and as it happened in or around the school.

- **Reactive and supportive approaches** focused on dealing with bullying after it had happened. Either through:

    - Recording of incidents, sanctions for the perpetrator and restorative justice after the event.
    - Supporting pupils who have been bullied and signposting young people questioning their sexual orientation or gender-identity to other resources where such support was beyond the expertise of ordinary teaching staff.

The first two of these approaches were broadly been seen in the literature as focusing on *preventative* work that tries to stop HBT bullying happening in the first place. The last three were seen as *reactive* or supportive dealing with HBT bullying *as or after the bullying happened*. We have separated these categories here for empirical clarity of approach. In reality schools use these different approaches, or it was suggested that they do so, at the same time.

3.2   Preventative or proactive approaches

3.2.1   A 'whole school' approach

A consistent theme through the research was that for anti-HBT bullying initiatives to be successful they needed to be part of *a 'whole school'* approach (Hardeep et al. 2003; Department for Education, 2011; Welsh Government, 2011). This was because the approach looked at the ways in which bullying should be addressed *across* and through *involvement of* the whole school rather than being limited to one area of activity (e.g. PSHE teaching) or just to one teacher or a small group of pupils. Key elements of the approach were that it would *'contribute to the ongoing work of all teachers with young people across the entire curriculum'* (O'Higgins et al. 2005 p. 2). It would also *'create an environment that prevents bullying from being a serious problem in the first place'* (Department for Education, 2004 p.6).

Some literature and the experiences of some teachers suggested that the whole school approach also needed to be linked into the *wider* (whole) *community* (Barrie, 2013). This was because early involvement of parents and governors helped to reduce opposition to initiatives. Support in the in the wider community also served to help sustain anti-HBT bullying messages given in schools rather than undermining them. It was suggested in Barrie's report that a good way to achieve links with the wider community was through

multi-agency working with children's services, the police and local LGB and/ or T organisations. Where possible it was all considered to be important to involve parents.

3.2.2 Specific parts of the whole school approach

According to O'Higgins et al (2005 p. 46-50) from their comprehensive literature review aspects of the whole school approach that make it more effective are:

- Leadership and management of change
- Policy development
- Curriculum planning for teaching and learning
- School ethos
- Student voice
- Provision of student support services
- Partnership with parents and local communities

A number of important aspects of a whole school approach that were discussed in the evidence review are outlined in turn below.

Leadership and involvement

Leadership and involvement of senior managers, Head Teachers, school governors, local authorities and parent/ carers was a recurring theme across the articles reviewed in terms of the success of initiatives and activities aimed at reducing HBT bullying.

- **Senior management or Head Teachers** were seen to convey authority and commitment to an initiative as well as ensuring funding for important changes in curriculum, training, teaching, enforcement of sanctions and support for pupils (Formby and Willis, 2011; Paul et al., 2010).
- **School governors** – were seen as important to support any initiatives. It also helped to have a named governor to support initiatives specifically focused on preventing or reducing HBT (Formby and Willis, 2011).
- **Parents/ carers** – guidance suggested that involvement of parents early in how to address homophobic bullying was a good way to reveal any opposition to doing so at the school and to address any concerns (Welsh Government, 2011). Guidance and literature reviewed also suggested that it helped to convey to parents the school policy on HBT bullying and what to do if their child was being bullied (Department for Education, 2013; Paul et al. 2010). Parents could be involved as supportive parent governors or through a school website or newsletter. Qualitative research with young people, teachers and youth services in South Yorkshire revealed that fear of parental complaints was a notable factor that prevented activities or initiatives being successful in schools (Formby and Willis, 2011).
- **Initiative 'champions'** – there was some support from the literature and from qualitative research with teachers and other providers for the idea of a named person or a group of 'advocates' to drive anti-HBT bullying work forward within the school (Morillas and Gibbons, 2010; Formby and Willis, 2011). From a case study of an anti-homophobic bullying initiative in a Grammar school was thought to be the case as long as such wasn't left to a *'few brave people'* (Ofsted, 2012a).
- **Local authorities** – where applicable it was suggested that local authorities could help provide the resources and expertise to develop initiatives. Some local authorities had anti-bullying co-ordinators who worked across schools and who could act as champions (Stonewall, 2013).

Collectively the evidence in relation to the importance of leadership and involvement was strong being based on relatively robust, primary qualitative work and reviews of case studies by expert stakeholders (e.g. Ofsted, Stonewall) in the field. The evidence suggests that it is important to have individual champions to drive work forward. However, it is also important for 'champions' to involve and co-ordinate a range of stakeholders rather than being wholly responsible for initiatives themselves.

Policy development

Establishing and embedding a clear policy, legal and empirical need to do work on HBT-bullying helped schools to support activities and initiatives and to drive work forward. A number of ways were suggested to do this:

- Literature reviewed, and interviews with expert stakeholders, suggested there was a need to challenge the idea that everyone is heterosexual or adheres to a simple binary gender. In particular, it was important to challenge the view that there were "no LGB or T pupils at the school" (Warwick et al., 2004).
- Guidance suggested that the need to undertake anti-HBT bullying in the schools could be supported by local surveys that showed the extent of HBT-bullying in the school or local authority or national surveys that showed the level HBT bullying in the country as a whole (e.g. Stonewall Education Equality Index, 2013). Previous government guidelines suggested that schools could conduct an anonymous survey to determine the extent and types of bullying in their school that could act as a baseline against which progress could be compared (Department for Children, Families and Schools, 2007).
- Government guidance suggested there was a need to reinforce the policy and legal framework for work to tackle HBT bullying (e.g. by referring to measures under the Education and Inspections Act 2006; Equality Act 2010; Malicious Communications Act, 1988) to ensure schools understood support to undertake work on HBT bullying and what they could do (Department for Education, 2013 p, 3-5)

Five important areas of *policy development* were identified in the literature review as necessary to support HBT anti-bullying work:

- **Equal Opportunities Policy** – that there should be *specific* mention of discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation and gender reassignment in the policy so that such issues are actively considered when thinking about what the school does to tackle HBT bullying (Stonewall Education Equality Index, 2013; Ofsted, 2013)
- **Inclusive anti-bullying policy** – guidance on HBT bullying and cyber bullying suggested that schools should have clear policies in place to tackle bullying - of which pupils, teachers and parents are aware - with sanctions for pupils who threaten, attack, exclude or otherwise mistreat other pupils based on their perceived or actual sexual orientation or gender identity (Stonewall Education Guide, 2014; Hinduja and Patchin, 2011).
- **Responsible electronic technology usage policy** – guidance and conferences on cyber bullying suggested that schools should have a policy agreed with students on acceptable and appropriate use of technology such as laptops, mobile phones, digital cameras that prohibited the use of HBT language and images. The policy should also educate pupils about the law on the sending of malicious electronic communications (Childnet International, 2009). It should also be updated regularly to keep up with developments in technology.

- **'Transitioning' and gender identity policy** – guidance documents on how to deal with transphobia in schools suggested schools prepare a contingency plan detailing how the school will respond if a pupil declares an intention to undergo gender reassignment, to transition to a different gender role or is 'outed' by someone else. Schools should also consider how to respond if a young person wishes to identify as neither gender or both (GIRES, 2008).
- **Link with other areas of health and well-being policies and interventions** – (e.g. National Healthy Schools, Social and Emotional Aspects of Learning (SEAL) in order to better promote and integrate anti-HBT-initiatives into the life of the school.

All of these suggestions were important - based on the literature and the views of expert stakeholders - but there is still the need to examine the relationship between policy development and its impact in practice. For example, Warwick et al. (2004) observe that, despite the importance attached to putting such policies in place: *'Making mention of homophobia in school policies is of little value if issues are not also dealt with in classrooms'* (Warwick et al, 2004 p.16).

Curriculum planning for teaching and learning

Positive case studies and original research evidence indicated that challenging HBT-bullying was more likely to be effective where there was specific mention of it in teaching *and* where there was a positive portrayal of LGB and/ or T people and/ or their families. Having a curriculum that clearly *included* LGB and/ or T people and specifically addressed their experiences was thought by experts, regulators and local authorities to help reduce prejudice against LGB and T pupils (Stonewall Equality Index, 2013; Ofsted, 2012; Tippett and Houlston, 2010). By comparison curriculum 'invisibility' or 'patchy coverage' were found in original mixed methods research to reinforce prejudices by suggesting such issues were unimportant (Formby, 2013; Formby and Willis, 2011).

Positive ways to integrate sexual orientation and gender identity into the curriculum that were identified included:

- **Historical or subject-based opportunities to challenge prejudices and promote equality** – e.g. learning about Alan Turing and the enigma machine in information technology lessons; in history about the Holocaust students learning about LGB or T people of the time; in art study the work of Grayson Perry (Department for Children, Schools and Families, 2007) . In relation to gender identity there were also opportunities in biology to learn about gender and in maths to learn about statistics on the likely percentage of the population that feel into social groups including, transgender, and the methodology on which assessments were made (GIRES, 2008).
- **Talking about difference and diversity in society** – particularly reinforcing that LGB and T people and the families of LGB and T people are a 'normal' part of society (Ofsted, 2012a; Ofsted, 2012b).
- **Ensuring inclusion of identity-based bullying in the formal curriculum such as PSHE lessons** (Tippett et al., 2010).

However, government guidance based on a review of the most effective anti-bullying strategies in schools stated that teaching about LGB and/ or T people and addressing HBT-bullying were only likely to work well where teaching staff had been given *appropriate training* that gave them *confidence to teach* on these issues (Department for Education, 2013). In the broadest sense experts working in the field suggested that effective anti-HBT teaching needed to be supported by diversity awareness training

(Ofsted, 2012a; Hinduja and Patchin, 2011). However, from the literature and interviews with experts educationalists working in the field specific training on anti-homophobic bullying was thought to be more effective. This was especially the case where it '*drew on the experience and expertise of anti-bullying organisations with a proven track record and/or specialised expertise in dealing with certain forms of bullying'* (Department for Education, 2013 p.8; Stonewall Education Equality Index, 2013).

Without such training it was felt that teachers would lack sufficient confidence to be able to tackle HBT-bullying, resulting in discomfort, embarrassment or lack of clear understanding about what to do if their own sexual orientation or gender identity are questioned. In one study with expert stakeholders, it was noted poor teacher training meant that *'homophobia was often ignored, responded to inappropriately and frequently reinforced'* (Warwick et al. 2004 p.16). Further research is needed with teachers themselves to understand whether they feel confident to tackle HBT bullying and to address the questions about sexual orientation and gender identity that may be raised as a result.

School ethos

School ethos referred to the overall values of the school and the ways in which they affected the day-to-day interactions between pupils, including whether bullying and HBT bullying were more or less likely. Original research and guidance suggested that schools that promoted good behaviour and a culture based on values of mutual respect, social justice, equality and diversity were more likely to successfully prevent HBT bullying or to address it as it arose. A number of issues were important from the evidence review:

- **An school ethos of mutual respect** – the Department for Education (2013 p.7) note from their review of information that, *'Schools which excel at tackling bullying have created an ethos of good behaviour where pupils treat one another and the school staff with respect because they know that this is the right way to behave'* . This allowed pupils to discuss their experiences of bullying in an open way without further fear of discrimination or victimisation**.**
- **Taking a social justice and equality approach** – expert stakeholders and teachers in interviews said that discussing HBT-bullying in the context of social justice, equality and diversity enabled teachers and other educators to link with other forms of discrimination such as sexism and racism. This could also: *'help build alliances among pupils to address a wide range of forms of intolerance and prejudice'* (Warwick et al., 2004 p.14). Importantly, this approach also allowed links into discussions about the significance of students of concepts of masculinity and femininity and the valorisation of masculinity that were thought to be at the route of anti LGB and T feelings (Daley et al., 2007).
- **Creating a school environment accepting of diversity and difference** – from consultations and reviews of work undertaken in schools, positive ways to do this generally were to said to be to: put up an anti-bullying notice board; have an anti-bullying week; hold a diversity festival; or celebrate real decreases in recorded incidents of bullying (Stonewall, 2014; Tower Hamlets Council Communications Unit (2011). More specific ways of creating acceptance of LGB and T people and pupils were seen to consist of displaying posters with supportive anti-homophobic messages (e.g. Stonewall's *Some People Are Gay. Get Over It!* campaign) or celebrating LGBT History Month (Learning and Teaching Scotland, 2014).
- **Stating that HBT-*bullying* is wrong even if this goes against cultural or religious attitudes** – cultural and religious attitudes prevalent among some communities were sometimes seen by professionals, teachers and pupils to be a potential barrier to anti-HBT bullying teaching and learning. This was revealed in

one consultative exercise in that some school staff said they were reluctant to discuss HBT bullying because they felt it probably wasn't appropriate to their pupils (Lewisham Safeguarding Children Board, 2011; Ofsted, 2012a). However, even in these instances guidance suggested that it shouldn't be assumed that most staff and young people wouldn't be prepared to see HBT bullying as wrong.

CASE EXAMPLE: In a London school inspected by Ofsted, girls of Black Caribbean heritage identified that they were being homophobic in their attitudes and language. School arranged for a black lesbian rap artist to perform to whole school then work more closely with this group of students. It was reported that 'their attitudes, behaviour and language changed to be more respectful and understanding of LGB people' (Ofsted, 2012a).

Current government advice is that, *'Notwithstanding the particular tenets of their faith, schools with a religious character should uphold the values of tolerance, non-discrimination and respect towards others and condemn all forms of bullying, as in any other school'* (Department for Education, 2013 p.9). In their research and consultation Tower Hamlet Communications Unit (2011) also state religious texts and faith leaders can be used where they make a stand against prejudice.

Significantly, while these ways of trying to create a positive ethos were all regarded as good practice by experts working in the field, there is little hard evidence or evaluation to date of how well they work in schools from the point of view of teachers and pupils. To this extent they identify important aspects of anti-HBT bullying initiatives that can be explored further in future research.

Student voice

Involvement of pupils/ young people in decisions about how to tackle HBT bullying, the form of teaching and responses to bullying was regarded by experts in the field and from school case studies as more likely to ensure that activities or initiatives succeed (O'Higgins et al., 2005; Formby and Willis, 2012). Ways of ensuring a student voice included getting School Councils involved in the development of anti-bullying policies, or setting up a School Diversity Forum or Anti-Bullying Committee (e.g. Tower Hamlets Council Communications Unit, 2011; Welsh Government, 2011; Ofsted, 2002). Other initiatives discussed included:

- **ABC (Anti-Bullying Crew)** students from year 10 and 11 who are trained by *Childline*. They visit younger classes, build relationships and offer support at lunch times through an anti-bullying club that anyone can visit. This approach was thought to have been particularly popular and successful among students in Wales because hours worked on the project contributed to the Welsh Baccalaureate Qualifications offered to sixth-formers. It also involved students who had been bullies in the past but had since changed their ways (Welsh Government, 2011)
- **Youth champions**. Wiltshire's County Council's 'ZeeTee' campaign was lead by a LGB and T youth group and is a campaign for zero tolerance of homophobic language in schools. It involves presentations at all school assemblies and invites students to sign pledge not to use HBT language and get a wristband (Stonewall Education Equality Index, 2013).

Once again, while these programmes and activities were promoted as good ways for students to have a voice in anti-HBT bullying strategies and to take ownership, there was

little hard evidence to date of whether they actually reduced the prevalence of homophobia, biphobia or transphobia.

Provision of support for pupils

Provision of support for students who were being bullied because they were LGB or T, because they were thought to be LGB or T, or because they were friends with LGB or T people is an important part of preventing the negative effects of bullying from escalating. Provision that was thought helpful by teachers and young people in reducing the affects of HBT bullying was having pertinent self-help literature in the school library; books and resources that included references to LGB or T people, (Morillas and Gibbons, 2010); and in-school counselling services (Formby, 2013). It was not possible from the evidence reviewed to say which books and resources pupils being bullied had found most useful.

3.3   Interactive, discursive and reflexive classroom-based teaching

A second theme than ran through the majority of the literature was that, *'homophobia and associated forms of bullying appear to be best addressed by not only taking a whole school approach, but also through specific classroom activities'* (Warwick et al, 2004 p.25). In particular, rather than top down assemblies, readings or simple presentation or videos, there was an emphasis throughout on the relative success of *interactive, discursive and reflexive teaching and learning*. This was particularly because it allowed time to ask questions and to reflect on the answers and experiences of others.

3.3.1   Interactive classroom-based teaching

In their review of evidence and interviews with expert stakeholders, Warwick et al. (2004) state that the:

> *'interactive teaching and leaning activities gained from teaching PSHE and other subjects to address homophobia…. have been shown to be useful in assisting pupils learn about sexualities and homophobia, providing students with opportunities for reflection on the needs of their peers – including same-sex attracted young people – on their own sexuality-related values and understandings, and on the forms of support that might best provide for those encountering homophobia'* (p. 14).

They note interactive teaching and learning activities have been particularly successful when linked to the formal curriculum such Personal Health and Social Education (PHSE), citizenship lessons in secondary schools and Quality Circles in primary schools or Sexual and Relationship Education (SRE) in both types of school (see also Tippett et al, 2011, Barrie, 2013; Ofsted, 2012b; Warwick and Aggleton, 2014). Expert stakeholders and people working with LGB and T young people also thought that interactive teaching techniques were most successful where they were *coupled with* readings, drama-based videos, talks by external visitors (including panels) and theatre-in-education productions (Warwick et al., 2004 p. 24-25).

> *CASE EXAMPLE:* Van de Ven (1995) are reported to have used interactive teaching and learning strategies gained from PHSE, including a story describing a conversation about homosexuality; lessons on identifying myths and stereotypes surrounding homosexuality; consideration of acceptable ways of relating to LGB and T people; legal consequences of discrimination; lesbian and gay speakers who don't conform to stereotypes. This approach showed *'that for all participants the intervention resulted in significantly less homophobic anger and behaviour intentions and the decline in homophobia was maintained for at least three months after the delivery of the'* (reported in O'Higgins et al. 2010, p.11).

3.3.2 Advantages of the interactive teaching approach when addressing HBT-bullying

A number of advantages of the interactive teaching approach were identified in the literature reviewed for dealing with discrimination against LGB and T young people and people perceived to be LGB or T.

- **It allowed reflection on stimulus materials encouraging pupils to think about HBT language and behaviour in new ways** – for example, Warwick et al's (2004) experienced professionals said that presentations followed by discussions encouraged pupils to *reflect* on issues of social justice, their own sexuality-related values and understandings, the needs of same-sex attracted young people and how best to prevent and respond to homophobia.
- **It allowed open discussion of differences between pupils, identified unhelpful stereotypes and led to debates among pupils** (Department for Education, 2013 p.7; Welsh Government, 2011).
- **It ensured that the individual, cultural and religious views of pupils could be addressed through questions** (Department for Education, 2013)**.**
- **It allowed the emphasis to be shifted from the views of the bullies to the harm their views can do** (Warwick et al., 2004).

Guidance or tool kits on tackling cyber bullying in general, and HBT cyber bullying in particular, also pinpointed the importance of interactive teaching in tackling bullying. Such methods were thought to work just as well because they allowed pupils to ask questions as they learnt new skills, in particular about how to protect themselves malicious messages and to put what they learnt into context. For example, it was suggested that presentations about Internet safety and how to be 'tech savvy' could be discussed alongside issues such as:

- whether they have posted offensive comments or pictures online;
- whether they were intentionally or unintentionally offensive;
- why such comments or pictures are offensive and wrong;
- and how they can lead to legal or criminal consequences.

Teaching young people about how to block bullies on social media sites such as *Facebook* or in virtual games were also mentioned among professional interviewees (Pescitelli, 2011) and in the summary of a conference of how to tackle cyber bullying (Marston, 2002).

The literature and guidance in these respects captured important insights from the views of expert stakeholders and teachers. It will be interesting, however, in future research to see if these views are equally reflected in the views of pupils and young people.

3.3.3 Factors that support successful teaching and learning related to HBT-bullying

A number of factors emerged that were regarded as hindering or promoting successful teaching and learning in the articles reviewed. These could be grouped in terms of *qualities of the teacher* and the *nature of the group*.

Qualities of the teacher

Firstly, the literature reviewed in several articles and some primary research suggested that it was important that teachers felt ***comfortable*** talking about sexual orientation and gender identity. This was because discomfort could convey that there was something wrong about doing so. For example, from their evidence review and primary research with teachers and pupils O'Higgins et al. (2010) suggest that teachers with backgrounds in social subjects may be best placed to deliver such teaching. Paul et al. (2010) found in their evaluation of Quality Circle Time that it was important for teachers to have a high commitment to tackling homophobic bullying to create the right inclusive environment. Using teachers or external providers with whom pupils didn't interact every day could also help facilitate a more open discussion for pupils because it was easier to talk to someone with whom they were less involved (see below).

Secondly, teachers needed to be ***skilled group facilitators*** to ensure all views were held within the groups. In particular pupils interviewed thought that it was important that a 'vocal minority' were not allowed to dictate what is considered 'normal' in discussions. It was also vital that teachers ensured that LGB and T pupils, pupils questioning their sexual identity or perceived to be LGB or T were not made the centre of attention in the group (O'Higgins et al., 2010). One way recommended by Paul et al. (2010) to do this was to use influential students in the group to help shape the discussion in a more balanced way.

Research in these respects provided important insights into the way in which pupils may receive messages about HBT bullying based in the knowledge and skills of teachers. Further research is needed to explore these issues more thoroughly from the perspectives of pupils and teachers.

Nature and membership of group discussions

The literature reviewed also suggested that it was also important to think about the nature and membership of the teaching group. In their evidence review and school case studies involving teachers and pupils, O'Higgins et al (2010) found that **smaller groups** were better than larger ones because this meant that participants were more likely to express their view against a perceived 'norm'.

The **age group** of pupils was also considered to be important in a number of articles reviewed, although this was sometimes based more on pupil and teacher perceptions than specific evaluations. There was a lot of discussion suggesting that pupils needed to be old enough to be *socially mature* but that teaching related to HBT should happen before pupils were old enough for *prejudices to set in*. One instance where this view was tested was in the study by Paul et al (2010). They reviewed a number of interventions

looking at whether early teaching that focused on pupils 8-9 years old might be able to prevent children from developing interactional patterns of bullying or being targeted and stereotyped into a victim role. They found that there were stronger positive effects of interventions in primary compared to secondary schools. They suggested this is because younger children were more accepting of teacher authority, while older children may explicitly reject teacher influence and values the school promotes.

Another consideration was **gender**. Paul et al (2010) found that girls generally had better attitudes towards victims of homophobic bullying and were more willing to take part in peer discussions and support than boys. In one 'all girls' school case study the pupil group interviewed expressed disappointment where a gay male external speaker was brought into the group rather than a lesbian speaker with whom they thought they would have more experiences in common (O'Higgins et al, 2005).

A final consideration discussed in the literature was whether to use **contact groups** used in programmes to reduce biased or prejudiced perceptions. These types of groups are more likely to be used in colleges than schools. They work on the idea that prejudice was reduced through contact with a specific group. In this case it would mean LGB and/ or T pupils or students meeting with non-LGB and/ or T students. O'Higgins et al. (2005) warn that this works best where prejudices are the result of long ingrained habits that have never been given any critical attention and not with people with deeply held prejudices.

These studies provide important insight into the way that the nature and membership teaching groups may shape the success of anti-HBT bullying messages. Further, larger scale evaluation comparing the way in which size of group, age, gender and contact between LGB and/ or T pupils would help to confirm whether these initial insights are correct.

3.3.4 Presentations and discussions by external providers

In some instances guidance and toolkits reviewed recommended that it was better to use external providers to lead discussion on sexual identities and HBT bullying than teachers within the school (EACH, 2012). A key reason for this was that outside 'experts' such as the police, LGB and/ or T youth group representatives or LGB and T people themselves were considered by pupils in one piece of research to give first-hand accounts that were more 'powerful' than indirect ones through teachers (Formby and Willis, 2011). Other examples that were discussed and that were considered effective from school case studies were visiting theatre productions or drama groups and a sports representative from the Pride Games who lead sporting activities and lead a discussion about prejudice-based language (Ofsted, 2002). Working in partnership with the police, health authorities and LGB and T groups or charities was one reason among others that local authorities and their schools were rated highly on *Stonewall*'s equality index (Stonewall Equality Index 2013).

The exact basis for these judgements weren't always clear. As a result, it will be important in future to find what teachers and pupils think about the impact of external providers in reducing HBT bullying in their schools. It will also be important to explore the role that external providers have within the context of wider initiatives to tackle bullying and HBT bullying being developed or already taking place in the school.

3.4   Playground or school life approaches

Playground and school life approaches deal with HBT bullying on an everyday basis where and as it happens. According to the Department for Education (2011) '*most direct forms of bullying happen in the playground and school grounds, so effective playground strategies are important for prevention*' (p. 3). Despite this there was very little discussion of the effectiveness of the approaches that were mentioned compared to the whole school approach and interactive teaching approaches. Four main approaches were discussed:

- **Making school playgrounds less bullying susceptible** – this could be through physical improvements to school buildings or grounds, although there we found no examples of where this was reported to have worked. There was one example where a toolkit suggested that the fast removal of HBT graffiti helped improve the school environment (EACH, 2012).
- **Challenging HBT language and behaviour every time they occurred** – here there was an emphasis in guidance and toolkits on training teachers, playground supervisors, and/ or older pupils to look out for HBT behaviour. Where HBT bullying language or behaviour was seen there was emphasis on providing staff and pupils with the skills to step in to explain why they weren't acceptable. In particular there was an emphasis on *always* challenging the use of the word 'gay' to mean bad or 'uncool' when it arose (Ofsted, 2012b; Welsh Government, 2011). This strategy was only thought to work by educationalists and teachers if negative language and behaviour were addressed *consistently* throughout the school and treated *equally seriously* as other forms of prejudiced language and behaviour such as racism (Warwick et al., 2004).There was little evidence of the views of pupils about the successfulness of this approach.
- **Creating advocates among staff and pupils to intervene where they see HBT bullying** – three approaches were mentioned in the literature, in toolkits aimed at schools and among pupils interviewed:
  - creating 'advocacy groups' within schools to ensure that HBT-bullying is taken seriously;
  - building 'gay-straight alliances' or extra-curricula clubs that create support and safe spaces for LGB students (Hinduja and Patchin, 2011; Morillas and Gibbons. 2010; O'Higgins et al., 2010); and
  - 'bystander defense training' so that pupils know how to intervene if they see bullying happening.

  Of these only the effectiveness of extra-curricula clubs was mentioned as having an impact, which was in allowing LGB and T pupils to have a better sense of belonging to the school. Bystander training, while mentioned, was hardly discussed at all in the articles reviewed.
- **Peer support or buddying** – one 'buddying' approach where pupils make friends with pupils likely to be bullied was the ABC Crew developed by *Childline* and discussed above. Again, the success of this approach and the precise mechanism by which it worked needed to be more fully evidenced.

The wider emphasis on school life was also noted in Department for Education (2013) guidance to schools where bullying happened *outside the playground and school* (e.g. outside the school gates, on school buses, in local schools and via social media). The Department noted legal powers available to schools and Head Teachers to address such issues. However, no specific initiatives in this respect had been researched. Ways to deal with cyber bullying outside school are discussed above.

Playground and school life approaches would appear to be one of the most important ways to address HBT bullying as it happens. Yet more research is needed to explore what is being done in schools and the mechanisms by which some strategies are more effective than others. In particular, initiatives need to be examined from the point of view of teachers and pupils involved in them and from the perspective of pupils who have experienced HBT bullying.

3.5 Reactive and supportive approaches

Reactive approaches were those that came *after* an incident of HBT-bullying had occurred and often focused on the bully. Supportive approaches were more focused on the victim who has been bullied because of her/ his actual or perceived identity.

3.5.1 Reactive approaches

As with playground and social life responses, there were a number of ways of reacting to HBT-bullying that were discussed but with very little evidence of whether they were effective or not. Three types of reactive approach were discussed:

- **Putting a place an incident reporting and recording** structure – the main issue raised in guidance on how to tackle HBT bullying was that reporting should be as *easy* for pupils as possible and that it should be possible via a number of routes. Having 'cause for concern slips' or 'bully boxes' where pupils could give information about bullying *anonymously* were seen as ways that some pupils may overcome a reluctance to report bullying (Department for Children, Schools and Families, 2007; Formby and Willis, 2011; Tower Hamlets Communication Unit, 2011; Barrie, 2013; Stonewall Education Guide, 2014). Other strategies suggested in guidance and toolkits were 'peer listening' structures and School Councils as alternative ways for teachers to hear about HBT related bullying. In most cases these views were based on guidance produced by government and expert stakeholders; although the evidence base on which the guidance was based wasn't always clear.

  The importance of having the right reporting and recording structure in place was that it could help to identify prevalence of bullying, any patterns emerging, whether incidents were being properly followed up and how bullying polices may need to change (Welsh Government, 2011; IGLYO, 2014; Ofsted, 2013).

- **An increasing sanctions against bullies** – The Department for Education state that 'successful schools': *'have policies in place to deal with bullying and poor behaviour which are clear to parents, pupils and staff so that, when incidents do occur, they are dealt with quickly*' (Department for Education, 2013 p.6). It was also suggested in previous government guidance that there should be a 'hierarchy of sanctions' (Department for Children, Families and Schools, 2007 p. 24) that eventually lead to the involvement of parents (where language or behaviour persist) and possible exclusions where necessary.

- The most important aspects affecting the effectiveness of sanctions according to guidance and pupils interviewed were that there should be agreement at the school about a 'zero tolerance' approach to HBT bullying and *consistent* application of this policy (Welsh Government, 2011; Formby and Willis, 2012). There was also some discussion in guidance documents of investigation about why children were bullying and whether this might raise child protection issues

for some children; in particular, if they were learning bullying or intimidating behaviour at home. There was no comparison in the literature reviewed about the effectiveness of different sanctions and their severity in reducing the prevalence or impact of HBT bullying from the point of view of the bullies or young people who had experienced HBT bullying.

- **The possibility of restorative justice** – while there was discussion of a schools having a 'restorative ethos' (Department for Education, 2011), and that the feelings of person being bullied should be the priority in this approach, there was limited evidence that it was happening from the articles reviewed.

3.5.2 Resources and support for young people 'questioning' their sexual orientation or gender-identity

Support for pupils who had been bullied because they were questioning their sexual orientation or gender identity was discussed in the literature. This was both within and outside of the school.

Support within the school
This type of approach did not exist in isolation from the others but did reflect the need to think about the 'victim' of HBT-bullying as well as what to do about the perpetrator. A number of authors discussed what they thought were effective ways of providing support that ensured that the person being bullied received help without being isolated from other pupils. Paul et al. (2010) report that peer support worked well for pupils in the initiatives they reviewed, as did buddying schemes and social-skills interventions that help pupils make friends or speak out for themselves. The pupils and young people they spoke to also said that assertiveness training could be helpful. Based on the views of pupils and expert stakeholders an important aspect of support was that there should be a named person within the school to act as a 'first point of contact'. This person could then refer pupils on to specialist support if necessary (Formby and Willis, 2011; Hinduja and Patchin, 2011). Given that most of this research was conducted with pupils and young in provides important insights into what works from their point of view.

Signposting to external support
Some pupils may need individual counselling or referral to specialist LGB and/ or T youth support groups to come to terms with their identity and to make supportive friends (Formby, 2013). Daley et al. (2007) note from the study with professionals working with LGB or T young people that this may be particularly important for pupils who cannot seek support at home for cultural or religious reasons. One suggestion made by lesbian and gay rights group Stonewall was that schools should build links with local LGB and/ or T groups or national charities (Stonewall Education Guide, 2014). This may, for example, mean schools being aware of local LGB and T youth groups that could give peer support (Barrie, 2013).

From their literature review Morillas and Gibbons (2010) noted that research with young LGB and T found that 'signposted' Internet support may often be unavailable to pupils because of 'filters' put on school computers. Formby and Willis (2011) also noted that the schools in their study did not always have good signposting to resources about how to deal with bullying because a pupil was LGB or T when the pupils needed it. This suggests that it will be important to explore in depth whether children and young people who have been bullied because they are LGB or T feel that they have received sufficient support and what form they would like it to take.

Reference List

Barrie, R. (2013). *The Birmingham LGBT Toolkit for Schools: A guide for teachers and support staff.* Birmingham LGBT.

Childnet International. (2009) *Cyberbullying: Supporting School Staff.* London: Department for children, schools and families.

Daley, A., Solomon, S., Newman, P. and Mishna, F. (2007) Traversing the Margins: Intersectionalities in the Bullying of Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual and Transgender Youth, *Journal of Lesbian and Gay Social Services*, Vol. 19, Issue 3/4, pp. 9-30.

Department for Children, Schools and Families (DCSF). (2007) *Safe to learn: embedding anti-bullying work in schools.* London: DCSF.

Department for Children, Schools and Families (DCSF). (2007) *Safe to learn: embedding anti-bullying work in schools.* London: DCSF.

Department for Education (2013) *Preventing and tackling bullying: Advice for headteachers, staff and governing bodies.* London: DfE.

Department for Education (DfE). (2011). The use and effectiveness of anti-bullying strategies in schools. London: DfE.

EACH (2012). *Ten Things Your School Can Do To Challenge Homophobia.* Accessed: http://www.eachaction.org.uk/resources/ [1 April 2014].

Formby, E., and Willis, B. (2011). *Tackling homophobia and transphobia in settings supporting young people: What are the barriers and facilitators? Findings from a South Yorkshire study.* Sheffield Hallam University.

Formby, Eleanor (2013). Understanding and responding to homophobia and bullying: contrasting staff and young people's views within community settings in England. *Sexuality Research and Social Policy.* Vol. 10; number 4.

GIRES (2008) Transphobic Bullying: guidance on combating transphobic bullying in schools. Home Office.

Hardeep, A., Marston, K., and Perry, T. (2003) *Homophobic Bullying: How well do we understand the problem?* Educational Action Challenging Homophobia.

Hinduja, S. and Patchin, J. W. (2011) *Cyberbullying and Sexual Orientation.* Cyberbullying Research Center.

IGLYO (2014). *Minimum standards to combat homophobic and transphobic bullying.* Accessed: http://www.iglyo.com/resources/ [10 April 2014]

Learning and Teaching Scotland. Toolkit for Teachers Dealing with Homophobia and Homophobic Bullying in Scottish Schools. Available: http://www.educationscotland.gov.uk/resources/d/genericresource_tcm4512285.asp [10 April 2014].

Lewisham Safeguarding Children Board and the Children and Young People's Strategic Partnership Board. Lewisham Anti-Bullying Policy and Guidance for those working with children and young people. (2011). Lewisham: Lewisham Safeguarding Children Board and the Children and Young People's Strategic Partnership Board Publication.

Marston, K. (2002) *Cyberhomophobia and bullying seminar report.* Educational Action Challenging Homophobia.

Morillas, C., & Gibbons, C. (2010). *Strategies for school personnel to support and protect Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual and Transgendered students.* Accessed: http://education.gsu.edu/schoolsafety/ [4 April 2014].

Ofsted (2013) Exploring the school's actions to prevent homophobic bullying: Briefing inspection 5, London: Ofsted.

Ofsted. (2012a) *Good practice resource - Tackling homophobic bullying to ensure lesbian, gay and bisexual (LGB) students feel safe: Prince Henry's Grammar School Specialist Language College.* London: Ofsted.

Ofsted (2012b) *A whole-school approach to tackling homophobic bullying and ingrained attitudes: Stoke Newington School and Sixth Form.* London: Ofsted.

O'Higgins-Norman, James, Goldrick, Michael and Harrison, Kathy (2010) *Addressing Homophobia in Second-Level Schools*, Tipperary: The Equality Authority.

Paul, S., Smith, P. K., and Blumberg, H. H. (2010) *Addressing cyberbullying in school using the quality circle approach.* Australian Journal of Guidance & Counselling, Issue 20, pp 157–157.

Pescitelli, A. (2011) *MySpace or yours? homophobic and transphobic bullying in cyberspace.* Vancouver: Simon Fraser University.

Smith, P.K., Pepler, D., and Rigby, K. (2005). *Bullying in schools: How successful can interventions be?* Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, (pp. 13-36).

Stonewall Education Guide. Challenging homophobic language. Accessed: https://www.stonewall.org.uk/at_school/education_for_all/quick_links/education_resources/4006.asp [4 April 2014].

Stonewall. (2013) *Educating equality index 2013.*London: Stonewall.

The Office for Standards in Education, Children's Services and Skills (Ofsted). (2013). *Exploring the school's actions to prevent homophobic bullying: Briefing for section 5 inspection.* London: Ofsted.

Tippet, N., Houlston, C., Smith, P. (2010) *Prevention and response to identity-based bullying among local authorities in England, Scotland and Wales.* London: Equality and Human Rights Commission.

Tower Hamlets Council's Communications Unit. (2011). *Tower Hamlets Anti-Bullying Resource Pack.* London: Tower Hamlets Council.

Warwick, I., and Aggleton, P. (2014). Bullying, 'cussing' and 'mucking about': complexities in tackling homophobia in three secondary schools in south London, UK. *Sex education*. Vol 14, Issue 2, pp 159-173.

Warwick, Ian, Chase, Elaine and Aggleton, Peter and Sanders, Sue (2004) *Homophobia, Sexual Orientation and Schools: A Review and Implications for Action*, London: Department for Education and Skills.

Welsh Government. (2011). *Respecting others: Homophobic bullying guidance.* Cardiff: Welsh Government.

Appendix A

What works in tackling homophobic, biphobic and transphobic bullying among school-age children and young people

Methodology paper: Prepared for the Government Equalities Office
April 2014.

Stage 1: Rapid Evidence Assessment

Introduction

In order to better understand how to reduce the prevalence and impact of homophobic, biphobic and transphobic (HBT) bullying among school-aged children and young people, it is necessary to review the existing evidence and practices. The first stage of this mixed methods research study involves a critical review, in the form of a Rapid Evidence Assessment (REA), of the evidence (including international). Through conducting this review, we will be able to synthesise existing evidence to point us in the direction of what appears to be working and why. It will also help inform the next stages of the study.

Research questions

o **What forms of HBT anti bullying initiatives for children and young people exist in schools and/ or outside schools for school-aged children and young people, with specific reference to those aimed at reducing HBT bullying?** We are aware that DfE advice does not distinguish between different types of bullying – schools are required, by law, to have a behaviour policy with measures to address all forms of bullying. However we would want to explore whether schools have specific measures in place that meet the needs and circumstances of their pupils, and of LGB or T pupils or pupils questioning the sexual orientation or gender identity in particular.

o **What specific factors are associated with effective initiatives and interventions?**

o **How effective are these interventions in reducing the**

   o **Prevalence of HBT bullying?**

   o **Impact of bullying on LGB and T children and young people (and those perceived to be LGB or T/different)?**

o **What evidence is there that these interventions are effective?**

o **What examples are there of facilitators or barriers to effective programme?**

Our approach

Using the inclusion criteria based on the aims of the research, 140 articles were identified and of these **31 articles** were selected for thorough review. The review covered:

- the legal and policy context in which anti-HBT bullying initiatives take place;
- existing knowledge on the effectiveness of anti-bullying activities/ initiatives, both general and specifically in relation to HBT bullying;
- anti-HBT bullying resources and the knowledge on which their effectiveness was based;
- specific differences of approach related to cyber bullying; specific issues or approaches relating biphobic and transphobic bullying.

The criteria for reviewing literature included:

Types of study - Primary research studies which have involved a mix of methodologies: qualitative, quantitative, ethnography, or a mix of these, and containing a full description of the methods used including sample sizes and data collection methods. We also reviewed best practice guidance and examples, written by government or other organisations such as Ofsted and anti-bullying charities.

Scope

- o primary and secondary school-age children,

- o HBT bullying within schools and educational institutions *and* cyber bullying,

- o HBT bullying of children and young people because of their *actual* or *perceived* sexual orientation or gender identity, because of their *association* with people who are gay, bisexual or transgender (or perceived to be),

- o HBT bullying behaviour (name calling, physical abuse for example) as well as attitudes and cultures which exist which influence this type of bullying.

- o Initiatives which focus on the perpetrator *and* the victim (restorative approaches),

- o The wide range of intervention type, e.g. peer-to-peer, teacher-to-pupil, whole school approach, those which involve parents and other people outside of the school such as the police.

Country - Given the potentially limited evidence base within England, we extended the research to include the United Kingdom, Europe (especially Scandinavia as outlined in the research specification), North America, Australia and New Zealand.

Language - Searches were restricted to English-language publications

Year of publication - Searches were focused on publications and sources from 2003 onwards. For UK policy and publication we specifically focussed on policy and publications from 2003 onwards so that literature is post-Section 28.

Focus - Searches focused specifically on anti-homophobic, biphobic and transphobic (HBT) bullying initiatives and initiatives where there was evidence of good practice or effectiveness.

Search terms

We reviewed literature from academic sources, grey literature and relevant websites using a combination of search terms including bullying, prejudic*, harass*, anti, AND

'homophob*', 'what works' OR 'effective' OR 'effectiveness' OR 'intervention*' OR 'initiative*', tool, toolkit, 'school' OR 'young people' OR 'good/best practice' OR 'pupil* child* teenage*, youth*, 'gay' OR 'homosexual' OR 'bisexual' OR 'lesbian' OR 'trans*' OR 'transgender' OR 'sexual', 'orientation', 'identity', 'gender'.

Databases/ Search Engines

- Academic literature:
  - British Library: http://explore.bl.uk
  - LSE Summon: http://lse.summon.serialssolutions.com/
  - Sage Journals: http://online.sagepub.com/
  - Google Scholar: http://scholar.google.co.uk/
  - PubMed Central: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/
  - Social Care Online: http://www.scie-socialcareonline.org.uk/
  - Social Policy Digest: http://journals.cambridge.org/spd/action/home;jsessionid=D2CE6C1368805B5ACA1E5B350FC26E43.tomcat8
  - Articles known to the research team
  - http://www.campbellcollaboration.org/lib/project/77/
  - Institute of Education

- Grey literature and relevant websites:
  - Google
  - GOV.UK: https://www.gov.uk/
  - Stonewall, Schools Out, GIRES, Anti-bullying Alliance, Beatbullying, Childnet, NSPCC, Education Action Challenging Homophobia, Restorative Justice Council websites and resource lists
  - Ofsted reports and best practice examples
  - Documents known to the research team

Evaluative criteria (at the screening stage)

Articles had to answer at least one of the REA questions to qualify for inclusion in the search. Articles that answered one or more of the REA questions were further evaluated using the criteria below, with 31 of the most relevant articles included in the review.

- **Date of publication** – the most recent publications by type were prioritised.
- **Robustness of the research methodology** – The robustness of the sample, how inclusive the sample was related to the findings presented (e.g. is a study that claims to be about LGB and/ or T people really just about L&G or just 'White' people), the quality of the way in which methods were used and the quality of analysis and reporting. For qualitative studies we looked at whether findings were based on convenience or purposive sampling, whether methods such as depth interviews and observations were used well and whether findings are supported by the sample. For quantitative studies we will look at sample size, how the sample was established, how instruments such as surveys were designed and conducted and whether conclusions reached are supported by the data. For all studies that draw conclusions about prevalence of HBT bullying being greater than other forms of bullying we will look to that there a comparative non-LGB and/ or T group.
- **The quality of the source** - The quality of the source will be judged on whether it is produced by a respected organisation or individual, the type of article (e.g. peer reviewed academic article, government report, campaigning material, best practice guidance and it was informed) and whether it adds any useful new information or questions to pursue in the research.

- **Variation of sources within range** (viz. different types of sources) - Here we will ensure a diversity of sources so that the research isn't dominated by one type of article and doesn't miss valuable information that may fall inside one type of search. We will try to achieve a balance between original research, reports and reviews, best practice guidance and 'grey' literature. We will also look to see that the sources cover a range of different perspectives from stakeholders and that source, as far as possible, cover how to deal effectively with homophobic, biphobic and transphobic bullying.
- **Coverage of each type of issue** – viz. homophobic, biphobic and transphobic, including research that is ground breaking in the fields or where there are few articles addressing specific issues.
- **Coverage of gender, sexual orientation and gender identity -** so that the different experiences of girls and boys, young lesbians, gay men, bisexual people and transgender people are included (as far as possible)
- **Inclusion of additional information** - relating to how approaches to HBT bullying may need to differ because of such factors such as the sex, religion, ethnicity or disability or other factors of LGB and T children and young people and the school population.

We collated the total number of sources (estimated to be around 140) into a thematic framework organised by the following themes:

1. Category 1: Policy context (LGB and T general)
2. Category 2: Anti-bullying context (LGB and/ or T specific)
3. Category 3: Anti-bullying resources (general)
4. Category 4: Anti-bullying resources (LGB and/ or T specific)
5. Category 5: Cyber bullying and resources
6. Category 6: Evaluation of effectiveness
7. Category 7: Prevalence of LGB and/ or T bullying
8. Category 8: Transphobic bullying

The total number of sources will then be screened and assessed by reading the abstracts and summaries and using the evaluative criteria described above and set out in the table below. Articles will be assigned a 'weight' (low, medium and high) across 5 areas.

	High (include)	**Medium** (possibly include)	**Low** (exclude)
1. Relevance/ Scope in relation to addressing research questions	Addresses HBT anti-bullying and its effectiveness in relation to children and young people and/or in schools.	Addressing aspects of HBT anti-bullying strategies and suggests best practice but the factors on which this is based are not clear/ not evidenced	Too general i.e. about sexual orientation issues more generally / about the effects of bullying / about the prevalence and nature of (HBT) bullying
2. Robustness of source	For quant studies: adequate sample size, inclusive sample, well supported rationale for data collection, conclusions supported by evidence. For qual studies: purposive	Suggests that good sample design and methods were used however some uncertainties around sample design and how the findings were used to	Poor transparency in methods; findings are not supported by the evidence or the sample.

	High (include)	Medium (possibly include)	Low (exclude)
	sampling methods employed, diverse sample, well supported rationale for data collection methods, conclusions supported by evidence.	come up with conclusions.	
3. Quality	Peer reviewed academic literature; government-commissioned literature; grey literature, i.e. working papers, NGO and consultant reports. Based on clear evidence.	Best practice guidance but with limited evidence and/or analysis.	Unreferenced, non-traceable web reports.
4. Date of publication	2003 - 2014	Older source (i.e. before 2003) but very relevant in terms of addressing the research questions	Before 2003. Before the repeal of Section 28.
5. Setting	UK context and International setting with transferable findings	Questionable whether international context would be relevant to UK	International context too unlike that of the UK to be of relevance

Articles that were rated 'low' across 3 or more of the 5 areas to were excluded from more depth analysis. Articles assigned a 'high' weight across 3 or more of the 5 areas and were included for further scrutiny. We found that this still left more articles than was manageable with the resources and time to review and so further selection was based on:

- **Coverage of each issue**: we included a range of sources to ensure coverage of homophobic, biphobic <u>and</u> transphobic related evidence.

- **Variation of sources:** we included mix of sources including journal articles, book chapters, best practice guidance and toolkits. We also ensured that the final sources selected represented the range of different perspectives from stakeholders (i.e. so that the evidence reviewed is not dominated by one single organisation's publications or views, DfE guidance for example).

- **Coverage of gender, sexual orientation and gender identity:** we ensured that across the board we have represented the experiences of different kinds of children and young people in relation to gender, sexual orientation and gender identity.

- **Inclusion of additional information:** We will need to ensure that we have some sources within the final list, if possible, that address how approaches to HBT bullying may need to differ because of factors such as gender, religion, ethnicity, disability etc.

In some instances it was necessary to exclude relatively robust articles of a similar type or covering similar issues to make sure that diversity related to transphobia and biphobia and articles relating to issues such as ethnicity and cyber bullying were included in the review.