The Version of Record of this manuscript has been published and is available in *Victims & Offenders*, 2024, Vol. 19, Nº 3, 491-512. https://doi.org/10.1080/15564886.2023.2182855

To cite this article: Ojeda, M., Elipe, P., & Del Rey, R. (2023). LGBTQ+ Bullying and Cyberbullying: Beyond Sexual Orientation and Gender Identity. *Victims & Offenders, 19*(3), 491–512. https://doi.org/10.1080/15564886.2023.2182855

# LGBTQ+ bullying and cyberbullying: Beyond sexual orientation and gender identity

Mónica Ojeda[a], Paz Elipe[b], and Rosario Del Rey[c]

[a] Department of Educational and Developmental Psychology, Universidad de Sevilla, Sevilla, Spain. monicaojeda@us.es. https://orcid.org/0000-0001-6056-8595

[b] Department of Psychology, Universidad de Jaen, Jaén, Spain. mpelipe@ujaen.es. https://orcid.org/0000-0001-5210-3747

[c] Department of Educational and Developmental Psychology, Universidad de Sevilla, Sevilla, Spain. delrey@us.es. https://orcid.org/0000-0002-1907-5489

Corresponding author: Paz Elipe, Department of Psychology, Universidad de Jaen, Jaén, Spain.

E-mail address: mpelipe@ujaen.es.

**Funding details:** This work was entirely supported by Fundación Pública Centro de Estudios Andaluces within the framework of the project "Acoso LGBTQ+fóbico en adolescentes andaluces: una realidad invisibilizada" [LGBTQ+phobic bullying in Andalusian adolescents: an invisibilized reality] under Grant PRY084/19. Authors are grateful for this support. Mónica Ojeda's work has been funded by the Spanish Ministry of Universities and the European Union – NextGenerationEU under Grant 20167.

**Disclosure statement:** The authors report there are no competing interests to declare.

# LGBTQ+ bullying and cyberbullying: Beyond sexual orientation and gender identity

LGBTQ+ bullying has a serious impact on young people's well-being. Many studies have analyzed this phenomenon in terms of the sexual orientation and/or gender identity of the victim, or taking just homophobic aggression into account. This view over-simplifies and limits our understanding of the phenomenon. The present study analyzes, exhaustively, in 2552 adolescents, the prevalence of both general and LGBTQ+ bullying and cyberbullying in accordance with age, assigned sex, gender identity, sexual orientation and gender expression. The results highlight the need to avoid general approaches and to consider the full spectrum of Affective-Sexual, Bodily, and Gender Diversity, given the differences that exist in the risk of victimization and cybervictimization among LGBTQ+ students. They also underscore the importance of taking these differences into consideration in order to design effective prevention and intervention strategies.

*Keywords:* Bullying; Cyberbullying; Sexual orientation; Gender identity; Gender expression.

**Word count: 9314**

## Introduction

For decades, bullying has probably been one of the most widely-studied types of interpersonal violence among adolescents and young people (Hatchel et al., 2020; Rettew & Pawlowski, 2022), and may even be a precursor to other types of violence, such as sexual violence and intimate partner violence (Espelage et al., 2022). Bullying continues to be present in many schools around the world (Salmivalli et al., 2021) and has more recently been joined by its counterpart in the digital environment, cyberbullying (Kowalski et al., 2014). The clear interconnection between the two phenomena is an example of the feedback that exists today between the online and offline worlds (Turkle, 2008; Wright, 2020). It has frequently been found that those involved in traditional bullying are more likely to participate in cyberbullying than those who are not (Olweus, 2013), with co-occurrence being common (Del Rey et al., 2012; Kowalski et al., 2014).

### *Bullying and cyberbullying*

Both bullying and cyberbullying are types of violence among young people which occur repeatedly and in an intentional manner over time (Olweus 2012), and in which there is an imbalance of power, be it physical, psychological, or social. In the case of cyberbullying, the harassment is carried out using digital media and the Internet, and may manifest in different forms, including verbal, psychological, and relational, in which latter case the victim is excluded from the online or social networking group (Olweus & Limber, 2018). In general, the two phenomena share the four main characteristics of traditional bullying: they are unjustified, repeated, intentional, and involve a power imbalance. However, in the case of cyberbullying, these characteristics take on certain different nuances, since the virtual environment changes them substantially (Kowalski et al., 2014). For example, cyberbullies are not constrained by any space-time limits, since an image or a message can be sent or

spread repeatedly in many places at the same time, and by many different people, thereby exponentially increasing the audience to the act of aggression (Hinduja & Patchin, 2008).

These problems are not evenly distributed throughout the entire population, and certain groups are much more likely to become victims. According to the social ecological perspective (Bronfenbrenner, 1979), certain social factors may, to a large extent, explain involvement in bullying and cyberbullying (Lambe et al., 2019). One such factor is when children or young people diverge from the sex-gender norm in terms of their sexual orientation and gender identity and/or expression. This includes lesbian, gay male, bisexual, transgender and gender-nonconforming (TGNC) and questioning people (from here on LGBTQ+ people).

***LGBTQ+ bullying and cyberbullying***

Sexual and gender minorities are becoming increasingly visible in our societies; however, studies on bullying involving these minorities indicate that there is still much work to be done in this field (Espelage et al., 2018). Discrimination against sexual and gender minorities is present not just in the classroom, but also in the peer group, the family and in society in general, and is therefore understood as a "structural" problem (UNESCO, 2017). Society has turned LGBTQ+ people into one of the most vulnerable of all minority groups, which is why bullying targeted at these young people is considered a specific type of harassment (Hong & Garbarino, 2012).

This type of bullying differs from general bullying in that the motivation behind it goes beyond individual elements and is rooted in certain social factors, forming part of what has been termed stigma-based bullying (Earnshaw et al., 2018). Stigma-based bullying and, consequently, LGBTQ+ bullying, are rooted in the importance of power dynamics based on

social structures, beliefs and ideas, social identity, peer group rules, and the social and moral assessment of discrimination (Brenick & Halgunseth, 2017).

Studies in this field have increased notably over recent years, although this type of bullying has been conceptualized in many different ways, and in accordance with a varied range of criteria. Some studies include no explicit definition of this type of bullying (Brown & Buthelezi, 2020; Horn & Schriber, 2020), and those that do, generally tend to refer to homophobic bullying (Hatchel et al., 2020; Parent et al., 2020) and, to a lesser degree, to gender-based bullying (Brinkman & Manning, 2015; Merrin et al., 2017), bias-based bullying (Day et al., 2020; Williams et al., 2018) or bullying among LGBT people (Mueller et al., 2015), among others. In this sense, it is important to bear in mind that this type of bullying goes far beyond homophobia, understood as a rejection of or aversion to lesbian and gay male people, and includes all those considered to belong to a sexual minority (Platero, 2008).

Meta-analyses have confirmed that young people from sexual minorities are exposed to significantly more bullying and higher levels of victimization at school than their heterosexual counterparts (Fedewa & Ahn, 2011; Toomey & Russell, 2016). However, in this regard, it is important to note that LGBTQ+ bullying and cyberbullying have not been studied equally in all countries, and only a few studies have analyzed this issue in European nations, such as Spain, where the present study was conducted. Despite this, however, the results suggest that LGBTQ+ youths are more frequently and severely victimized than their heterosexual cisgender counterparts both internationally, in the USA, Asia, Canada and Europe (Jonas et al., 2022), and nationally, in Spain (Garaigordobil & Larrain, 2020). Furthermore, previous studies in the USA have shown that the prevalence of victimization varies in accordance not only with sexual orientation, but also with gender identity and expression (Kosciw et al., 2020). Indeed, adolescents and young people perceive transgender and gender diverse youths as the most victimized group (Gower et al., 2018), and young

people from sexual minorities are at greater risk of poly-victimization, i.e., being victims of both traditional bullying and cyberbullying (Elipe et al., 2021; Sterzing et al., 2017). Nevertheless, according to recent systematic reviews analyzing studies from, among others, the USA, Portugal, Canada, Italy, the UK, Spain, Israel, Ireland, Bulgaria, Poland, Africa, Chile and Mexico, the diversity of definitions used has contributed to a broad spectrum of prevalence rates, ranging between 22% and 87% (Earnshaw et al., 2018), or even between 3.6% and 50% (Moyano & Sánchez-Fuentes, 2020). Studies conducted in Spain reflect the same conceptual and methodological diversity as international studies, generally assessing only sexual orientation and/or the presence of homophobic aggression (Elipe et al., 2018; Garaigordobil & Larrain, 2020), with only some including perceived motives (Pichardo & Stéfano, 2015).

This situation is further complicated by the fact that, to date, many studies in this field have focused either exclusively on homophobic bullying or exclusively on general bullying (e.g., Angoff & Barnhart, 2021; Elipe et al., 2018; Rodríguez-Hidalgo & Hurtado-Mellado, 2019), rather than studying both types at once. Others have taken only the sexual orientation of victims into account, comparing heterosexuality with other orientations or with not being sure about one's orientation (e.g., Birkett et al., 2009; Elipe et al., 2021; Garaigordobil & Larrain, 2020; Toomey & Russell, 2016). Some studies have made a conceptual and methodological effort to include TGNC people (e.g., Kosciw et al., 2020; Toomey et al., 2012). However, it is important to analyze bullying and cyberbullying targeted at the entire range of sex-gender diversity, in other words, the whole spectrum of LGBTQ+ bullying and cyberbullying, in order to gain a more comprehensive overview of these phenomena. Failure to take all forms of sexual and gender diversity into account may lead to only a partial view of this type of violence, thereby hampering educational interventions designed to combat it (Anagnostopoulos et al., 2008). This is why it is necessary to analyze this type of violence in

a comprehensive manner, bearing in mind not only the motivation behind it and the form that it takes (i.e., whether it be LGBTQ+ or general in nature), but also the people at whom it is targeted, taking the different dimensions of diversity into account, including assigned sex, sexual orientation, gender identity, and gender expression.

***The present study***

The absence of a clear, integrating conceptualization of this type of harassment poses an additional problem for its analysis, rendering it invisible and making comparisons between studies difficult. Moreover, the limited number of studies that have been conducted in European countries, such as Spain, makes it difficult to report on possible cultural differences. It is therefore hard to draw clear conclusions to help guide the development of prevention and intervention strategies. The present study adopts a comprehensive outlook, comparing involvement in bullying and cyberbullying (both general and LGBTQ+) in accordance with sexual and gender diversity.

Our aim was, firstly, to analyze the prevalence of both general and LGBTQ+ bullying and cyberbullying among Spanish adolescents in accordance with age, sex assigned at birth, gender identity, sexual orientation and gender expression. We also sought to determine which adolescents are more likely to be targeted by general and LGBTQ+ bullying and cyberbullying.

In light of our review of the literature, we expected to find differences in the prevalence of LGBTQ+ bullying and cyberbullying in accordance with the criteria used in the study: sex, sexual orientation, gender identity and gender expression (hypothesis 1). We also expected the prevalence of LGBTQ+ bullying and cyberbullying to be higher when all the dimensions of sexual and gender diversity were considered than when just one of them was analyzed separately (hypothesis 2). Finally, we expected to find that some groups within the

LGBTQ+ population are more likely than others to be targeted by LGBTQ+ bullying and cyberbullying. Specifically, we expected TGNC youths to be targeted more than their cisgender counterparts and, in terms of sexual orientation, we expected pansexual and bisexual youths to be targeted more than lesbian and gay male adolescents (hypothesis 3).

## Methods

### *Recruitment and procedure*

The study followed a cross-sectional, prospective and unified ex post facto design (Montero & León, 2007). To determine the sample size required to obtain statistically reliable results, a minimum number of LGBTQ+ participants was established in accordance with the percentages of LGBTQ+ youth in the general population, as reported by previous studies (Elipe et al., 2018; Garaigordobil & Larrain, 2020). We also adjusted the sample size so as to avoid exceeding a sample error of + 5.5%, with a confidence interval of 95.44% (Osuna et al., 1991). The number of LGBTQ+ participants required was estimated at 330, meaning that the total sample needed to contain around 2200 adolescents. Incidental cluster sampling was performed, with clusters being schools and training centers and the ultimate units of analysis being students from years 1 to 4 of compulsory secondary education (abbreviated to ESO in Spanish), the two years of the Spanish Baccalaureate, Training Cycles and Basic Vocational Training (equivalent to grades 7 - 12 and vocational training in the US, and to years 8-13 and further education 0-2 in the UK). During the second year of the worldwide COVID-19 pandemic, telephone conversations were held and emails exchanged with schools and vocational training centers, and detailed information about the study was sent, outlining its different phases and the instruments to be used. Any school or center that expressed an interest was allowed to participate. Once we had confirmed the participation of the schools and centers, informed consent documents were sent out to be completed by students' parents and/or legal guardians, and a date was agreed upon for data collection. Each participating

school or center was offered a choice of two data collection formats: online, in which students completed a battery of instruments through a link to the SurveyMonkey platform; and paper and pencil format. In both formats, schools and centers could opt to gather the information themselves or to ask the research team to come to the premises to oversee the procedure. During the administration of the instruments, participants were assured of the anonymous and voluntary nature of the study. They were also assured that their responses would be strictly confidential, and emphasis was placed on the importance of being honest in their answers. The study was approved by the University of Jaen's Ethics Committee [OCT.20/6.PRY].

***Participants***

A total of 2552 adolescents aged 11-20 years (M = 14.52; SD = 1.66) from 13 secondary schools and further education and vocational training centers in Andalusia (Spain) participated in the study. Of these, 21.2% were in year 1 of ESO; 22% were in year 2; 21.6% in year 3; 16% in year 4; 16.8% were doing the Spanish Baccalaureate or a Training Cycle and 2.4% were engaged in Basic Vocational Training. The majority (96%) had been born in Spain. Based on their parents' country of birth, 92.3% of participants can be considered native Spaniards (i.e., people with no migration background), 5.8% had a migration background and 1.9% could not be determined due to missing information.

Table 1 shows the valid percentages of the characteristics of our sample in terms of sexual and gender diversity. In terms of sex assigned at birth, 55.5% of participants were female and 44.5% male. In terms of gender identity, 43.9% were cisgender boys, 53.5% cisgender girls, 0.6% transgender boys, 0.4% transgender girls, and 1.6% non-binary youths (bigender or agender). Regarding sexual orientation, 81.1% identified as heterosexual and 18.9% indicated another sexual orientation: lesbian, gay male, bisexual, pansexual, asexual and questioning. Finally, in terms of gender expression, 61.8% said they thought they were perceived in

accordance with what was socially associated with the gender with which they identified (boy or girl); 36.6% said they thought they were perceived as neutral or androgynous; and 1.6% said they thought they were perceived as the opposite gender to the gender with which they identified (from a binary perspective), namely, feminine boys or masculine girls. It should be noted that all non-binary gender students said they were viewed by other people as androgynous.

[INSERT TABLE 1 ABOUT HERE]

***Measures***

Self-report measures about general and LGBTQ+ bullying and cyberbullying and assigned sex, gender identity, gender expression, and sexual orientation were used.

*General bullying and LGBTQ+ bullying.* General bullying was measured using the *European Bullying Intervention Project Questionnaire* (EBIP-Q; Ortega-Ruiz et al., 2016). This instrument comprises 7 double items measured on a 5-point Likert-type scale ($\alpha$ = .85) (from "0 = Never" to "4 = Yes, more than once a week") that assess victimization ($\alpha$ = .84) and aggression ($\alpha$ = .81) suffered or perpetrated over the past two months (e.g., Someone has hit me, kicked me or pushed me).

To assess LGBTQ+ bullying, 5 double items were added to the EBIP-Q, again rated on a Likert-type scale ($\alpha$ = .72), to measure the specific victimization ($\alpha$ = .76) and aggression ($\alpha$ = .70) suffered by or perpetrated against someone as a result of their diverse gender identity, sexual orientation or gender expression over the past two months (e.g., Someone has made fun of my appearance, clothes or gestures for not considering them sufficiently "masculine" or "feminine").

*General cyberbullying and LGBTQ+ cyberbullying.* General cyberbullying was measured using the *European Cyberbullying Intervention Project Questionnaire* (ECIP-Q;

Del Rey et al., 2015). This instrument comprises 11 double items measured on a 5-point Likert-type scale (α = .87) (from "0 = Never" to "4 = Yes, more than once a week") that assess cybervictimization (α = .82) and cyberaggression (α = .88) suffered or perpetrated over the past two months (e.g., Someone hacked into my account and pretended to be me).

To assess LGBTQ+ cyberbullying, 5 double items were added to the ECIP-Q, again rated on a Likert-type scale (α = .76), to measure the specific cybervictimization (α = .72) and cyberaggression (α = .83) suffered by or perpetrated against someone as a result of their diverse gender identity, sexual orientation or gender expression over the past two months (e.g., Someone has threatened me through social networks alluding to my sexual orientation or identity).

*Sex and gender identity.* To measure sex assigned at birth, one direct item was used with the response options "male" and "female". To determine gender identity, another direct item was used: "I consider myself..." with the response options being: "a boy", "a girl", "both a boy and a girl" and "neither a boy nor a girl". Previous national studies conducted in several countries, including the USA, the UK and Spain, have shown the benefits of including direct questions about sex and gender identity (e.g., Bradlow et al., 2017; Kosciw et al., 2018).

*Sexual and/or romantic attraction.* Sexual and/or romantic attraction was assessed by adapting an item from Austin et al. (2008). It is an item that asks directly about attraction, "Do you generally feel romantically and/or sexually attracted to…" with students selecting their answer from various options: "boys", "girls", "boys and girls", "individuals, regardless of their sex or gender", "neither boys nor girls", "I'm not sure" and "others". In their study, Austin et al. (2008) found that this type of question was understood better by adolescents than those asking them to label themselves. Other studies (e.g., Collier et al., 2013) also endorse this way of formulating the question, which focuses more on attraction than on sexual orientation labelling.

*Gender expression.* An adaptation of the Socially Assigned Gender Nonconformity instrument (Wylie et al., 2010) was used to assess gender expression. This scale comprises 2 items which ask students about how they believe others see them in relation to their gender expression: “Our appearance, style or the way we dress may affect what other people think about us. In general, how do you think people perceive your appearance, style, and the way you dress?” and “Our gestures (the way in which we talk, move our hands, walk, etc.) may affect what other people think of us. In general, how do you think people perceive your gestures?” Responses are given on a continuous 7-point scale, ranging from “Very feminine” to “Equally feminine and masculine” to “Very masculine”. The inclusion of this instrument has added value, since despite the importance of this dimension as an acknowledged risk factor, it is very hard to assess and is rarely included in any studies.

***Data analysis***

The data were coded and analyzed using SPSS 26.0. Variables linked to gender identity, sexual orientation, and gender expression, the comprehensive Affective-Sexual, Bodily, and Gender Diversity (ASBGD) variable, co-involvement in general and LGBTQ+ bullying and co-involvement in general and LGBTQ+ cyberbullying were recoded.

Gender identity was calculated by crossing the data from the gender identity and sex assigned at birth variables, obtaining the following values: “cisgender boys”, “cisgender girls”, “transgender boys”, “transgender girls”, “bigender youths” and “agender youths”. Given the low prevalence of some identities, the variable was subsequently recoded into "cisgender people" and "trans and gender-nonconforming (TGNC) people", which included transgender boys and girls as well as bigender and agender youths. Sexual orientation was calculated by crossing data from the gender identity and sexual attraction variables, obtaining the following values: “heterosexual orientation”, “gay/lesbian orientation”, “bisexual orientation”, “pansexual orientation”, “asexual” and “questioning”. During the multiple regression

analyses, the bisexual and pansexual orientations were collapsed. Gender expression was calculated using the mean for gender expression, gestures, and clothing, obtaining the values "feminine", "androgynous" and "masculine". Values around the mean (3, 4 and 5) were considered indicative of an androgynous gender expression, and extreme values were considered indicative of a feminine (1 and 2) or masculine gender expression (6 and 7), respectively. Subsequently, gender expression was calculated in accordance with gender identity, obtaining the following values: "concordant gender expression", "androgynous gender expression" and "discordant gender expression". The comprehensive ASBGD variable was calculated by crossing gender identity, sexual orientation and gender expression, with two groups being obtained: "LGBTQ+ youths", which included those participants whose orientation, gender identity or gender expression diverged from heteronormativity, i.e., lesbian/gay, bisexual, pansexual, asexual, questioning and TGNC youths and cisgender heterosexual youths whose gender expression was discordant; and "Heteronormative cisgender (HC) youths", which included both cisgender heterosexual people whose expression concurred with their gender and cisgender heterosexual people who were perceived as androgynous. Variables linked to co-involvement with general and LGBTQ+ bullying and co-involvement with general and LGBTQ+ cyberbullying were calculated by combining involvement in general bullying and involvement in LGBTQ+ bullying, and involvement in general cyberbullying and involvement in LGBTQ+ cyberbullying, respectively. The following values were obtained: "not involved", "general victim", "LGBTQ+ victim", "poly-victim", "general bully", "LGBTQ+ bully", "poly-bully", "general bully-victim", "LGBTQ+ bully-victim", "poly-bully-victim" and "combined bully-victim".

Next, basic descriptive analyses were carried out, including Cronbach's alphas, frequencies, contingency tables and Chi-square tests. In the contingency tables, corrected standardized residual values were used to estimate significant associations between category

levels, with values equal to or higher than ± 1.96 being considered significant. Multiple linear regression analyses were performed to analyze associations between sex, gender identity, sexual orientation and gender expression as independent variables, and bullying victimization and cyberbullying victimization, both general and LGBTQ+, as dependent variables. To this end, dummy variables were created for each of the response options of the independent variables. $R^2$ was used as a measure of effect size. All variables were entered simultaneously into the model. The data are available in the institutional repository for scientific production of University of Jaen (Spain).

## Results

### *Prevalence of LGBTQ+ bullying*

In general terms, 31% of young people had been involved in general bullying over the past two months: 19.9% as victims, 4.3% as bullies and 6.9% in both roles. In relation to specific LGBTQ+ bullying, 11.5% reported being involved: 7.9% as victims, 2.1% as bullies and 1.5% in both roles.

In terms of ASBGD, involvement in general bullying, LGBTQ+ bullying or both (poly-victim) was found to vary in accordance with assigned sex, gender identity, sexual orientation and gender expression (see Table 2).

[INSERT TABLE 2 ABOUT HERE]

In relation to assigned sex ($\chi^2[10, N = 2340] = 53.04$, $p < .001$; V = .151), female students were more targeted as general victims (17.1%) and poly-victims (5.2%) than their male counterparts (12.9% and 3.3%, respectively); and male participants were more involved as LGBTQ+ bullies (1%), poly-bullies (1.3%), poly-bully-victims (1.9%) and combined bully-victims (3.8%) than their female counterparts (0.1%, 0.4%, 0.2% and 2.3%, respectively).

In terms of gender identity ($\chi^2$[10, $N$ = 2340] = 48.70, $p$ < .001; V = .144), TGNC people were more targeted as LGBTQ+ victims (7%) and poly-victims (17.5%) than their cisgender counterparts (1.6% and 4%, respectively). TGNC youths were also more involved as poly-bully-victims (3.5%) than cisgender participants (0.9%).

As regards sexual orientation ($\chi^2$[50, $N$ = 2312] = 211.97, $p$< .001; V = .135), gay/lesbian (8.5%) and bisexual (4.9%) students were more targeted as LGBTQ+ victims (8.5%, 4.9%, respectively) than heterosexual students (1.1%). Pansexual people (24.6%) were more targeted as poly-victims than their counterparts in any of the other groups mentioned above (18.5%, 11.8% and 2.2%, respectively). In contrast, heterosexual students were more involved as poly-bullies (1%) and pansexual students as poly-bully-victims (3.5%).

As regards gender expression ($\chi^2$[20, $N$ = 2334] = 109.91, $p$ < .001; V = .153), those with discordant and androgynous gender expressions were more targeted as LGBTQ+ victims (7.9% and 2.7%, respectively) than those with a concordant gender expression (1%). Furthermore, those with a discordant gender expression were more involved as LGBTQ+ bullies (2.6%) and those with a concordant gender expression were more involved as poly-bullies (1.1%).

Looking at ASBGD in general ($\chi^2$[10, $N$ = 2334] = 140.50, $p$ < .001; V = .245), LGBTQ+ youths were more targeted as LGBTQ+ victims (4.4%) and poly-victims (12.5%) than their cisgender heteronormative (CH) counterparts (1.1% and 2.3%, respectively). In contrast, CH youths were more involved as poly-bullies (1%) and LGBTQ+ youths were more involved as combined bully-victims (4.4%).

***Prevalence of LGBTQ+ cyberbullying***

In general terms, 18.1% of young people had been involved in general cyberbullying over the past two months: 10.8% as victims, 3.2% as bullies and 4.2% in both roles. In relation to specific LGBTQ+ cyberbullying, 8.1% reported being involved: 5.1% as victims, 1.8% as bullies and 1.1% in both roles.

In terms of ASBGD, involvement in general cyberbullying, LGBTQ+ cyberbullying or both (poly-cybervictimization) was found to vary in accordance with assigned sex, gender identity, sexual orientation, and gender expression (see Table 3).

[INSERT TABLE 3 ABOUT HERE]

As regards assigned sex ($\chi^2[10, N = 2383] = 33.10, p < .001$; V = .118), female students were more targeted as general cybervictims (8.9%) than male students (6.6%), who in turn were more involved as LGBTQ+ cyberbullies (0.9%), poly-cyberbullies (1.0%) and poly-cyberbully-victims (1.1%) than their female counterparts (0.2%, 0.1% and 0.3%, respectively).

In terms of gender identity ($\chi^2[10, N = 2383] = 70.75, p < .001$; V = .172), TGNC youths were more targeted as general cybervictims (14.8%) and poly-cybervictims (16.4%) than their cisgender counterparts (7.7% and 2.2%, respectively). Also, TGNC students were more involved as combined cyberbully-victims (8.2%) than cisgender participants (1.9%).

As regards sexual orientation ($\chi^2[50, N = 2353] = 142.42, p < .001$; V = .110), bisexual people were more targeted as LGBTQ+ cybervictims (3.8%) than heterosexual students (1.0%). Pansexual (10%) and bisexual people (10%) and gay/lesbian youths (8.6%) were more targeted as poly-cybervictims than heterosexual participants (1.3%). In contrast, asexual students were more involved as poly-cyberbully-victims (4.5%) and questioning students were more involved as combined cyberbully-victims (5.8%).

In terms of gender expression ($\chi^2$[20, $N$ = 2375] = 59.98, $p$ < .001; V = .112), those with an androgynous gender expression were more targeted as LGBTQ+ cybervictims (2.5%) than those with a concordant gender expression (0.9%). Those with discordant and androgynous gender expressions were more targeted as poly-cybervictims (10.3% and 4.4%, respectively) than those with a concordant gender expression (1.2%). In contrast, those with a concordant gender expression were more involved as combined cyberbully-victims (1.6%).

Looking at ASBGD in general ($\chi^2$[10, $N$ = 2375] = 95.48, $p$ < .001; V = .201), LGBTQ+ youths were more targeted as general cybervictims (10.5%), LGBTQ+ cybervictims (3.3%) and poly-cybervictims (7.4%) than their heteronormative cisgender counterparts (17.2%, 1.0% and 1.3%, respectively). Also, LGBTQ+ youths were more involved as combined cyberbully-victims (3.3%) than CH youths (1.7%).

***Association between general and LGBTQ+ victimization and cybervictimization and ASBGD***

The multiple linear regression models performed returned significant results (see Tables 4 and 5). Variables linked to age, assigned sex, sexual orientation, gender identity, and gender expression explained 4.4% of the variance in the general victimization model, 12.3% of the variance in the LGBTQ+ victimization model, 3% of the variance in the general cybervictimization model and 10.5% of the variance in the LGBTQ+ cybervictimization model.

Specifically, in the general victimization model (F [8, 2454] = 14.002, p < .001; $R^2$ = .044), being younger, having a TGNC identity and a bisexual or pansexual orientation were significantly associated with being targeted by general bullying (see Table 4).

In the LGBTQ+ victimization model (F [8, 2454] = 42.718, p < .001; $R^2$ = .123), being younger, having a TGNC identity and a gay, lesbian, bisexual or pansexual orientation

and an androgynous or discordant gender expression were significantly associated with being targeted by LGBTQ+ bullying (Table 4).

[INSERT TABLE 4 ABOUT HERE]

In the general cybervictimization model ($F [8, 2454] = 9.557$, $p < .001$; $R^2 = .030$), being younger and having a TGNC identity and a bisexual or pansexual orientation were significantly associated with being targeted by general cyberbullying (see Table 5).

Finally, in the LGBTQ+ cybervictimization model ($F [8, 2454] = 35.756$, $p < .001$; $R^2 = .105$), being younger, having a TGNC identity, a gay, lesbian, bisexual or pansexual orientation and an androgynous or discordant gender expression were significantly associated with being targeted by LGBTQ+ cyberbullying (Table 5).

[INSERT TABLE 5 ABOUT HERE]

## Discussion

Bullying and cyberbullying are universal problems (UNESCO, 2013) that play a vital role in people's psychosocial development (Ttofi et al., 2011). Traditional social values have turned LGBTQ+ people into one of the most vulnerable groups in the population. For this reason, coupled with the scarcity of studies in this field (Zych et al., 2015), exploring the different types of violence perpetrated against LGBTQ+ youths has become a key undertaking in the effort to satisfy children's and young people's needs. The present study furthers existing knowledge of LGBTQ+ bullying and cyberbullying, analyzing its prevalence in a comprehensive manner and taking the entire spectrum of sex-gender diversity into account, as well as different types of aggression, from the more general variety to the more specific kind. Moreover, within this sex-gender diversity, the study enabled us to identify those groups most likely to become involved in the different roles encompassed by this type of violence.

***Prevalence of LGBTQ+ bullying and cyberbullying***

The results of the present study confirm that the prevalence rates of general and LGBTQ+ bullying and cyberbullying vary in accordance with assigned sex, gender identity, sexual orientation and gender expression, a finding that corroborates hypothesis 1. Consistently with that reported by previous studies (Fedewa & Ahn, 2011; Toomey & Russell, 2016), adolescents and young people with non-heterosexual orientations were found to be targeted more often by bullying and cyberbullying, as were those with a non-heteronormative gender identity (TGNC) and/or gender expression (androgynous or discordant). Moreover, in terms of assigned sex, female students were targeted as victims, cybervictims and poly-victims (of both LGBTQ+ and general bullying) more often than their male counterparts. For their part, students whose assigned sex was male were more involved in both LGBTQ+ bullying and cyberbullying as bullies, poly-bullies and combined bully-victims.

In general terms, in relation to each of the dimensions analyzed, more than one out of every five students whose assigned sex was female, more than two out of every five TGNC youths, almost two out of every five bisexual, gay and lesbian youths, and more than two out of every five of those with a discordant gender expression were victims of either general or LGBTQ+ bullying, or both. Although these prevalence rates were higher than those found for the other participants in our study, they nevertheless indicate that bullying rates during the two months prior to the study were lower than those reported by other studies carried out in the USA (72% of LGBT students; Hinduja & Patchin, 2011), Mexico (67% of LGBTQ students; Baruch, 2012) and the UK (55% of LGB students; Guasp et al., 2012). However, they were higher than those reported by other Spanish studies, which found victimization rates of 19.6% among students who had doubts about their sexual orientation, 14.3% among

lesbian/gay or bisexual students (Rodríguez-Hidalgo & Hurtado-Mellado, 2019) and 25.1% among non-heterosexual students (Garaigordobil & Larrain, 2020).

Consistently with previous studies (Garaigordobil & Larrain, 2020), it seems that both, general and LGBTQ+ bullying, are mainly perpetrated by heterosexual youths. Bully-victims are generally youths whose assigned sex is male, as well as TGNC and LGBTQ+ youths, as opposed to their CH counterparts. The involvement of questioning people coincides with that reported by other studies, in which those in this group were also found to perpetrate bullying (Hinduja & Patchin, 2011). Their greater involvement in the combined bully-victim role than as bullies alone may be explained by the bully-victim cycle that characterizes this phenomenon. Bullies and victims are not two totally independent groups. Rather, on many occasions, young people switch roles and end up becoming involved in both types of behavior (Ma, 2001).

In the case of cyberbullying (general, LGBTQ+, or both), one out of every ten people whose assigned sex was female, almost two out of every five TGNC youths, more than one out of every five gay/lesbian, bisexual or pansexual youths and more than one out of every five youths with a discordant gender expression were cybervictims, rates that were higher than those reported by the other participants in the study. Despite this, however, and similarly to that observed in relation to traditional bullying, involvement rates in cyberbullying during the two months prior to the study were lower than those reported by other studies carried out in different countries, such as the USA (36.1% of LGBT students, Hinduja & Patchin, 2011; and 44.9% of LGBTQ students, Kosciw et al., 2020). However, they were higher than those reported by other Spanish studies, which, for example, found cybervictimization rates of 13.7% among non-heterosexual students (Garaigordobil & Larrain, 2020).

Consistently with previous studies (Garaigordobil & Larrain, 2020), both general and LGBTQ+ cyberbullying are mainly perpetrated by boys and, in our study, by those whose assigned sex was male. Cyberbully-victims are mainly youths whose assigned sex is male, TGNC youths and LGBTQ+ students, as opposed to their CH counterparts. As with traditional bullying, the greater involvement of the youths in these groups as poly-cyberbully-victims or combined cyberbully-victims suggests that the bully-victim cycle may be present also in the case of cyberbullying (Ma, 2001).

This partially confirms hypothesis 2, since the prevalence of LGBTQ+ bullying and cyberbullying is higher when the entire spectrum of Affective-Sexual Bodily and Gender Diversity is taken into consideration, although certain characteristics are associated with greater victimization and cybervictimization as in the case of TGNC people, for example (Heino et al., 2021). Nevertheless, the complex situation that underlies these phenomena indicates the need to simplify and use a single variable that considers all types of Affective-Sexual Bodily and Gender Diversity, namely the combined ASBGD variable. When this is done, we can conclude that almost two out of every five and more than one out of every five young LGBTQ+ people are the targets of bullying and cyberbullying, respectively, as opposed to one out of every ten CH youths.

***Victimization and cybervictimization in relation to Affective-Sexual, Bodily and Gender Diversity***

The present study empirically shows that both sex-gender diversity and LGBTQ+ bullying and cyberbullying are very much present in today's classrooms (Angoff & Barnhart, 2021). However, the results also confirm that, within this sex-gender diversity, certain characteristics are associated with a greater likelihood of be targeted as victim (Heino et al., 2021). The results confirm that those identities, orientations and expressions that do not

coincide with heteronormative beliefs and values are more likely to become targets for both general and LGBTQ+ bullying and cyberbullying. However, the likelihood is not the same for all members of the group, a finding that confirms hypothesis 3.

The likelihood of being the target of general and LGBTQ+ bullying and cyberbullying decreases with age among young people aged between 11 and 20 years. Despite the inevitable and progressively more intense use of the social media that occurs as young people move through adolescence (Garmendia et al., 2016), this finding is consistent with that reported by other studies, which observed that online and offline victimization decreases with age (DeSmet et al., 2018). This may be due to the fact that, as youngsters grow older, they have more resources and sources of aid to help them cope with this type of violence (D'Augelli et al., 2002).

Consistently with that reported by previous studies (Kosciw et al., 2020), general and LGBTQ+ victimization and cybervictimization rates were higher among TGNC youths and, in relation to sexual orientation, among bisexual and pansexual students. This finding supports the idea that these young people are the targets of not only specific homophobic, biphobic or transphobic attacks (Sánchez-SanSegundo et al., 2019), but of general ones as well (Goodenow et al., 2016), and may also be more involved as poly-victims (Elipe et al., 2021). This finding points to the need for research to take other identities and orientations into account also, beyond the gay, lesbian and bisexual ones, which are the most commonly analyzed (Fedewa & Ahn, 2011). This is consistent with that reported by previous studies, which found that those perceived as more incongruent with their gender, such as TGNC people, were more likely targeted as victims and experience emotional distress (Gower et al., 2018).

Moreover, the likelihood of being targeted by specific LGBTQ+ bullying and cyberbullying is also higher among those with a gay or lesbian sexual orientation, as well as among those with an androgynous or discordant gender expression. Again, these results, and particularly the key role played by gender expressions that are not concordant with the person's gender from a traditional viewpoint, support the thesis that group beliefs, prejudices and stereotypes regarding sexual diversity are basic factors in LGBTQ+ bullying and cyberbullying (Earnshaw et al., 2018). Indeed, Kosciw and Pizmony-Levy (2016) found that verbal bullying at school was generally based on sexual orientation and gender expression. It seems that, among peers, this type of bullying or mockery may serve as a means of making people conform to expected gender roles in the group (Tucker et al., 2016). Homophobic insults are not only used to impose one's own status, but also to warn others not to deviate from socially-accepted gender behaviors.

***Implications and contributions***

Despite the prevalence and impact of LGBTQ+ bullying and cyberbullying, these phenomena are hardly dealt with at all in schools. Although several different initiatives have been developed to try to combat them, the existing lack of consensus regarding their conceptualization, the resulting lack of suitable measurement instruments and the invisible nature of the problem have meant that these initiatives are still very much in the minority, and in general, are supported by very little empirical evidence (Toomey & Russell, 2016). The present study therefore aims to render these types of violence more visible, increase our knowledge of them and help further their scientific delimitation by studying their contributing variables, in order to enable the future design of effective intervention strategies. To the best of our knowledge, this is one of the first studies to analyze these phenomena taking into account both different types of aggression (general and LGBTQ+) and the entire spectrum of sex-gender diversity, rather than just sexual orientation and gender identity. Analyzing

ASBGD in all its various forms, as well as the differences found in victimization within the LGBTQ+ group, will help lay the groundwork for future prevention and intervention programs.

Given the impact that these types of violence have on adolescents (Andersen et al., 2015), an educational effort should be made early on and with all students in the classroom, since diversity and contact between different groups help promote inclusive attitudes and reduce prejudice (Gundelach, 2014; Davies et al., 2011). Nevertheless, it is necessary to avoid generalized intervention approaches that assume that what will work for the general population will also work for specific groups; the high prevalence of LGBTQ+ bullying and cyberbullying, as well as the absence of efficacy evaluations of LGBTQ+ bullying prevention programs, suggest that this assumption is not entirely correct (Minton, 2014). It is necessary to design programs that contemplate diversity in the classroom from an inclusive standpoint.

In order to understand these types of bullying, what is required is a social ecological approach similar to that proposed by Bronfenbrenner and Morris (2006). This approach holds that vulnerability is not something that is inherent to the individual, but is rather the result of the interaction between individual, interpersonal and social variables at a specific social-historical moment, and highlights the importance of shared ideas and beliefs in each historical-cultural context. Students who are the targets of this type of bullying and cyberbullying have a clear set of socially devalued characteristics, identities and/or attributes that permeate into the peer group. This is why it is so important for educational efforts to focus on power dynamics (based on structures, beliefs and social ideas), social identity, peer group rules and the social and moral assessment of discrimination, as well as on eradicating prejudices and stereotypes among teachers, students, families and society.

***Limitations and future directions***

It is important to bear a number of limitations in mind when interpreting the results of this study. The first is the use of a convenience sample and the cross-sectional nature of the data. Also, self-report instruments pose the risk of obtaining socially desirable or imprecise responses. However, this is controversial, since different variables and instruments may influence the degree of variance observed (Richardson et al., 2009) and, given the nature of the phenomena under study, collecting and verifying data about LGBTQ+ bullying and cyberbullying independently would be very difficult. Furthermore, although previous studies have demonstrated that online data collection is an acceptable method (Chetverikov & Upravitelev, 2016), it should be noted that the study was conducted during the COVID-19 pandemic, which led to approximately half of the schools and centers participating face-to-face and the other half online. However, the main limitation stems from the absence of an intersectional approach that allows us to consider all, or at least some, axes of oppression and/or privilege, such as race, ethnicity, or social class. Although our community sample may have served to limit this bias, since it included different public schools and training centers from different cities and some villages, we are uncertain as to what extent the characterization of the phenomenon in this study may indeed be biased. Large-scale studies, such as the one conducted by Angoff and Barnhart (2021) in the USA, provide some clues in this sense. Future research should therefore strive to incorporate a broader intersectionality approach in order to enable a more comprehensive understanding of LGBTQ+ bullying and cyberbullying. Moreover, the small size of the sample of TGNC youths requires us to be cautious when generalizing the results, especially in relation to this population group.

## Conclusions

In sum, the results obtained underscore the importance of considering LGBTQ+ bullying and cyberbullying as phenomena in their own right that are present in today's

classrooms. It is also important to remember that, although victims are mainly those who diverge from heteronormative patterns, these behaviors affect all students, both LGBTQ+ and CH alike, in their diverse roles. This supports the idea that this type of bullying should not be considered as a phenomenon linked only to minority groups, but rather as one that is based on and maintained by certain shared beliefs present in (although also transcending) the class group, which, if not prevented or debunked, tend to normalize the idea that there are different types of people in the group with different rights. Moreover, the differences found are particularly relevant for designing effective prevention interventions. The results reported here suggest the need to avoid general approaches that assume that what works for the majority works for all minorities too. They also highlight the need to design programs that contemplate the entire range of diversity that exists in the classroom from an inclusive perspective.

## References


Anagnostopoulos, D., Buchanan, N. C. T., Pereira, C., & Lichty, L. F. (2008). School staff responses to gender-based bullying as moral interpretation: An exploratory study. *Educational Policy*, *23*(4), 519–553. https://doi.org/10.1177/0895904807312469

Andersen, J. P., Zou, C., & Blosnich, J. (2015). Multiple early victimization experiences as a pathway to explain physical health disparities among sexual minority and heterosexual individuals. *Social Science & Medicine*, *133*, 111–119. https://doi.org/10.1016/J.SOCSCIMED.2015.03.043

Angoff, H. D., & Barnhart, W. R. (2021). Bullying and cyberbullying among LGBQ and heterosexual youth from an intersectional perspective: Findings from the 2017 National Youth Risk Behavior Survey. *Journal of School Violence*, *20*(3), 274–286. https://doi.org/10.1080/15388220.2021.1879099

Austin, S. B., Conron, K. J., Patel, A., & Freedner, N. (2008). Making sense of sexual orientation measures: Findings from a cognitive processing study with adolescents on health survey questions. *Journal of LGBT Health Research*, *3*(1), 55–65. https://doi.org/10.1300/J463V03N01_07

Baruch, R. (2012). *1ª Encuesta nacional sobre bullying homofóbico [1st National Survey about homophobic bullying]*. http://www.adilmexico.com/wp-content/uploads/2015/08/Bullying-homofobico-114-May-12.pdf

Birkett, M., 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*(7), 989–1000. https://doi.org/10.1007/S10964-008-9389-1

Bradlow, J., Bartram, F., Guasp, G., & Jadva, V. (2017). *School report: The experiences of*

*lesbian, gay, bi and trans young people in Britain's schools in 2017*. https://www.stonewall.org.uk/sites/default/files/the_school_report_2017.pdf

Brenick, A., & Halgunseth, L. C. (2017). Brief note: Applying developmental intergroup perspectives to the social ecologies of bullying: Lessons from developmental social psychology. *Journal of Adolescence*, *59*, 90–95. https://doi.org/10.1016/J.ADOLESCENCE.2017.05.018

Brinkman, B. G., & Manning, L. (2015). Children's intended responses to gender-based bullying as targets and bystanders: *Childhood*, *23*(2), 221–235. https://doi.org/10.1177/0907568215595095

Bronfenbrenner, U. (1979). *The ecology of human development: experiments by nature and design*. Harvard University Press.

Bronfenbrenner, U., & Morris, P. A. (2006). The bioecological model of human development. In R.M. Lerner & W. Damon (Eds.), *Handbook of child psychology: Theoretical models of human development* (pp. 793–828). Wiley.

Brown, A., & Buthelezi, J. (2020). School-Based support team responses to sexual diversity and homophobic bullying in a South African school. *Interchange*, *51*(4), 471–482. https://doi.org/10.1007/S10780-020-09404-2

Chetverikov, A., & Upravitelev, P. (2016). Online versus offline: The Web as a medium for response time data collection. *Behavior research methods, 48*(3), 1086-1099. https://doi.org/10.3758/s13428-015-0632-x

Collier, K. L., Van Beusekom, G., Bos, H. M. W., & Sandfort, T. G. M. (2013). Sexual orientation and gender identity/expression related peer victimization in adolescence: A systematic review of associated psychosocial and health outcomes. *The Journal of Sex Research*, *50*(3–4), 299–317. https://doi.org/10.1080/00224499.2012.750639

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*(2), 148–167. https://doi.org/10.1521/SCPQ.17.2.148.20854

Day, J. K., Fish, J. N., Grossman, A. H., & Russell, S. T. (2020). Gay-Straight Alliances, inclusive policy, and school climate: LGBTQ youths' experiences of social support and bullying. *Journal of Research on Adolescence: The Official Journal of the Society for Research on Adolescence*, *30*(2), 418–430. https://doi.org/10.1111/JORA.12487

Del Rey, R., Casas, J. A., Ortega-Ruiz, R., Schultze-Krumbholz, A., Scheithauer, H., Smith, P., Thompson, F., Barkoukis, V., Tsorbatzoudis, H., Brighi, A., Guarini, A., Pyżalski, J., & Plichta, P. (2015). Structural validation and cross-cultural robustness of the European Cyberbullying Intervention Project Questionnaire. *Computers in Human Behavior*, *50*, 141–147. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2015.03.065

Del Rey, R., Elipe, P., & Ortega-Ruiz, R. (2012). Bullying and cyberbullying: Overlapping and predictive value of the co-occurrence. *Psicothema*, *24*(4), 608–613. https://www.psicothema.com/pdf/4061.pdf

DeSmet, A., Rodelli, M., Walrave, M., Soenens, B., Cardon, G., & De Bourdeaudhuij, I. (2018). Cyberbullying and traditional bullying involvement among heterosexual and non-heterosexual adolescents, and their associations with age and gender. *Computers in Human Behavior*, *83*, 254–261. https://doi.org/10.1016/J.CHB.2018.02.010

Earnshaw, V. A., Reisner, S. L., Menino, D. D., Poteat, V. P., Bogart, L. M., Barnes, T. N., & Schuster, M. A. (2018). Stigma-based bullying interventions: A systematic review. *Developmental Review*, *48*, 178–200. https://doi.org/10.1016/J.DR.2018.02.001

Elipe, P., Muñoz, M.O., & Del Rey, R. (2018). Homophobic bullying and cyberbullying: study

of a silenced problem. *Journal of homosexuality*, *65*(5), 672–686. https://doi.org/10.1080/00918369.2017.1333809

Elipe, P., Espelage, D. L., & Del Rey, R. (2021). Homophobic verbal and bullying victimization: Overlap and emotional impact. *Sexuality Research and Social Policy, 19*, 1178-1189. https://doi.org/10.1007/s13178-021-00613-7

Espelage, D. L., Hong, J. S., Merrin, G. J., Davis, J. P., Rose, C. A., & Little, T. D. (2018). A longitudinal examination of homophobic name-calling in middle school: Bullying, traditional masculinity, and sexual harassment as predictors. *Psychology of Violence*, *8*(1), 57–66. https://doi.org/10.1037/VIO0000083

Espelage, D. L., Ingram, K. M., Hong, J. S., & Merrin, G. J. (2022). Bullying as a developmental precursor to sexual and dating violence across adolescence: Decade in review. *Trauma, Violence, & Abuse, 23*(4), 1358-1370. https://doi.org/10.1177/15248380211043811

Fedewa, A. L., & Ahn, S. (2011). The effects of bullying and peer victimization on sexual-minority and heterosexual youths: A quantitative meta-analysis of the literature. *Journal of GLBT Family Studies*, *7*(4), 398–418. https://doi.org/10.1080/1550428X.2011.592968

Garaigordobil, M., & Larrain, E. (2020). Acoso y ciberacoso en adolescentes LGTB: Prevalencia y efectos en la salud mental. *Comunicar*, *28*(62), 79–90. https://doi.org/10.3916/C62-2020-07

Garmendia, M., Jiménez, E., Casado, M. A., & Mascheroni, G. (2016). *Net Children Go Mobile: Riesgos y oportunidades en internet y el uso de dispositivos móviles entre menores españoles (2010-2015)*. https://bit.ly/2viYYc2

Goodenow, C., Homma, Y., Watson, R. J., Adjei, J., & Saewyc, E. (2016). Sexual orientation trends and disparities in school bullying and violence-related experiences, 1999-2013.

*Psychology of Sexual Orientation and Gender Diversity*, *3*(4), 386–396. https://doi.org/10.1037/SGD0000188

Gower, A. L., Rider, G. N., Coleman, E., Brown, C., McMorris, B. J., & Eisenberg, M. E. (2018). Perceived gender presentation among transgender and gender diverse youth: Approaches to analysis and associations with bullying victimization and emotional distress. *LGBT Health*, *5*(5), 312–319. https://doi.org/10.1089/LGBT.2017.0176

Guasp, A., Statham, H., Jadva, V., & Daly, I. (2012). *The school report. The experiences of gay young people in Britain's schools in 2012*. https://healtheducationresources.unesco.org/library/documents/school-report-experiences-gay-young-people-britains-schools-2012

Hatchel, T., Ingram, K. M., Huang, Y., & Espelage, D. L. (2020). Homophobic bullying victimization trajectories: The roles of perpetration, sex assigned at birth, and sexuality. *Aggressive Behavior*, *46*(5), 370–379. https://doi.org/10.1002/AB.21897

Heino, E., Ellonen, N., & Kaltiala, R. (2021). Transgender identity is associated with bullying involvement among Finnish adolescents. *Frontiers in Psychology*, *11*, 3829. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2020.612424

Hinduja, S., & Patchin, J. W. (2008). Cyberbullying: An exploratory analysis of factors related to offending and victimization. *Deviant Behavior*, *29*(2), 129–156. https://doi.org/10.1080/01639620701457816

Hinduja, S., & Patchin, J. W. (2011). *Bullying, cyberbullying, and sexual orientation*. https://cyberbullying.org/cyberbullying_sexual_orientation_fact_sheet.pdf

Hong, J. S., & Garbarino, J. (2012). Risk and protective factors for homophobic bullying in schools: An application of the social–ecological framework. *Educational Psychology Review*, *24*(2), 271–285. https://doi.org/10.1007/S10648-012-9194-Y

Horn, S. S., & Schriber, S. E. (2020). Bullied and punished: Exploring the links between bullying and discipline for sexual and gender minority youth. *Journal of Research on Adolescence*, *30*(3), 735–752. https://doi.org/10.1111/JORA.12556

Kosciw, J. G., Greytak, E. A., Zongrone, A. D., Clark, C. M., & Truong, N. L. (2018). *The 2017 National School Climate Survey: The experiences of lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, and queer youth in our nation's schools*. https://www.glsen.org/sites/default/files/2019-10/GLSEN-2017-National-School-Climate-Survey-NSCS-Full-Report.pdf

Kosciw, J. G., Clark, C. M., Truong, N. L., & Zongrone, A. D. (2020). *The 2019 National School Climate Survey: The experiences of lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, and queer youth in our nation's schools.* https://www.glsen.org/sites/default/files/2021-04/NSCS19-FullReport-032421-Web_0.pdf

Kosciw, J. G., & Pizmony-Levy, O. (2016). International perspectives on homophobic and transphobic bullying in schools. *Journal of LGBT Youth*, *13*(1), 1–5. https://doi.org/10.1080/19361653.2015.1101730

Kowalski, R. M., Giumetti, G. W., Schroeder, A. N., & Lattanner, M. R. (2014). Bullying in the digital age: A critical review and meta-analysis of cyberbullying research among youth. *Psychological Bulletin*, *140*(4), 1073–1137. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0035618

Ma, X. (2001). Bullying and being bullied: To what extent are bullies also victims? *American Educational Research Journal Summer*, *38*(2), 351–370. https://doi.org/10.3102/00028312038002

Merrin, G. J., Haye, K., Espelage, D. L., Ewing, B., Tucker, J. S., Hoover, M., & Green, H. D. (2017). The co-evolution of bullying perpetration, homophobic teasing, and a school friendship network. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 47*(3), 601–618. https://doi.org/10.1007/S10964-017-0783-4

Minton, S. J. (2014). Prejudice and effective anti-bullying intervention: Evidence from the bullying of "minorities". *Nordic Psychology*, *66*(2), 108–120. https://doi.org/10.1080/19012276.2014.928485

Montero, I., & León, O. G. (2007). A guide for naming research studies in Psychology. *International Journal of Clinical and Health Psychology*, *7*(3), 847–862. https://bit.ly/2wVCuhY

Moyano, N., & Sánchez-Fuentes, M. M. (2020). Homophobic bullying at schools: A systematic review of research, prevalence, school-related predictors and consequences. *Aggression and Violent Behavior*, *53*. https://doi.org/10.1016/J.AVB.2020.101441

Mueller, A. S., James, W., Abrutyn, S., & Levin, M. L. (2015). Suicide ideation and bullying among US adolescents: examining the intersections of sexual orientation, gender, and race/ethnicity. *American Journal of Public Health*, *105*(5), 981–985. https://doi.org/10.2105/AJPH.2014.302391

Olweus, D. (2012). Cyberbullying: An overrated phenomenon? *European Journal of Developmental Psychology*, *9*(5), 520–538. https://doi.org/10.1080/17405629.2012.682358

Olweus, D. (2013). School bullying: Development and some important challenges. *Annual Review of Clinical Psychology*, *9*, 751–780. https://doi.org/10.1146/ANNUREV-CLINPSY-050212-185516

Olweus, D., & Limber, S. P. (2018). Some problems with cyberbullying research. *Current Opinion in Psychology*, *19*, 139–143. https://doi.org/10.1016/J.COPSYC.2017.04.012

Ortega-Ruiz, R., Del Rey, R., & Casas, J. A. (2016). Evaluar el bullying y el cyberbullying validación española del EBIP-Q y del ECIP-Q. *Psicología Educativa*, *22*(1), 71–79. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pse.2016.01.004

Osuna, J. R., Ferreras, M. L., & Núñez, A. (1991). Inferencia estadística, niveles de precisión y diseño muestral. *REIS: Revista Española de Investigaciones Sociológicas*, *54*, 162. https://doi.org/10.2307/40183521

Parent, M. C., Johnson, K. E., Russell, S., & Gobble, T. (2020). Homophobic bullying and suicidal behavior among US heterosexual youth. *Journal of the American Academy of Child & Adolescent Psychiatry*, *59*(2), 205-208.E1. https://doi.org/10.1016/J.JAAC.2019.08.473

Pichardo Galán, J.I. & De Stéfano Barbero, M. (eds.) (2015) *Diversidad sexual y convivencia: Una oportunidad educativa.* Universidad Complutense de Madrid.

Platero, R. (2008). La homofobia como elemento clave del acoso escolar homofóbico. Algunas voces desde Rivas Vaciamadrid [Homophobia as a key element of homophobic school bullying. Some voices from Rivas Vaciamadrid]. *Información Psicológica*, *94*, 71–83. https://www.informaciopsicologica.info/revista/article/view/240

Rettew, D. C., & Pawlowski, S. (2022). Bullying: An update. *Child and Adolescent Psychiatric Clinics, 31*(1), 1-9. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chc.2021.09.001

Richardson, H. A., Simmering, M. J., & Sturman, M. C. (2009). A tale of three perspectives: Examining post hoc statistical techniques for detection and correction of common method variance. *Organizational Research Methods*, *12*(4), 762–800. https://doi.org/10.1177/1094428109332834

Rodríguez-Hidalgo, A. J., & Hurtado-Mellado, A. (2019). Prevalence and psychosocial predictors of homophobic victimization among adolescents. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health, 16*(7). https://doi.org/10.3390/IJERPH16071243

Salmivalli, C., Laninga-Wijnen, L., Malamut, S. T., & Garandeau, C. F. (2021). Bullying

prevention in adolescence: Solutions and new challenges from the past decade. *Journal of research on adolescence, 31*(4), 1023-1046. https://doi.org/10.1111/jora.12688

Sánchez-SanSegundo, M., Smith, E., Albaladejo-Blazquez, N., Ferrer-Cascales, R., Ruiz-Robledillo, N., & Perrin, P. B. (2019). Psychometric properties of the Spanish version of the Homophobic Content Agent Target Scale among adolescent students. *Archives of Sexual Behavior*, *49*(5), 1683–1691. https://doi.org/10.1007/S10508-019-01511-1

Sterzing, P. R., Ratliff, G. A., Gartner, R. E., McGeough, B. L., & Johnson, K. C. (2017). Social ecological correlates of polyvictimization among a national sample of transgender, genderqueer, and cisgender sexual minority adolescents. *Child Abuse & Neglect*, *67*, 1–12. https://doi.org/10.1016/J.CHIABU.2017.02.017

Toomey, R. B., McGuire, J. K., & Russell, S. T. (2012). Heteronormativity, school climates, and perceived safety for gender nonconforming peers. *Journal of Adolescence*, *35*(1), 187–196. https://doi.org/10.1016/J.ADOLESCENCE.2011.03.001

Toomey, R. B., & Russell, S. T. (2016). The role of sexual orientation in school-based victimization: A meta-analysis. *Youth & Society*, *48*(2), 176–201. https://doi.org/10.1177/0044118X13483778

Ttofi, M. M., Farrington, D. P., Lösel, F., & Loeber, R. (2011). Do the victims of school bullies tend to become depressed later in life? A systematic review and meta-analysis of longitudinal studies. *Journal of Aggression, Conflict and Peace Research*, *3*(2), 63–73. https://doi.org/10.1108/17596591111132873

Tucker, J. S., Ewing, B. A., Espelage, D. L., Green, H. D., de la Haye, K., & Pollard, M. S. (2016). Longitudinal associations of homophobic name-calling victimization with psychological distress and alcohol use during adolescence. *Journal of Adolescent Health*, *59*(1), 110–115. https://doi.org/10.1016/J.JADOHEALTH.2016.03.018

Turkle, S. (2008). Always-on/always-on-you: The tethered self. In J. E. Katz (Ed.), *Handbook of Mobile Communication Studies* (pp. 121–137). MIT Press.

UNESCO. (2013). *Respuestas del sector de educación frente al bullying homofóbico [Education sector responses to homophobic bullying]*. http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0022/002229/222918S.pdf

UNESCO. (2017). *Abiertamente: respuestas del sector de educación a la violencia basada en la orientación sexual y la identidad/expresión de género*. https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000244652_spa

Williams, A. J., Banks, C. S., & Blake, J. J. (2018). High school bystanders motivation and response during bias-based bullying. *Psychology in the Schools*, *55*(10), 1259–1273. https://doi.org/10.1002/PITS.22186

Wright, M. F. (2020). Popularity and social preference pressure from parents, friends, and the media. *youth & Society*, *52*(3), 332–348. https://doi.org/10.1177/0044118X18773222

Wylie, S. A., Corliss, H. L., Boulanger, V., Prokop, L. A., & Austin, S. B. (2010). Socially Assigned Gender Nonconformity: A brief measure for use in surveillance and investigation of health disparities. *Sex Roles, 63*(3), 264–276. https://doi.org/10.1007/S11199-010-9798-Y

Zych, I., Ortega-Ruiz, R., & Del Rey, R. (2015). Scientific research on bullying and cyberbullying: Where have we been and where are we going. *Aggression and Violent Behavior*, *24*, 188–198. https://doi.org/10.1016/J.AVB.2015.05.015

Table 1. Sample characteristics.

| Variables | N | % |
|---|---|---|
| **Assigned Sex** | | |
| Female | 1407 | 55.5 |
| Male | 1128 | 44.5 |
| Total | 2535 | 100 |
| **Gender Identity** | | |
| Cisgender boys | 1112 | 43.9 |
| Cisgender girls | 1356 | 53.5 |
| Transgender boys | 15 | 0.6 |
| Transgender girls | 11 | 0.4 |
| Bigender | 24 | 0.9 |
| Agender | 17 | 0.7 |
| Total | 2535 | 100 |
| **Sexual Orientation** | | |
| Heterosexual | 2028 | 81.1 |
| Gay/Lesbian | 60 | 2.4 |
| Bisexual | 219 | 8.8 |
| Pansexual | 60 | 2.4 |
| Asexual | 23 | 0.9 |
| Questioning | 111 | 4.4 |
| Total | 2501 | 100 |
| **Gender Expression** | | |
| Concordant | 1560 | 61.8 |
| Androgynous | 924 | 36.6 |
| Discordant | 41 | 1.6 |
| Total | 2525 | 100 |

Table 2. Involved and co-involved in general bullying and LGBTQ+ bullying according to assigned sex, sexual orientation, gender identity, gender expression and ASBGD (continue in the next page).

| | Victim %(N) | | | | Bully %(N) | | | | Bully-Victim %(N) | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | G | LG..+ | Poly | T | G | LG..+ | Poly | T | G | LG..+ | Poly | Comb.[1] | T |
| **Assigned Sex** | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Male | 12.9 (134)* | 1.4 (15) | 3.3 (34)* | **17.6** (183) | 3.6 (37) | 1.0 (10)* | 1.3 (13)* | **5.9** (60) | 3.5 (36) | 0.2 (2) | 1.9 (20)* | 3.8 (40)* | **9.4** (98) |
| Female | 17.1 (222)* | 2.0 (26) | 5.2 (67)* | **24.3** (315) | 2.7 (35) | 0.1 (1)* | 0.4 (5)* | **3.2** (41) | 3.5 (45) | 0.0 (0) | 0.2 (3)* | 2.3 (30)* | **6** (78) |
| Total | 15.2 (356) | 1.8 (41) | 4.3 (101) | **21.4** (498) | 3.1 (72) | 0.5 (11) | 0.8 (18) | **4.4** (101) | 3.5 (81) | 0.1 (2) | 1.0 (23) | 3.0 (70) | **7.6** (176) |
| **Sexual Orientation** | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Heterosexual | 14.9 (279) | 1.1 (21)* | 2.2 (42)* | **18.2** (342) | 3.2 (59) | 0.5 (10) | 1.0 (18)* | **4.7** (87) | 3.8 (71) | 0.1 (2) | 0.9 (17) | 2.7 (51) | **7.5** (141) |
| Gay/Lesbian | 8.5 (5) | 8.5 (5)* | 18.5 (11)* | **35.5** (21) | 3.4 (2) | 0.0 (0) | 0.0 (0) | **3.4** (2) | 0.0 (0) | 0.0 (0) | 0.0 (0) | 5.1 (3) | **5.1** (3) |
| Bisexual | 19.2 (39) | 4.9 (10)* | 11.8 (24)* | **35.9** (73) | 2.5 (5) | 0.0 (0) | 0.0 (0) | **2.5** (5) | 2.5 (5) | 0.0 (0) | 1.0 (2) | 3.0 (6) | **6.5** (13) |
| Pansexual | 14.0 (8) | 3.5 (2) | 24.6 (14)* | **42.1** (24) | 1.8 (1) | 0.0 (0) | 0.0 (0) | **1.8** (1) | 1.8 (1) | 0.0 (0) | 3.5 (2)* | 5.3 (3) | **10.6** (6) |
| Asexual | 23.8 (5) | 0.0 (0) | 0.0 (0) | **23.8** (5) | 0.0 (0) | 0.0 (0) | 0.0 (0) | **0.0** (0) | 0.0 (0) | 0.0 (0) | 4.8 (1) | 4.8 (1) | **9.6** (2) |
| Questioning | 16.8 (17) | 3.0 (3) | 4.0 (4) | **23.8** (24) | 5.0 (5) | 0.0 (0) | 0.0 (0) | **5.0** (5) | 3.0 (3) | 0.0 (0) | 0.0 (0) | 5.9 (6) | **8.9** (9) |
| Total | 15.3 (353) | 1.8 (41) | 4.1 (95) | **21.2** (489) | 3.1 (72) | 0.4 (10) | 0.8 (18) | **4.3** (100) | 3.5 (80) | 0.1 (2) | 1.0 (22) | 3.0 (70) | **7.6** (174) |

Notes: G: General; LG..+: LGBTQ+; T: Total; *Corrected

Standardized Residuals $\geq \pm$ 1.96.

[1] Combined bully-victim role refers to those cases involved as a bully in general or LGBTQ+ bullying and as a victim in the other phenomena.

Table 2. Continuation

| | Victim %(N) | | | | Bully %(N) | | | | Bully-Victim %(N) | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | G | LG..+ | Poly | T | G | LG..+ | Poly | T | G | LG..+ | Poly | Comb.[1] | T |
| **Gender Identity** | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Cisgender | 15.2 | 1.6 | 4.0 | **20.8** | 3.1 | 0.4 | 0.8 | **4.3** | 3.5 | 0.1 | 0.9 | 2.9 | **7.4** |
| | (346) | (37)* | (91)* | (474) | (71) | (10) | (18) | (99) | (80) | (2) | (21)* | (67) | (170) |
| TGNC[2] | 17.5 | 7.0 | 17.5 | **42.0** | 1.8 | 1.8 | 0.0 | **3.6** | 1.8 | 0.0 | 3.5 | 7.0 | **12.3** |
| | (10) | (4)* | (10)* | (24) | (1) | (1) | (0) | (2) | (1) | (0) | (2)* | (4) | (7) |
| Total | 15.2 | 1.8 | 4.3 | **21.3** | 3.1 | 0.5 | 0.8 | **4.4** | 3.5 | 0.1 | 1.0 | 3.0 | **7.6** |
| | (356) | (41) | (101) | (498) | (72) | (11) | (18) | (101) | (81) | (2) | (23) | (71) | (177) |
| **Gender Expression** | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Concordant | 14.4 | 1.0 | 1.8 | **17.2** | 3.2 | 0.6 | 1.1 | **4.9** | 3.5 | 0.1 | 1.1 | 3.0 | **6.5** |
| | (208) | (15)* | (26)* | (249) | (46) | (9) | (16)* | (71) | (50) | (1) | (16) | (43) | (110) |
| Androgynous | 16.7 | 2.7 | 7.7 | **27.1** | 2.8 | 0.1 | 0.2 | **3.1** | 3.5 | 0.1 | 0.8 | 3.2 | **5.6** |
| | (143) | (23)* | (66)* | (232) | (24) | (1) | (2)* | (27) | (30) | (1) | (7) | (27) | (65) |
| Discordant | 13.2 | 7.9 | 21.1 | **42.2** | 5.3 | 2.6 | 0.0 | **7.9** | 2.6 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 2.6 | **2.6** |
| | (5) | (3)* | (8)* | (16) | (2) | (1)* | (0) | (3) | (1) | (0) | (0) | (1) | (2) |
| Total | 15.3 | 1.8 | 4.3 | **21.4** | 3.1 | 0.5 | 0.8 | **4.4** | 3.5 | 0.1 | 1.0 | 3.0 | **7.6** |
| | (356) | (41) | (100) | (497) | (72) | (11) | (18) | (101) | (81) | (2) | (23) | (71) | (177) |
| **Affective-Sexual Bodily and Gender Diversity (ASBGD)** | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| CH[3] | 14.9 | 1.1 | 2.3 | **18.3** | 3.1 | 0.5 | 1.0 | **4.6** | 3.8 | 0.1 | 0.9 | 2.7 | **7.5** |
| | (277) | (20)* | (42)* | (339) | (58) | (10) | (18)* | (86) | (70) | (2) | (17) | (50)* | (139) |
| LGBTQ+ | 16.7 | 4.4 | 12.5 | **33.6** | 3.0 | 0.2 | 0.0 | **3.2** | 2.3 | 0.0 | 1.3 | 4.4 | **8.0** |
| | (79) | (21)* | (59)* | (159) | (14) | (1) | (0)* | (15) | (11) | (0) | (6) | (21)* | (38) |
| Total | 15.3 | 1.8 | 4.3 | **21.4** | 3.1 | 0.5 | 0.8 | **4.4** | 3.5 | 0.1 | 1.0 | 3.0 | **7.6** |
| | (356) | (41) | (101) | (498) | (72) | (11) | (18) | (101) | (81) | (2) | (23) | (71) | (177) |

Notes: G: General; LG..+: LGBTQ+; T: Total; *Corrected Standardized Residuals $\geq \pm 1.96$.

[1] Combined bully-victim role refers to those cases involved as a bully in general or LGBTQ+ bullying and as a victim in the other phenomena.

[2] TGNC: Transgender and gender-noncoforming people.

[3] CH: Cisgender Heteronormative

Table 3. Involved and co-involved in general and LGBTQ+ cyberbullying according to assigned sex, sexual orientation, gender identity, gender expression and ASBGD (continue in the next page).

| | **Cybervictim %(N)** | | | | **Cyberbully %(N)** | | | | **Cyberbully-victim %(N)** | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | G | LG..+ | Poly | T | General | LG..+ | Poly | T | G | LG..+ | Poly | Comb.[1] | T |
| **Assigned Sex** | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Male | 6.6 (69)* | 1.6 (17) | 2.1 (22) | **10.3** (108) | 2.9 (30) | 0.9 (9)* | 1.0 (11)* | **4.8** (50) | 1.8 (19) | 0.2 (2) | 1.1 (12)* | 2.3 (24) | **5.4** (57) |
| Female | 8.9 (119)* | 1.4 (19) | 2.9 (38) | **13.2** (176) | 2.0 (26) | 0.2 (3)* | 0.1 (1)* | **2.3** (30) | 2.1 (28) | 0.0 (0) | 0.3 (4)* | 1.8 (24) | **4.2** (56) |
| Total | 7.9 (188) | 1.5 (36) | 2.5 (60) | **11.9** (284) | 2.3 (56) | 0.5 (12) | 0.5 (12) | **3.3** (80) | 2.0 (47) | 0.1 (2) | 0.7 (16) | 2.0 (48) | **4.8** (113) |
| **Sexual Orientation** | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Heterosexual | 7.3 (138) | 1.0 (19)* | 1.3 (24)* | **9.6** (181) | 2.6 (49) | 0.6 (12) | 0.6 (12) | **3.8** (73) | 1.8 (35) | 0.1 (2) | 0.7 (13) | 1.7 (33) | **4.3** (83) |
| Gay/Lesbian | 13.8 (8) | 3.4 (2) | 8.6 (5)* | **25.8** (15) | 1.7 (1) | 0.0 (0) | 0.0 (0) | **1.7** (1) | 1.7 (1) | 0.0 (0) | 0.0 (0) | 1.7 (1) | **3.4** (2) |
| Bisexual | 11.0 (23) | 3.8 (8)* | 10.0 (21)* | **24.8** (52) | 1.4 (3) | 0.0 (0) | 0.0 (0) | **1.4** (3) | 2.9 (6) | 0.0 (0) | 0.5 (1) | 1.4 (3) | **4.8** (10) |
| Pansexual | 8.3 (5) | 3.3 (2) | 10.0 (6)* | **21.6** (13) | 0.0 (0) | 0.0 (0) | 0.0 (0) | **0.0** (0) | 3.3 (2) | 0.0 (0) | 1.7 (1) | 3.3 (2) | **8.3** (5) |
| Asexual | 9.1 (2) | 0.0 (0) | 0.0 (0) | **9.1** (2) | 0.0 (0) | 0.0 (0) | 0.0 (0) | **0.0** (0) | 0.0 (0) | 0.0 (0) | 4.5 (1)* | 4.5 (1) | **9.0** (2) |
| Questioning | 6.7 (7) | 2.9 (3) | 1.0 (1) | **10.6** (11) | 2.9 (3) | 0.0 (0) | 0.0 (0) | **2.9** (3) | 2.9 (3) | 0.0 (0) | 0.0 (0) | 5.8 (6)* | **8.7** (9) |
| Total | 7.8 (183) | 1.4 (34) | 2.4 (57) | **11.6** (274) | 2.4 (56) | 0.5 (12) | 0.5 (12) | **3.4** (80) | 2.0 (47) | 0.1 (2) | 0.7 (16) | 2.0 (46) | **4.8** (111) |

Notes: G: General; LG..+: LGBTQ+; T: Total; *Corrected Standardized Residuals $\geq \pm$ 1.96.

[1] Combined cyberbully-victim role refers to those cases involved as a cyberbully in general or LGBTQ+ bullying and as a cybervictim in the other phenomena.

[2] TGNC: Transgender and gender-noncoforming people.

[3] CH: Cisgender Heteronormative.

Table 3. Continuation

| | Cybervictim %(N) | | | | Cyberbully %(N) | | | | Ciberbully-victim %(N) | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | G | LG..+ | Poly | T | G | LG..+ | Poly | T | G | LG..+ | Poly | Comb.[1] | T |
| **Gender Identity** | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Cisgender | 7.7 (179)* | 1.5 (35) | 2.2 (50)* | **11.4** (264) | 2.4 (56) | 0.5 (12) | 0.5 (12) | **3.4** (80) | 2.0 (46) | 0.1 (2) | 0.6 (15) | 1.9 (44)* | **4.6** (107) |
| TGNC[2] | 14.8 (9)* | 1.6 (1) | 16.4 (10)* | **32.8** (20) | 0.0 (0) | 0.0 (0) | 0.0 (0) | **0.0** (0) | 1.6 (1) | 0.0 (0) | 1.6 (1) | 8.2 (5)* | **11.4** (7) |
| Total | 7.9 (188) | 1.5 (36) | 2.5 (60) | **11.9** (284) | 2.3 (56) | 0.5 (12) | 0.5 (12) | **3.3** (80) | 2.0 (47) | 0.1 ( 2) | 0.7 (16) | 2.1 (49) | **4.9** (114) |
| **Gender Expression** | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Concordant | 7.5 (110) | 0.9 (13)* | 1.2 (17)* | **9.6** (140) | 2.7 (39) | 0.7 (10) | 0.7 (10) | **4.1** (59) | 2.0 (30) | 0.1 (2) | 0.8 (12) | 1.6 (23)* | **4.5** (67) |
| Androgynous | 8.5 (74) | 2.5 (22)* | 4.4 (38)* | **15.4** (134) | 1.8 (16) | 0.2 (2) | 0.2 (2) | **2.2** (20) | 2.0 (17) | 0.0 (0) | 0.5 (4) | 2.8 (24) | **5.3** (45) |
| Discordant | 7.7 (3) | 2.6 (1) | 10.3 (4)* | **20.6** (8) | 2.6 (1) | 0.0 (0) | 0.0 (0) | **2.6** (1) | 0.0 (0) | 0.0 (0) | 0.0 (0) | 5.1 (2) | **5.1** (2) |
| Total | 7.9 (187) | 1.5 (36) | 2.5 (59) | **11.9** (282) | 2.4 (56) | 0.5 (12) | 0.5 (12) | **3.4** (80) | 2.0 (47) | 0.1 (2) | 0.7 (16) | 2.1 (49) | **4.9** (114) |
| **Affective-Sexual Bodily and Gender Diversity (ASBGD)** | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| CH[3] | 7.2 (136)* | 1.0 (19)* | 1.3 (24)* | **9.5** (179) | 2.0 (48) | 0.6 (12) | 0.6 (12) | **3.2** (72) | 1.9 (35) | 0.1 (2) | 0.7 (13) | 1.7 (33)* | **4.4** (83) |
| LGBTQ+ | 10.5 (51)* | 3.3 (16)* | 7.4 (36)* | **21.2** (103) | 0.3 (8) | 0.0 (0) | 0.0 (0) | **0.3** (8) | 2.5 (12) | 0.0 (0) | 0.6 (3) | 3.3 (16)* | **6.4** (31) |
| Total | 7.9 (187) | 1.5 (35) | 2.5 (60) | **11.9** (282) | 2.4 (56) | 0.5 (12) | 0.5 (12) | **3.4** (80) | 2.0 (47) | 0.1 (2) | 0.7 (16) | 2.1 (49) | **4.9** (114) |

Notes: G: General; LG..+: LGBTQ+; T: Total; *Corrected

Standardized Residuals $\geq \pm$ 1.96.

[1] Combined cyberbully-victim role refers to those cases involved as a cyberbully in general or LGBTQ+ bullying and as a cybervictim in the other phenomena.

[2] TGNC: Transgender and gender-noncoforming people.

[3] CH: Cisgender Heteronormative.

Table 4. Multiple regression parameters for general and LGBTQ+ victimization.

| Variables | General Victimization | | | LGBTQ+ Victimization | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | β | *t* | 95% CI | β | *t* | 95% CI |
| Age | -0.06*** | -7.99 | -0.75 – (-0.05) | -0.02*** | -3.78 | -0.03 – (-0.01) |
| Assigned sex female | 0.01 | 0.48 | -0.40 - 0.07 | -0.05** | -3.11 | -0.9 – (-0.02) |
| Assigned sex male | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Cisgender | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| TGNC[1] | 0.27** | 2.91 | 0.09 – 0.45 | 0.38*** | 6.42 | 0.26 - 0.49 |
| Heterosexual | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Gay/lesbian | -0.2 | -0.17 | -0.18 - 0.15 | 0.24*** | 4.54 | 0.14 – 0.35 |
| Bisexual/pansexual | 0.19*** | 4.38 | 0.11 – 0.28 | 0.31*** | 11.37 | 0.26 – 0.37 |
| Asexual/Questioning | -0.06 | -1.05 | -0.17 – 0.05 | 0.03 | 0.68 | -0.05 – 0.11 |
| Concordant Gender Expression | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Androgynous Gender Expression | 0.05 | 1.63 | -0.01 - 0.10 | 0.08*** | 4.20 | 0.04 – 0.11 |
| Discordant Gender Expression | 0.10 | 0.90 | -0.12 – 0.31 | 0.24*** | 3.56 | 0.11 – 0.38 |
| Constant | 1.28*** | 11.48 | 1.06 - 1.50 | 0.37*** | 5.18 | 0.23 – 0.50 |

**$p<.01$; ***$p<.001$

[1.] TGNC: Transgender and gender-noncoforming people.

Table 5. Multiple regression parameters for general and LGBTQ+ cybervictimization.

| Variables | General Cybervictimization | | | LGBTQ+ Cybervictimization | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | **β** | ***t*** | **95% CI** | **β** | ***t*** | **95% CI** |
| Age | -0.01*** | -3.27 | -0.02 – (-0.01) | -0.01*** | -3.87 | -0.02 – (-0.01) |
| Assigned sex female | 0.02 | 1.26 | -0.01 – 0.05 | -0.05*** | -3.55 | -0.07 – (-0.02) |
| Assigned sex male | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Cisgender | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| TGNC[1] | 0.18*** | 3.73 | 0-09 – 0.28 | 0.26*** | 5.63 | 0.17 – 0.35 |
| Heterosexual | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Gay/lesbian | 0.06 | 1.31 | -0-03 - 0.15 | 0.19*** | 4.40 | 0.10 – 0.27 |
| Bisexual/pansexual | 0.10*** | 4.15 | 0.05 - 0.14 | 0.23*** | 10.68 | 0.19 – 0.27 |
| Asexual/Questioning | -0.01 | -0.32 | -0.07 – 0.05 | 0.04 | 1.27 | -0.02 – 0.09 |
| Concordant Gender Expression | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Androgynous Gender Expression | 0.03 | 1.95 | 0.00 – 0.06 | 0.05*** | 3.69 | 0.03 – 0.08 |
| Discordant Gender Expression | 0.03 | 0.47 | -0.09 – 0.14 | 0.15** | 2.71 | 0.04 – 0.25 |
| Constant | 0.34*** | 5.77 | 0.22 – 0.45 | 0.28*** | 5.01 | 0.17 – 0.39 |

**$p$<.01; ***$p$<.001

[1.] TGNC: Transgender and gender-noncoforming people.