

Repositório ISCTE-IUL

Deposited in *Repositório ISCTE-IUL*:

2019-12-11

Deposited version:

Post-print

Peer-review status of attached file:

Peer-reviewed

Citation for published item:

Zotti, D., Carnaghi, A., Piccoli, V. & Bianchi, M. (2019). Individual and contextual factors associated with school staff responses to homophobic bullying. *Sexuality Research and Social Policy*. 16 (4), 543-558

Further information on publisher's website:

[10.1007/s13178-018-0362-9](https://doi.org/10.1007/s13178-018-0362-9)

Publisher's copyright statement:

This is the peer reviewed version of the following article: Zotti, D., Carnaghi, A., Piccoli, V. & Bianchi, M. (2019). Individual and contextual factors associated with school staff responses to homophobic bullying. *Sexuality Research and Social Policy*. 16 (4), 543-558, which has been published in final form at <https://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s13178-018-0362-9>. This article may be used for non-commercial purposes in accordance with the Publisher's Terms and Conditions for self-archiving.

Use policy

Creative Commons CC BY 4.0

The full-text may be used and/or reproduced, and given to third parties in any format or medium, without prior permission or charge, for personal research or study, educational, or not-for-profit purposes provided that:

- a full bibliographic reference is made to the original source
- a link is made to the metadata record in the Repository
- the full-text is not changed in any way

The full-text must not be sold in any format or medium without the formal permission of the copyright holders.

1 **Individual and contextual factors associated with school staff responses to homophobic**
2 **bullying**

3
4
5 Davide Zotti¹, Andrea Carnaghi¹, Valentina Piccoli¹, and Mauro Bianchi²

6
7 ¹University of Trieste, Trieste Italy

8 ²HEI-Lab-Lusófona University / ISCTE-Lisbon University Institute, Lisboa, Portugal

9
10
11 Published online on *Sexuality Research and Sexual Policy*: 12 November 2018

12
13
14
15
16
17
18 Corresponding Author:

19 Davide Zotti, Department of Life Sciences, University of Trieste, Via Weiss, 21, 34100 Trieste,

20 Italy. Email: davide.zotti@phd.units.it

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20

Abstract

This cross-sectional research investigates the individual (i.e., sexual prejudice, contact with lesbian and gay [LG] people, and perceived seriousness of homophobic epithets) and contextual (i.e., homophobic bullying observed by school staff and perceived colleague reactions to homophobic bullying) factors as predictors of school staff intervention against vs. legitimization of homophobic bullying. Data were collected in secondary schools in the North of Italy via a paper-and-pencil survey. Participants were school staff members (N = 273) from 24 Italian secondary schools. The results have indicated that the higher the sexual prejudice and the lower the contact with LG individuals, the higher the legitimization of homophobic bullying. Also, perceiving colleagues as legitimizing or intervening in cases of homophobic bullying predicted similar reactions on the part of school staff participants. The findings are discussed with respect to the current literature regarding homophobic bullying, and applied interventions for school staff training programs to tackle homophobic bullying at school are put forward.

Key words: School climate; School Staff; Bullying; Homophobia; Contact hypothesis; Secondary School

1 Students who identify as or who are considered to be lesbian, gay, bisexual or transgender
2 (i.e., LGBT) are more frequently the target of discrimination in general, and in particular of
3 bullying within the school context, compared to their heterosexual and cisgender peers (Greytak,
4 Kosciw, Villenas, & Giga, 2016; Rivers & D'Augelli, 2001; Robinson, Espelage, & Rivers, 2013;
5 UNESCO, 2012, 2016; Williams, Connolly, Pepler, & Craig, 2005). Studies carried out in
6 numerous countries have shown that homophobic bullying, as well as harassment and name-calling,
7 is a widespread phenomenon in school settings, for instance in Great Britain (Guasp, 2012), Ireland
8 (Higgins et al., 2016), Italy (Ioverno, Baiocco, Nardelli, Orfano, & Lingiardi, 2016), European
9 Union (European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights, 2014), the United States (Kosciw,
10 Greytak, Giga, Villenas, & Danischewski, 2016), Canada (Taylor et al., 2011), and Australia
11 (Hillier et al., 2010).

12 Surveys conducted in Canada (Smith, 2000; Taylor et al., 2011), Great Britain (Guasp, 2012),
13 Israel (Pizmony-Levy, Kama, Shilo, & Lavee, 2008) and the US (Kosciw et al., 2016) have
14 revealed that LGBT students frequently declare that school staff tend not to intervene in cases of
15 homophobic verbal or physical assault. Inaction on the part of school staff can be understood as
16 implicit approval of the bullying acts (Mishna, Newman, Daley, & Solomon, 2008). Additionally, at
17 least in certain cases, school staff justifies the students perpetrating the bullying behavior, thus
18 blatantly legitimizing the bullying, which is part of a general response of disengagement (Bandura,
19 Barbaranelli, Caprara, & Pastorelli, 1996; Camodeca, Baiocco, & Posa, 2018). For instance, in Italy,
20 which is the context of the current research, 25.8% of secondary school students reported teachers
21 having justified the students perpetrating the bullying behavior in the case of homophobic episodes
22 (Prati, Coppola, & Saccà, 2010).

23 In a recent study (Kosciw et al., 2016) among U.S. LGBT students, more than half who have
24 been the victim of homophobic bullying never reported these incidents to school staff, as they cast
25 doubts on the effectiveness of school staff intervention, expressed concerns about staff members'
26 reactions, and fear that reporting these homophobic episodes would have made the situation worse.

1 Furthermore, Kosciw and colleagues (2016) found that students in schools where staff intervene
2 less often in cases of homophobic remarks felt less safe in their school because of their sexual
3 orientation and gender expression.

4 Conversely, school staff can also improve the climate at school when they actively address
5 homophobic bullying and support the victims. Indeed, school staff intervention in cases of
6 homophobic bullying enhances the feelings of acceptance on the part of LGBT students (Ploderl,
7 Faistauer, & Fartacek, 2010), and creates a supportive and safe school environment (Bochenek &
8 Brown, 2001; Toomey, McGuire, & Russell, 2012). Moreover, LGBT students with supportive
9 school staff, compared to those whose school staff is less supportive, are less likely to miss school
10 because they feel embedded in a safer and more comfortable environment (Kosciw et al., 2016).
11 In sum, evidence suggests that school staff reactions can vary significantly, including, but not
12 limited to, underestimation of the seriousness of bullying, engaging in homophobic jokes and name
13 calling, a lack of awareness regarding homophobic bullying episodes, direct intervention to address
14 the bullying, and collective actions to counter-act the phenomenon in question. Despite the
15 extensive variety of school staff reactions, however, many responses can fall into two categories of
16 interest here, namely those reactions that covertly and overtly tend to legitimize homophobic
17 bullying episodes, hereafter referred to as legitimizing reactions, and supportive interventions in
18 cases of these episodes. Legitimizing reactions refer to different responses to homophobic bullying,
19 spanning from subtler (e.g., ignoring, not intervening) to more blatant (e.g., discounting the
20 offensiveness of homophobic acts and the student perpetrating the bullying behavior) reactions,
21 which likely contribute to legitimizing the bullying episodes. Supportive interventions in cases of
22 homophobic bullying refer to all the individual attempts to purposively support the victim, and
23 counteract the bullying episodes. Significantly, these distinct types of reactions shape different
24 outcomes at school, the former reactions being associated with unsafe feeling and absenteeism
25 among students and high levels of victimization, and the latter reactions associated with supportive
26 school climate and a reduced rate of drop-outs (Anagnostopoulos, Buchanan, Pereira, & Lichty,

1 2009; Goodenow, Szalacha, and Westheimer, 2006; Kosciw et al., 2016). The aim of this work is to
2 analyze the distinct individual and contextual correlates associated with these two different types of
3 school staff reactions.

4 A recent review (Vega, Crawford, & Pelt, 2012) suggests that the manner in which school
5 staff manage sexual orientation-based discriminations is due to both individual factors, such as
6 school staff's personal attitudes and beliefs, and to contextual factors, such as their perception of
7 colleagues' beliefs and reactions towards these forms of discrimination. Several qualitative studies
8 have examined school staff reactions to bullying or harassment based on sexual orientation or
9 gender expression (Anagnostopoulos et al., 2009; Ferfolja & Robinson, 2004; Gerouki, 2010;
10 McGarry, 2008; McIntyre, 2009; Meyer, 2008; O'Higgins-Norman, 2009; Sykes, 2004). Only a few
11 recent quantitative studies have explicitly examined either individual factors (Greytak & Kosciw,
12 2014; Nappa, Palladino, Menesini, & Baiocco, 2017), or the interplay of individual and contextual
13 factors (Collier, Bos, & Sandfort, 2015; McCabe, Rubinson, Dragowski, & Elizalde-Utnick, 2013),
14 as predictors of school staff reactions to homophobic bullying or incidents of harassment. The aim
15 of this study is to complement these empirical works by analyzing within the same research design
16 the different or overlapping contributions of individual and contextual factors in predicting two
17 distinct school staff reactions to homophobic bullying, namely their legitimization of the
18 homophobic bullying episodes or their supportive intervention in case of these episodes.

19 As for the individual variables, we corroborate previous findings that attest to a relationship
20 between sexual prejudice on the part of school staff and their reactions to homophobic bullying
21 (Collier et al., 2015; Nappa et al., 2017), and extend this investigation to factors that have received
22 little attention, such as school staff contact with LG individuals (Greytak & Kosciw, 2014) and the
23 perceived offensiveness of homophobic verbal assaults. As for the contextual variable, the
24 frequency of homophobic bullying observed by school staff, and their perception of colleagues'
25 reactions to homophobic bullying comprise the contextual variables, as it has been shown that they
26 play a significant role in shaping the manner in which school staff manage homophobic bullying

1 (Collier et al., 2015; McCabe et al. 2013; Novick & Isaacs, 2010). Pursuing this goal would allow
2 us to clarify the specific contribution of the individual and contextual factors as unique predictors of
3 staff reactions to homophobic bullying in terms of legitimization of or intervention to counteract
4 homophobic bullying episodes.

5 It is worth noting that the only two studies that have addressed the interplay between the
6 individual together with contextual factors and school staff reactions to homophobic bullying were
7 carried out in the Netherlands and the United States (Collier et al., 2015; McCabe et al. 2013), while
8 no research on this issue has yet been carried out in the Italian context. A recent Eurobarometer
9 survey in the European Union has shown that the Italian context is characterized by high levels of
10 negative attitudes toward LG individuals (European Commission, 2015; see also, Baiocco, Nardelli,
11 Pezzuti, & Lingiardi, 2013; Lingiardi, Falanga, & D'Augelli, 2005), and a national survey has
12 shown the widespread use of homophobic epithets, even in the adult population (ISTAT, 2012).
13 Moreover, only 58% of those interviewed claimed to personally know LG individuals (ISTAT,
14 2012). The prevalence of a negative and stigmatizing view of LG individuals, the high usage of
15 homophobic epithets and the low level of contact with LG individuals make the Italian cultural
16 context a useful setting in which to test whether school staff's homophobia, contact with LG
17 individuals and the perceived seriousness of homophobic epithets (i.e., individual factors) might
18 contribute to shape staff reactions towards homophobic bullying. Also, no policy that prohibits
19 discrimination based on sexual orientation exists in Italian schools (Nappa et al., 2017; Prati,
20 Pietrantoni, & D'Augelli, 2011). Differently from other European countries (e.g., Ireland, the
21 Netherlands, Belgium, Sweden, the United Kingdom, France), Italian schools are neither provided
22 with a national guideline nor supported by specific training to deal with homophobic bullying
23 (Dankmeijer, 2017). Moreover, in-school support groups (e.g., Gay-Straight Alliance) are not
24 present in the Italian school context. The lack of any institutional condemnation of discrimination
25 based on sexual orientation, as well as any institutional support to address homophobic bullying,

1 makes the analyses of school contextual factors especially important in understanding staff
2 reactions towards homophobic bullying, particularly in the Italian context.

3 **Individual factors related to school personal reaction in homophobic bullying incidents**

4 **Sexual prejudice.** Experimental research in social psychology has demonstrated that sexual
5 prejudice is a strong determinant in preventing social observers from intervening in cases of
6 homophobic discrimination. In a relevant study Kreuz, Turner, Goodnight, Brennan and Swartout
7 (2016), assessed, among other constructs, participants' sexual prejudice and then exposed
8 participants to current verbal harassment and physical intimidation perpetrated by an aggressor
9 confederate toward an ostensibly gay male target. The time participants took to intervene in the
10 staged scenario was assessed. Results revealed that the higher the sexual prejudice, the longer the
11 time participants took to intervene. The fact that sexual prejudice likely interferes with intervention
12 in cases of homophobic discrimination has also been demonstrated outside the laboratory, and
13 specifically in the case of homophobic bullying at school. Precursory evidence has shown the co-
14 occurrence of homophobic attitudes among teachers and their tendency to refrain from addressing
15 LGBT issues in school (Bailey & Phariss, 1996; Ollis, 2010; Sears, 1992). The relationship between
16 teachers' sexual prejudice and the manner in which they manage homophobic bullying episodes has
17 also been analyzed by Collier and colleagues (2015). In this research, which was conducted with
18 secondary school teachers in the Netherlands (Collier et al., 2015), the authors assessed participants'
19 attitudes towards homosexuality, presented them with homophobic bullying scenarios and measured
20 participants' behavioral intention to intervene in the described incidents. Bivariate correlations
21 indicated that higher levels of negative attitudes towards homosexuality were associated with lower
22 intentions to intervene. Recently, and in the Italian school context, Nappa and colleagues (2017)
23 found that higher levels of teachers' homophobia (i.e., attitudes toward lesbians and gay men
24 related to three dimensions such as deviance, personal discomfort, and institutional homophobia;
25 Lingiardi et al. 2015) were associated with higher feeling of powerlessness and a lower feeling of
26 positive activation, such as understanding the needs and thoughts of the victim.

1 On the basis of this empirical evidence, assessing school staff’s sexual prejudice could be
2 highly informative regarding the manner in which they deal with homophobic bullying in the school
3 context. Specifically, the above-mentioned evidence demonstrates that sexual prejudice may reduce
4 the likelihood of teacher intervention in situations of homophobic discrimination in general, and
5 also in hypothetical homophobic bullying scenarios, as well as distancing school staff from
6 understanding the needs and thoughts of the victim. Hence, we hypothesized that higher levels of
7 sexual prejudice on the part of school staff could be associated with higher levels of homophobic
8 bullying legitimization. (*Hypothesis 1*).

9 **Contact with LG people.** Inter-group contact is a crucial variable in improving inter-group
10 relations, such as weakening prejudice, enhancing cooperation and pro-social behaviors (Abbott &
11 Cameron, 2014; Poteat & Vecho, 2016; Sakalli & Ugurulu, 2003; Shamloo, Carnaghi, Piccoli,
12 Grassi, & Bianchi, 2018; Smith, Axelton, & Saucier, 2009). Notwithstanding the importance of
13 contact as a key factor in shaping bystander intervention in bullying episodes, to our knowledge
14 there is only one qualitative study (McGarry, 2008) and one quantitative research (Greytak &
15 Kosciw, 2014) that have analyzed the association between teachers’ contact with LGBT individuals
16 and the way in which they deal with homophobic bullying episodes. In the qualitative study carried
17 out on a sample of secondary teachers in an American school, McGarry (2008) reported that higher
18 levels of contact with LGBT individuals was an important factor in promoting teacher intervention
19 in cases of homophobic bullying. Similarly, in a quantitative study based on an American national
20 sample of secondary school teachers, Greytak and Kosciw (2014) showed that the lower the contact
21 with both an LGBT student and an LGBT person other than a student or a co-worker, the lower the
22 teachers’ intervention in anti-LGBT bullying and harassment.

23 Building on this premise, and given the few empirical studies on this issue, we intend to
24 gather additional quantitative evidence on the association between staff levels of contact with LG
25 individuals and the manner in which they deal with homophobic bullying. In line with results from
26 Greytak and Kosciw (2014), we hypothesized that lower levels of contact with LG individuals

1 among school staff would be a significant predictor of higher levels of homophobic bullying
2 legitimization (*Hypothesis 2*).

3 **Perceived seriousness of homophobic epithets.** As far as the manner in which school staff
4 deals with the use of homophobic language in the school environment, a survey conducted in the
5 UK (Guasp, 2014) revealed that secondary school teachers considered homophobic epithets
6 harmless banter and too common to intervene in every situation. These findings suggest that the
7 seriousness and the extent of the usage of homophobic epithets are often denied or minimized
8 (Gerouki, 2010; Zack, Mannheim, & Alfano, 2010). More importantly for our purpose, the
9 perceived seriousness of homophobic bullying events has been found to influence the way school
10 staff manages these events. Indeed, research has suggested that forms of bullying that are processed
11 as not serious, including cyber and homophobic bullying, end up being considered less worthy of
12 attention and consequently of intervention (Craig, Bell, & Leschild, 2011; see also, Greytak &
13 Kosciw, 2014; Perez, Schanding, & Dao, 2013; Yoon, 2004).

14 The present study intends to explore the potential relationship between the perceived
15 seriousness of homophobic epithets by school staff and the manner in which homophobic bullying
16 episodes are dealt with. Based on the reported research which indicates that dismissing the
17 seriousness of homophobic bullying is associated with decreased levels of intervention (Craig et al.,
18 2011; see also Greytak & Kosciw, 2014), we hypothesized that the lower the perceived seriousness
19 and offensiveness of homophobic epithets, the higher the probability that the school staff would
20 legitimize homophobic bullying episodes. (*Hypothesis 3*).

21 **Contextual factors related to school personnel reactions to homophobic bullying episodes**

22 **Homophobic bullying observed by school staff.** Research addressing the role of
23 homophobic bullying observed by school staff in influencing the manner in which this bullying is
24 managed has produced mixed findings. In a qualitative study conducted in the Irish secondary
25 school context, O'Higgins-Norman (2009) found that when teachers stated that name-calling
26 occurred with great frequency, they also claimed that they could not address bullying all the time.

1 In a similar vein, results coming from a survey in the UK (Guasp, 2014) showed that teachers who
2 admitted to refraining from intervening in cases of homophobic remarks justified their behavior by
3 claiming that homophobic slurs were too common to intervene in every situation. This pattern of
4 results suggests a potential negative relation between the homophobic bullying observed by school
5 staff and their intention to actively intervene in homophobic bullying episodes. In a quantitative
6 research regarding bullying in general (i.e., not specific to homophobic bullying), Novick and
7 Isaacs (2010) assessed how frequently teachers observed or were informed about bullying episodes
8 and their intervention in bullying incidents (i.e., coaching students on how to dealing with bullying
9 episodes and support for bullying prevention and social skills). Otherwise, results indicated that the
10 higher the levels of observed bullying episodes, the higher the teachers' interventions.

11 Given the few studies addressing the relationship between the homophobic bullying
12 observed by staff and the manner in which they manage homophobic bullying, additional evidence
13 is needed to evaluate this relationship. In the current study we intend to contribute to the debate on
14 this issue by testing whether the levels of observed homophobic bullying may or may not be
15 associated with either staff intervention in case of homophobic bullying or legitimization of
16 bullying episodes (*Hypothesis 4*).

17 **Perceived colleagues' reactions to homophobic bullying.** Social norms strongly orient
18 individuals' behaviors. The manner in which one observes others responding to a given event may
19 contribute to shape an individual's response to that event (Carnaghi, & Yzerbyt, 2006; Cialdini &
20 Goldstein, 2004; Deutch & Gerard, 1955; Turner & Oakes, 1986). Descriptive norms refer to norms
21 pointing to the perception of what most people do in a given situation (Cialdini, Kallgren, & Reno,
22 1991). The study by Collier et al. (2015) is, to our knowledge, the first to address (among other
23 variables) the impact of descriptive norms on teachers' intentions to intervene in homophobic
24 bullying scenarios. Specifically, Collier and colleagues (2015) assessed teachers' intentions to
25 intervene, their perceptions of what colleagues would do in a similar situation, and their perception
26 of whether salient referents (e.g., the school principal) expect them to intervene (i.e., injunctive

1 norm). Bivariate correlations showed a significant association between both norms and intentions to
2 intervene. In other words, the more favorable the descriptive and injunctive norms were with regard
3 to intervening, the stronger the reported intention to intervene.

4 The current study tests whether school staff perception of colleagues' responses to
5 homophobic bullying, namely the descriptive norm, would be associated with similar responses to
6 such events by participants. We reasoned that especially within the school context without
7 institutional norms regarding how to deal with homophobic bullying episodes, such as in the Italian
8 context, perceived colleague reactions to homophobic bullying might be a source of information
9 regarding how one is expected to respond to such events (Abrams & Hogg, 1990). Hence, and in
10 line with results from Collier and colleagues (2015), we hypothesized that perceived legitimization
11 of homophobic bullying by other school staff members would be positively correlated with self-
12 assessed legitimization of homophobic bullying. In a similar vein, we hypothesized that perceived
13 intervention by other school staff members would be positively correlated with self-assessed
14 intervention in homophobic bullying. (*Hypothesis 5*).

15 **Overview of the study**

16 The current study aims to analyze the unique predictors of school staff reactions to
17 homophobic bullying in terms of supporting the LG students victimized by peers or legitimizing
18 homophobic bullying. For the first time, this research analyzes the specific contribution of both
19 individual factors (i.e., sexual prejudice, contact with LG individuals, the perceived seriousness of
20 homophobic epithets) and contextual factors (i.e., the homophobic bullying observed by school staff
21 and the perceived responses of colleagues to homophobic bullying) in predicting staff reactions to
22 homophobic bullying in the Italian context (see Figure 1).

23 **Method**

24 **Participants**

25 Two hundred seventy-three school staff members ($n = 179$ women, $n = 84$ men, $n = 10$
26 participants did not indicate their gender) from 24 secondary schools in north Italy voluntarily took

1 part in the research. Participants' ages ranged from 21 to 63 ($M = 49.25$, $SD = 8.44$). The research
2 was presented to all the secondary schools of the Region in which the study was carried out ($N = 75$
3 schools). School participation in the research was contingent upon the agreement of the school
4 principal as well as the faculty. Twenty-four schools (i.e., 36.9% of the Region schools) agreed to
5 take part in the research, and 16.1% of the school staff voluntarily agreed to fill in the questionnaire.
6 At the Regional level, school staff was comprised of 62.4% women. Our sample reflected the
7 gender make-up of the population, 65.6% of the research sample being women. Also, at the
8 Regional level, the mean age was 52.5 years old, which is close to the mean age of the research
9 sample. As the number of school staff is not officially listed per institution, we are not able to
10 ascertain whether participation proportionally varied from school to school. Moreover, 77.3 % of
11 participants were teachers, 6.6% of participants were janitors, 5.5% of participants belonged to the
12 office staff, 1.5 % of participants were technicians, and $n = 1$ participant reported being a
13 psychologist. Finally, 8.8% of respondents did not report their position.

14 **Procedure**

15 School staff was officially informed by the school board that the local university was
16 conducting a study on homophobic bullying in collaboration with the local regional government.
17 The current questionnaire was reviewed and discussed by our lab and the school boards and
18 approved by the school boards. Participants were invited to take part in the study and fill out a
19 questionnaire left in the staff-room. Participants were asked to fill in the questionnaire individually
20 and then put it in a box provided by the researcher. Participants were requested to fill out the
21 questionnaire only one time and, to enhance participants' compliance, the reason behind this request
22 was explained by stating that the reliability of the research output strongly depended on that.
23 Participants were informed that their responses were anonymous, and they could withdraw from the
24 study at any time. To ensure anonymity and encourage completion of the questionnaire, sexual
25 orientation of the participants was not requested in their background information. Participants were

1 informed that they could contact the researcher for any question or clarification. No incentive was
2 provided to participants to complete the survey. Data collection lasted for two months.

3 **Measures**

4 Measures were presented in the following order: *sexual prejudice, contact with LG*
5 *individuals, homophobic bullying observed by school staff, perceived colleague reactions to*
6 *homophobic bullying, personal reactions to homophobic bullying, perceived seriousness of*
7 *homophobic epithets, demographic measures.*

8 **Sexual prejudice.** Sexual prejudice is a multidimensional phenomenon that maps onto
9 different aspects of the representation of sexual orientation (Herek, 2004; Herek & McLemore,
10 2013). Due to this complexity, the current operationalization of this construct relies on multiple
11 assessments (for a similar procedure, see Prati et al., 2011). Specifically, the complexity of sexual
12 prejudice was addressed by multiple assessments including a robust measure of attitudes towards
13 LG individuals, sexual stigma assessment, gender-inversion beliefs towards LG individuals
14 assessment, and acceptability of same-sex sexual behaviors in public contexts. Indeed, participants
15 were presented with the short form of the Attitude towards Gays and Lesbians (i.e., ATGL, Herek,
16 2000; see Herek & Capitano, 1996; e.g., ‘Sex between two men [women] is just plain wrong’).
17 Participants rated their answers on a 4-point scale, ranging from 1(= *strongly disagree*) to 4 (= *strongly agree*). We averaged participants’ ratings on the ATGL to form a single index. Higher
18 values on this index indicated negative attitudes towards LG individuals. Means, standard
19 deviations and Cronbach’s alpha are reported in Table 1.

21 Also, participants rated three items pertaining to assess sexual stigma (i.e., ‘Homosexuality is
22 immoral’; ‘Homosexuality is an illness’, Homosexuality is a threat to family’). Participants reported
23 the level of endorsement of each item by means of a 4-point scale, ranging from 1(= *strongly*
24 *disagree*) to 4 (= *strongly agree*). Similarly, we averaged participants’ ratings on sexual stigma;
25 higher values on this scale indicate the higher endorsement of a stigmatizing view towards
26 homosexuality (see Table 1).

1 Third, acceptability of same-sex sexual behaviors was measured by means of the affective
2 scale already used in the Italian national survey on this issue (ISTAT, 2012). Specifically,
3 participants read three short descriptions concerning two individuals kissing each other. In the first
4 description, the two individuals were a man and a woman; in the second description they were two
5 men, while in the third description they were two women. For each description, participants
6 indicated whether that behavior was acceptable or not (binary response, 0 = no, 1 = yes). We
7 summed participants' responses on items related to the acceptability of same-sex sexual behaviors
8 thus creating an index ranging from 0 to 2. To make the entire sets of measures coherent, we
9 reversed this index so that higher values indicated a lower acceptance of these behaviors (see Table
10 1).

11 Fourth, since sexual prejudice is an overarching construct that includes, among others,
12 evaluative, emotional responses and beliefs, and given that the above-mentioned items are more
13 related to the evaluative, emotional-based component of attitudes towards LG individual, we
14 decided to enter a gender role non-conformity measure to tap the beliefs about LG individuals.
15 Although gender ideology is a distinct construct from sexual prejudice (Herek, 2004), other
16 authors (e.g., Kimmel, 1997) have argued that contemporary sexual prejudice is entrenched with
17 beliefs that, for instance, gay men are insufficiently masculine. Also, empirical works show that
18 endorsing beliefs about the gender inversion of gay and lesbian individuals is a strong correlate of
19 sexual prejudice (Barron, Struckman-Johnson, Quevillon, & Banka, 2008; Baunach, Burgess, &
20 Muse, 2010; Keiller, 2010; Kilianski, 2003; Meaney & Rye, 2010; Parrott, Adams, & Zeichner,
21 2002). Given the significance of the beliefs about gender role-non conformity, we assessed beliefs
22 about the gender-role non-conformity of LG individuals by asking participants the extent to which
23 they agreed with the following statements: 'In general gay men [lesbians] are effeminate males
24 [masculine females]'; In general heterosexual men [heterosexual women] are effeminate males
25 [masculine females]'. Participants reported their level of endorsement with the above-mentioned
26 beliefs by means of a 4-point scale, ranging from 1 (= *strongly disagree*) to 4 (= *strongly agree*). To

1 compute the extent to which participants believed that LG individuals were gender non-conforming,
2 participants' ratings of the heterosexual-referred items were subtracted from their ratings of the
3 homosexual-referred items, separately for men and women as targets. The different scores were
4 then averaged thus forming an index of beliefs in the gender non-conformity of LG individuals.
5 Higher values indicated a stronger belief about LG individuals' gender non-conformity, while
6 values equal to zero indicated that homosexuals and heterosexuals were thought to be similar in
7 terms of gender conformity (See Table 1).

8 Participants' averaged scores on the ATGL, the sexual stigma, gender non-conformity, and
9 acceptability were significantly and positively correlated (see Table 2). Participants' averaged
10 scores on these variables were *z*-transformed. Reliability analyses were then computed and
11 demonstrated a good level of internal consistency ($\alpha = .80$). To fulfill our requirement of gaining a
12 complex measure of sexual prejudice and to avoid multicollinearity, participants' scores on these
13 variables were averaged, thus forming a single measure of sexual prejudice (for a similar procedure,
14 see Saroglou, Lamkaddem, Van Pachterbeke, & Buxant, 2009). Higher values on this measure
15 indicated higher levels of sexual prejudice.

16 **Contact with LG individuals.** In line with the procedures outlined by Greytak and Kosciw
17 (2014), participants were asked to indicate whether they personally knew at least one LG individual
18 by means of a binary response format (no = 0 vs. yes = 1). They further indicated whether the LG
19 individual/s was/were: a family member, somebody at school, somebody at work, a friend, a
20 neighbor, or an acquaintance. The measure allowed for multiple responses. An index of contact
21 with LG individuals was calculated by summing the selected options. This index ranges from 0 to 6,
22 namely from a lack of contact with LG individuals to a high level of contact with LG individuals.

23 **Perceived seriousness of homophobic epithets.** We included a measure of the offensiveness
24 of homophobic insults (see Carnaghi & Maass, 2008; Hunt et al., 2016), thus analyzing whether the
25 extent to which homophobic labels addressing gay males and lesbians might contribute to shaping
26 staff's own reactions. Specifically, participants were presented with homophobic labels addressing

1 gay males (i.e., *finocchio* [poof], *frocio* [faggot], *checca*, *culattone* [fairy]) and lesbians (i.e.,
2 *lesbicona* [dyke], *pervertita* [perverted]), category labels referring to gay males and lesbians (i.e.,
3 *gay*, *omosessuale* [homosexual], *lesbica*, [lesbian]), two light slurs unrelated to sexual orientation
4 (i.e., *scemo* [silly], *stupido* [stupid]) and two hard slurs not associated with sexual orientation (i.e.,
5 *coglione* [asshole], *stronzo* [bastard]). Participants rated the extent to which they perceived each
6 term as insulting by means of a 4-point scale, ranging from 1 (= *not all*) to 4 (= *very much*). Since
7 homophobic labels addressing gay males and lesbians were significantly and positively correlated,
8 $r(266) = .84, p < .001$, participants' ratings on these two measures were averaged together.
9 Moreover, since category labels referring to gay males and lesbians were significantly and
10 positively correlated, $r(264) = .95, p < .001$, participants' ratings on these two measures were also
11 averaged together. Higher values indicated that terms were perceived as insulting (see Table 1).

12 **Homophobic bullying observed by the school staff.** As for the homophobic bullying
13 observed (i.e., HBO) by the school staff, participants rated a modified version of the observation of
14 homophobic aggressive behavior scale (Prati, 2012). This scale was comprised of eight items, four
15 related to gay male-directed homophobic bullying and four related to lesbian-directed homophobic
16 bullying (i.e., to hear offensive labels such as *finocchio* [poof], *frocio* [faggot], *checca*, *culattone*
17 [fairy], *lesbicona* [dyke], *pervertita* [perverted]; to read offensive labels such as the above-
18 mentioned on a wall, in a restroom, on a door, in an email, in a SMS and on a social network; to
19 notice a student who was socially excluded or marginalized because he/she appeared to be or was
20 homosexual; to notice a student who was teased, insulted or the target of aggression because he/she
21 appeared to be or was homosexual). Participants reported the extent to which they witnessed these
22 events in the last school year on a 4-point scale, ranging from 1 (= *never*) to 4 (= *always*).
23 Participants' ratings on the HBO were averaged to form a single index. Higher scores indicated a
24 stronger observed prevalence of homophobic bullying (see Table 1).

25 **Personal reactions to homophobic bullying.** We relied on Prati, Coppola, and Saccà's
26 (2010) scale, which was derived from the work of Bacchini, Amodeo, Vitelli, Abbruzzese, and

1 Ciardi (1999) and has already been used in the Italian context. Participants were presented with a
2 description of a case of verbal homophobic bullying (i.e., when someone is called by offensive
3 labels such as the above-mentioned) and then with a case of behavioral homophobic bullying (i.e.,
4 when someone is excluded and/or attacked). Participants were asked to report how they had
5 managed such cases. To attain this aim, they read five items assessing personal *legitimization of*
6 *homophobic bullying* (i.e., 'I do nothing as it [the bullying episode] is a boyish prank'; 'I pretend
7 not to see it'; 'I justify the bully'; 'I'm not present [when this occurs]'; 'I do not realize it'). Also,
8 they read three items assessing *supportive personal intervention* (i.e., 'I intervene to defend the
9 victim, but the insults then increase'; 'I intervene to defend the victim, but nothing changes; 'I
10 intervene to defend the victim, and the insults then decrease and stop'). It is worth noticing that
11 personal *legitimization of homophobic bullying* items point to behaviors that either blatantly support
12 homophobic bullying or collude with it so as to legitimize the occurrence of homophobic bullying,
13 whilst the supportive personal intervention items allowed us to assess the frequency of personal
14 intervention regardless of their effectiveness, thus controlling for the different outcomes of these
15 interventions.

16 Participants rated these items on a 5-point scale, ranging from 1 (= *never*) to 5 (= *always*).
17 Participants' ratings on items assessing *personal legitimization of homophobic bullying* were
18 averaged. Higher values indicated higher legitimization of homophobic bullying (see Table 1). The
19 same computation was applied to participants' ratings on items assessing *personal intervention in*
20 *the case of homophobic bullying*. Higher values indicated higher intervention in the case of
21 homophobic bullying (see Table 1).

22 **Perceived colleague reactions to homophobic bullying.** Participants were presented with
23 both the verbal and behavioral bullying episodes as above. Participants had to report how their
24 colleagues usually manage such cases. To do so, participants were provided with the same items
25 already used to assess personal reactions to homophobic bullying but this time framed so as to refer

1 to their colleagues' reactions. Participants rated their colleagues' reactions on the items on a 5-point
2 scale, ranging from 1 (= *never*) to 5 (= *always*).

3 Participants' ratings on items assessing *perceived colleague legitimization of homophobic*
4 *bullying* were averaged. Higher values indicated higher legitimization of homophobic bullying by
5 school staff (see Table 1). The same computation was applied to participants' ratings on items
6 assessing *perceived colleague intervention in the case of homophobic bullying*. Higher values
7 indicated higher intervention in the case of homophobic bullying by school staff.

8 **Demographic measures.** Participants reported their gender, age, their role within school staff,
9 the type of secondary school in which they were employed, the geographic location of the school
10 (province), and the class they taught.

11 **Statistical analyses**

12 A regression analysis was conducted with the sexual prejudice index, contact with LG
13 individuals, homophobic bullying observed by school staff, colleague intervention in the case of
14 homophobic bullying, colleague legitimization of homophobic bullying, and the perceived
15 seriousness of homophobic epithets as predictor variables and personal intervention in the case of
16 homophobic bullying and personal legitimization of homophobic bullying as criterion variables.
17 Demographic variables (i.e., age, gender) were also included in the regression analyses as predictors.

18 Given that the personal *legitimization of homophobic bullying* and *personal intervention in*
19 *the case of homophobic bullying* captures two distinct, and not necessarily complimentary personal
20 reactions to homophobic bullying, and since the two personal reactions to homophobic bullying
21 were not significantly correlated (see Tab. 2), the above-mentioned regression model was carried
22 out separately on these two types of personal reactions to homophobic bullying.

23 Continuous variables were z-standardized, and participant gender was coded as binary
24 variable (0 = woman, 1 = man). These models allowed us to verify the unique predictors of each
25 type of school staff reactions (i.e., personal legitimization of homophobic bullying and personal

1 intervention in the case of homophobic bullying) as criterion variables, thus also controlling for age
2 and gender.

3 As shown by the correlation analyses (see Table 2) and the tolerance analyses (see Tables 3
4 and 4), no multicollinearity was detected among predictors. Below we discuss significant predicted
5 effects, while the full models are shown in Table 3 and Table 4.

6 **Results**

7 **Descriptive analyses**

8 As regards the *Contact with LG individuals* measure, 12 % of the sample affirmed that they
9 did not personally know at least one LG individual. Among those who personally knew at least one
10 LG individual, 7% of the sample reported that the LG individual(s) in question was/were a family
11 member, 16.5% of the sample affirmed that the LG individual(s) was/were somebody at school,
12 19.8% of participants declared that they personally knew at least one LG individual at work. 43.2%
13 of our sample reported that the LG individual(s) was/were a friend/s, 5.9% reported that he/she
14 was/were a neighbor and 51.3% affirmed that the LG individual(s) was/were an acquaintance.

15 Participants' ratings on *Perceived seriousness of homophobic epithets* were analyzed by
16 means of a 4 (labels: homophobic vs. category vs. hard slurs vs. light slurs) repeated measure
17 ANOVA. The omnibus effect was significant $F(1, 262) = 87.16, p < .001, \eta^2_p = .25$. Pairwise
18 comparisons (Bonferroni's correction) showed that participants perceived homophobic labels and
19 hard slurs as similarly offensive ($p = 1$), and more offensive than both category labels and light
20 slurs ($p < .001$). Also, light slurs were perceived as being more offensive than category labels (p
21 $< .001$). However, category labels were not perceived as neutral labels, as revealed by a one-sample
22 t -test on a test value equal to 1, which stands for not at all offensive, $t(264) = 13.51, p < .001$.

23 With regard to *Personal reactions to homophobic bullying*, a paired sample t -test showed
24 that participants reported more intervention in the case of homophobic bullying than legitimization
25 of homophobic bullying, $t(202) = 13.02, p < .001$. Moreover, a paired sample t -test showed that

1 participants reported more intervention on the part of their colleagues in the case of homophobic
2 bullying than legitimization of homophobic bullying, $t(193) = 8.09, p < .001$.

3 **Regression analyses**

4 Incomplete questionnaires were not entered into the main analyses. Regarding personal
5 legitimization of homophobic bullying, the overall model was significant, $Adj. R^2 = .33, F(11, 166)$
6 $= 8.94, p < .001$. The sexual prejudice index was positively associated with personal legitimization
7 of homophobic bullying, $B = .11, SE = .05, t = 2.30, p = .02, sr^2 = .14$, indicating that the higher the
8 level of participants' sexual prejudice the higher the tendency to legitimize homophobic bullying
9 (supporting *Hypothesis 1*). Contact with LG individuals significantly and negatively predicted the
10 legitimization of homophobic bullying, $B = -.09, SE = .04, t = 2.27, p = .03, sr^2 = -.14$. This pattern
11 of results indicated that the lower the contact with LG individuals, the higher the tendency to
12 legitimize homophobic bullying (supporting *Hypothesis 2*). Finally, the extent to which participants
13 perceived colleagues legitimizing homophobic bullying was positively associated with the extent to
14 which participants legitimize homophobic bullying, $B = .33, SE = .05, t = 7.18, p < .001, sr^2 = .44$
15 (supporting *Hypothesis 5*).

16 As for personal intervention in the case of homophobic bullying, the overall model was
17 significant, $Adj. R^2 = .49, F(11, 164) = 16.16, p < .001$. The only statistically significant result
18 concerned the association between colleagues' intervention and participants' own intervention.
19 Specifically, colleague intervention in the case of homophobic bullying was positively associated
20 with personal intervention regarding the same behavior, $B = .66, SE = .06, t = 11.91, p < .001, sr^2$
21 $= .64$, showing that the higher the extent to which participants perceived their colleagues would
22 intervene in the case of homophobic bullying, the higher their personal intervention (supporting
23 *Hypothesis 5*).

24 Since the perceived seriousness of homophobic epithets and the observed homophobic
25 bullying were not significantly associated with staff legitimization of or intervention in bullying
26 episodes, *Hypotheses 3 and 4* were not supported.

Discussion

The majority of research related to intervention by school staff in bullying incidents has explored student perceptions, leaving staff attitudes towards and reactions to these episodes partially unexplored (Bauman, Rigby, & Hoppa, 2008; Craig, Henderson, & Murphy, 2000; Craig et al., 2011; Espelage, Polanin, & Low, 2014; Sairanen & Pfeffer, 2011). Significantly, the underrepresentation of studies addressing the way school staff appraise and react to bullying is even more pronounced when homophobic bullying is taken into account (e.g., Collier et al., 2015; Greytak & Kosciw, 2014; Guasp, 2014; McCabe et al., 2013; Nappa et al. 2017; Norman, 2004; Russell, Day, Ioverno, & Toomey, 2016). This work helps fulfill this lacuna by analyzing the specific contribution of individual factors (i.e. sexual prejudice, contact with LG individuals, perceived seriousness of homophobic epithets), and of contextual factors (i.e., homophobic bullying observed by staff, perceived colleague reactions to homophobic bullying) in motivating staff members to intervene in the case of homophobic bullying or legitimizing this bullying.

School staff reported that they were more likely to intervene rather than legitimize bullying episodes. Importantly, regression analyses showed that distinct individual and contextual factors predicted whether participants intervene when facing homophobic bullying episodes or legitimize these episodes. As far as individual factors are concerned, our results indicated that they play a crucial role in shaping participants' personal legitimization of homophobic bullying only but not participants' intervention in cases of homophobic bullying. Specifically, and in line with our hypotheses 1 and 2, participants' personal legitimization of homophobic bullying was predicted by sexual prejudice and contact with LG individuals. The results of the associations between sexual prejudice and the legitimization of homophobic bullying episodes confirmed previous findings showing the correlation between these two constructs (Collier et al., 2015; Nappa et al., 2017), and further boosted the experimental findings on this issue by showing the crucial role of sexual prejudice in refraining from intervening in situations of sexual discrimination (Kreus et al., 2016). As for findings concerning contact with LG individuals, our results corroborate the only finding

1 reported in the literature thus far regarding the relation between contact with LG individuals and the
2 way school staff manages bullying episodes (Greytak & Kosciw, 2014). As previous research on
3 this issue has been conducted in the US context, our data provide the first evidence on the
4 importance of establishing contact with LG individuals as a way in which to weaken staff
5 legitimization of homophobic bullying in the Italian context as well. Moreover, our study
6 contributes to the literature on the contact hypothesis (Pettigrew & Tropp, 2006) by demonstrating
7 that low contact plays a key role in preventing bystanders from intervening when processing group
8 discrimination. In summary, endorsing sexual prejudice and having low contact with LG
9 individuals independently promoted the personal legitimization of homophobic bullying.

10 As for the contextual variables, perceived colleague reactions to homophobic bullying were
11 the only contextual factors that accounted for personal reactions to homophobic bullying. Indeed,
12 both perceiving others as legitimizing homophobic bullying episodes, and perceiving colleague
13 intervention in the case of homophobic bullying predicted similar reactions on the part of
14 participants (hypothesis 5). These findings are in line with previous evidence (Collier et al., 2015;
15 McCabe et al., 2013) showing the impact of descriptive norms on personal reactions when dealing
16 with homophobic episodes.

17 Contrary to hypothesis 3, the perceived seriousness of homophobic epithets was unrelated to
18 the likelihood that school staff would legitimize homophobic bullying episodes as well as
19 intervening in such episodes. Although null results are difficult to interpret, it might be plausible
20 that as these epithets are processed as hard slurs, their homophobic content might be disregarded,
21 thus losing their connection with homophobic bullying (for a similar explanation, see Hunt et al.,
22 2016). Future studies can address this issue by more directly assessing the perceived bullying nature
23 of homophobic labels and hard slurs, thus clarifying the relative contribution of the perceived
24 offensiveness and bullying characteristics of these insults in predicting school staff reactions to
25 homophobic bullying.

1 Finally, the homophobic bullying observed by school staff was not a significant predictor of
2 either school staff legitimization of homophobic bullying or intervention in such episodes
3 (hypothesis 4). We speculated that at least two factors could have contributed to the lack of
4 association between the variables in question. First, and differently from the study carried out by
5 Novick and Isaacs (2010), we only assessed the frequency of observed bullying episodes by school
6 staff, while we failed to consider the extent to which school staff were informed about bullying
7 episodes. Second, and in contrast to Novick and Isaacs' (2010) research, we limited our
8 investigation on school staff reactions to a restricted number of participants' types of intervention in
9 cases of homophobic bullying, while Novick and Isaacs' (2010) detailed distinct and different types
10 of interventions in bullying incidents, such as coaching students on the manner in which they could
11 deal with bullying episodes. Hence, limitations regarding the nature of measures both in the
12 predictor and the outcome variable could have overshadowed the association between the
13 homophobic bullying observed by school staff and their reactions when dealing with homophobic
14 bullying episodes.

15 The findings of the current research have relevant applied implications. First, training
16 programs for school staff should aim to reduce sexual prejudice thus likely decreasing the
17 legitimization of homophobic bullying episodes (Athanasas, & Larrabee, 2003; Greytak, Kosciw, &
18 Boesen, 2013; Szalacha, 2004). For instance, training programs should promote the opportunities
19 for preservice and in-service teachers to deconstruct prejudicial attitudes and biased beliefs
20 regarding LG individuals. Also, national and local school administration should promote training
21 programs that support LG youth and adult visibility to enhance school staff familiarity and contact
22 with LG people in the school community (i.e., students, school staff members, parents).

23 The interventions mentioned above are especially needed in those contexts in which sexual
24 prejudice is strongly entrenched and the contact with LG individuals is still elusive, such as in the
25 Italian school context. It is worth noting that in our sample 12% of participants did not know any
26 LG individual, whereas only 16.5% knew a LG person at school.

1 Second, an enumerated antibullying policy should be promoted in the national and school
2 setting. If Italian state law were to provide policies to protect listed categories of students, including
3 but not limited to LG individuals, this would likely promote school staff intervention in cases of
4 LGBT youth victimization (Russell, Kosciw, Horn, & Saewyc, 2010). Indeed, the presence at the
5 school level of antibullying enumerated policy is positively associated with school staff engagement
6 in supportive actions toward LGBT students (e.g., immediately addressing homophobic language;
7 Swanson & Gettinger, 2016). Complimentarily, LGBTQ students in schools with inclusive policies
8 report higher rates of school staff interventions in homophobic remarks than students in schools
9 with no policy or only a generic one (Kosciw et al., 2016). These policies are specifically needed in
10 Italy where the Ministry of Education, University and Research (MIUR) has not provided national
11 policies to prevent and counteract bullying based on sexual orientation, gender identity and
12 expression specifically (Nappa et al., 2017).

13 Third, to counteract school staff legitimization of homophobic bullying and enhance the
14 probability of counteracting homophobic bullying episodes, guidelines for school staff members in
15 handling homophobic bullying and harassment episodes would be relevant to deconstruct the school
16 staff's perceived normativity of legitimizing homophobic bullying as well as informing school staff
17 regarding the best practices of intervention against homophobic bullying and harassment.

18 Together, these tools are urgently needed given the detrimental consequences that
19 homophobic bullying and harassment have on the victim's well-being (e.g., depression,
20 psychological distress, and low self-esteem; Bianchi, Piccoli, Zotti, Fasoli, & Carnaghi, 2017;
21 Bontempo & D'Augelli, 2002; Collier, Van Beusekom, Bos, & Sandfort, 2013; Swearer, Turner,
22 Givens, & Pollack, 2008; Wyss, 2004), and scholastic success (e.g., school absenteeism, discipline
23 problems, and a low level of school belonging; Kosciw et al., 2016; Rivers, 2000; Poteat &
24 Espelage, 2007).

25 Some methodological limitations should be acknowledged. First, the outcome measure
26 concerning school staff intervention presented less variability in terms of types of interventions than

1 the outcome measure concerning the legitimization of homophobic bullying. Future studies could
2 rely on intervention-related measures that assessed different active strategies to counteract
3 homophobic bullying. Second, given that the primary interest of the current study was to address an
4 arbitrary classification of school staff reactions to homophobic bullying (i.e., school staff
5 intervention vs. legitimization of homophobic bullying), we forced participants' responses in a
6 simplified format. Hence, broader classifications of school staff reactions to such a phenomenon is
7 encouraged for subsequent studies thus mapping staff reactions in a more ecological fashion. Third,
8 we relied on self-reported measures, which are extremely sensitive to social desirability and self-
9 presentational concerns. Future research should complement this measurement procedure with
10 observations and reports from additional sources (e.g., students). Fourth, this study adopted a
11 passive survey collection method, which could have interfered with a more appropriate random
12 sampling. Fifth, although our sample at least in part matched the demographic characteristics of the
13 target population, we warn against generalizing our findings to the school staff of the Region under
14 examination, given a self-selection bias likely occurred in our sample.

15 Although this empirical effort is, to our knowledge, among the few studies which addresses
16 the psychological predictors of the manner in which school staff manage homophobic bullying in
17 the Italian context specifically (Nappa et al., 2017), additional work should be carried out in other
18 countries to corroborate and enhance the external validity of our findings. Moreover, given the
19 importance of contact with LG individuals in shaping staff reactions towards homophobic bullying,
20 future studies should assess this variable by taking into account not only the quantity of contact, as
21 in the current research, but also the quality of contact (Viki, Culmer, Eller, & Abrams, 2006), which
22 has been found to be predictive of behavioral intention in the inter-group context. Also, and parallel
23 to the quality of contact measure, it would be significant to assess the level of distant/close contact
24 with LG individuals, by relying on an appropriate scale (Tausch, Hewstone, Schmid, Hughes, &
25 Cairns, 2011), as it has been demonstrated that intimate contact is associated with more positive

1 attitudes towards LG individuals (Heinze & Horn, 2009) and likely influence school staff appraisal
2 of homophobic bullying episodes.

3 **Ethical approval**

4 All procedures performed in studies involving human participants were in accordance with
5 the ethical standards of the institutional and/or national research committee and with the 1964
6 Helsinki declaration and its later amendments or comparable ethical standards.

7 **Informed consent**

8 Informed consent was obtained from all individual participants included in the study.

9

10

References

- Abbott, N., & Cameron, L. (2014). What makes a young assertive bystander? The effect of intergroup contact, empathy, cultural openness, and ingroup bias on assertive bystander intervention intentions. *Journal of Social Issues, 70*(1), 167-182. doi: 10.1111/josi.12053
- Abrams, D., & Hogg, M. A. (1990). Social identification, self-categorization and social influence. *European review of social psychology, 1*(1), 195-228. doi: 10.1080/14792779108401862
- Anagnostopoulos, D., Buchanan, N. T., Pereira, C., & Lichty, L. F. (2009). School staff responses to gender-based bullying as moral interpretation: An exploratory study. *Educational policy, 23*(4), 519-553. doi: 10.1177/0895904807312469
- Athanases, S. Z., & Larrabee, T. G. (2003). Toward a consistent stance in teaching for equity: Learning to advocate for lesbian-and gay-identified youth. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 19*(2), 237-261. doi: 10.1016/S0742-051X(02)00098-7
- Bacchini, D., Amodeo, A., Vitelli, R., Abbruzzese, R., & Ciardi, A. (1999). La valutazione del bullismo negli insegnanti [The evaluation of bullying by teachers]. *Ricerche di Psicologia, 23*, 75-103.
- Bailey, N. J., & Phariss, T. (1996). Breaking through the wall of silence: Gay, lesbian, and bisexual issues for middle level educators. *Middle School Journal, 27*(3), 38-46. doi: 10.1080/00940771.1996.11496162
- Baiocco, R., Nardelli, N., Pezzuti, L., & Lingiardi, V. (2013). Attitudes of Italian heterosexual older adults towards lesbian and gay parenting. *Sexuality Research and Social Policy, 10*(4), 285–292. doi: 10.1007/s13178-013-0129-2
- Bandura, A., Barbaranelli, C., Caprara, G. V., & Pastorelli, C. (1996). Mechanisms of moral disengagement in the exercise of moral agency. *Journal of personality and social psychology, 71*(2), 364. doi: 10.1037/0022-3514.71.2.364

- 1 Barron, J. M., Struckman-Johnson, C., Quevillon, R., & Banka, S. R. (2008). Heterosexual
2 men's attitudes toward gay men: A hierarchical model including masculinity, openness, and
3 theoretical explanations. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity*, 9(3), 154. doi: 10.1037/1524-
4 9220.9.3.154
- 5 Bauman, S., Rigby, K., & Hoppa, K. (2008). US teachers' and school counsellors' strategies
6 for handling school bullying incidents. *Educational Psychology*, 28(7), 837-856. doi:
7 10.1080/01443410802379085
- 8 Baunach, D. M., Burgess, E. O., & Courtney S. Muse, 2010. Southern (dis) comfort: Sexual
9 prejudice and contact with gay men and lesbians in the south. *Sociological Spectrum*, 30(1), 30-64.
10 doi: 10.1080/02732170903340893
- 11 Bianchi, M., Piccoli, V., Zotti, D., Fasoli, F., & Carnaghi, A. (2017). The impact of
12 homophobic labels on the internalized homophobia and body image of gay men: The moderation
13 role of coming-out. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology*, 36(3), 356-367. doi:
14 10.1177/0261927X16654735
- 15 Bochenek, M., & Brown, A. W. (2001). *Hatred in the hallways: Violence and discrimination*
16 *against lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender students in U.S. schools*. Retrieved from Human
17 Rights Watch website: <http://www.hrw.org/sites/default/files/reports/usalbg01.pdf>
- 18 Bontempo, D. E., & d'Augelli, A. R. (2002). Effects of at-school victimization and sexual
19 orientation on lesbian, gay, or bisexual youths' health risk behavior. *Journal of Adolescent*
20 *Health*, 30(5), 364-374. doi: 10.1016/S1054-139X(01)00415-3
- 21 Camodeca, M., Baiocco, R., & Posa, O. (2018). Homophobic bullying and victimization
22 among adolescents: The role of prejudice, moral disengagement, and sexual orientation. *European*
23 *Journal of Developmental Psychology*, 1-19. doi: 10.1080/17405629.2018.1466699
- 24 Carnaghi, A., & Maass, A. (2008). Derogatory language in intergroup context: Are “gay” and
25 “fag” synonymous? In Y. Kashima, K. Fiedler, & P. Freytag (Eds.), *Stereotype dynamics:*

1 *Language-based approaches to the formation, maintenance, and transformation of stereotypes*, (pp.
2 117-134). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

3 Carnaghi, A., & Yzerbyt, V. Y. (2006). Social consensus and the encoding of consistent and
4 inconsistent information: When one's future audience orients information processing. *European*
5 *Journal of Social Psychology*, 36(2), 199-210. doi: 10.1002/ejsp.265

6 Cialdini, R. B., & Goldstein, N. J. (2004). Social influence: Compliance and conformity. *Annual*
7 *Review of Psychology*, 55, 591-621. doi: 10.1146/annurev.psych.55.090902.142015

8 Cialdini, R. B., Kallgren, C. A., & Reno, R. R. (1991). A focus theory of normative conduct:
9 A theoretical refinement and reevaluation of the role of norms in human behavior. *Advances in*
10 *experimental social psychology*, 24, 201-234. doi: 10.1016/S0065-2601(08)60330-5

11 Collier, K. L., Bos, H. M., & Sandfort, T. G. (2015). Understanding teachers' responses to
12 enactments of sexual and gender stigma at school. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 48, 34-43. doi:
13 10.1016/j.tate.2015.02.002

14 Collier, K. L., Van Beusekom, G., Bos, H. M. W., & Sandfort, T. G. M. (2013). Sexual
15 orientation and gender identity/expression-related peer victimization in adolescence: A systematic
16 review of associated psychosocial and health outcomes. *Journal of Sex Research*, 50, 299–317. doi:
17 10.1080/00224499.2012.750639

18 Craig, K., Bell, D., & Leschied, A. (2011). Pre-service teachers' knowledge and attitudes
19 regarding school-based bullying. *Canadian Journal of Education*, 34(2), 21-33.

20 Craig, W. M., Henderson, K., & Murphy, J. G. (2000). Prospective teachers' attitudes toward
21 bullying and victimization. *School Psychology International*, 21(1), 5-21. doi:
22 10.1177/0143034300211001

23 Dankmeijer, P. (2017). *GALE European Report 2017 on the Implementation of the Right to*
24 *Education for Students who are Disadvantaged because of their Expression of Sexual Preference*
25 *Or Gendered Identity*. Amsterdam, Netherlands: GALE.

- 1 Deutsch, M., & Gerard, H. B. (1955). A study of normative and informational social
2 influences upon individual judgment. *The journal of abnormal and social psychology*, 51(3), 629-
3 636.
- 4 Espelage, D. L., Polanin, J. R., & Low, S. K. (2014). Teacher and staff perceptions of school
5 environment as predictors of student aggression, victimization, and willingness to intervene in
6 bullying situations. *School psychology quarterly*, 29(3), 287. doi: 10.1037/spq0000072
- 7 European Commission (2015). *Special Eurobarometer 437: Discrimination in the EU in 2015*.
8 Retrieved from http://www.equineteurope.org/IMG/pdf/ebs_437_en.pdf
- 9 European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights. (2014). *LGBT survey: European Union*
10 *lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender survey*. Retrieved from [fra.europa.eu/sites/default/files/fra-](http://fra.europa.eu/sites/default/files/fra-eu-lgbt-survey-main-results_tk3113640enc_1.pdf)
11 [eu-lgbt-survey-main-results_tk3113640enc_1.pdf](http://fra.europa.eu/sites/default/files/fra-eu-lgbt-survey-main-results_tk3113640enc_1.pdf)
- 12 Ferfolja, T., & Robinson, K. H. (2004). Why anti-homophobia education in teacher
13 education? Perspectives from Australian teacher educators. *Teaching Education*, 15(1), 9–25. doi:
14 10.1080/1047621042000179961
- 15 Gerouki, M. (2010). The boy who was drawing princesses: Primary teachers' accounts of
16 children's non-conforming behaviours. *Sex Education*, 10(4), 335-348. doi:
17 10.1080/14681811.2010.515092
- 18 Goodenow, C., Szalacha, L., & Westheimer, K. (2006). School support groups, other school
19 factors, and the safety of sexual minority adolescents. *Psychology in the Schools*, 43(5), 573-589.
- 20 Greytak, E. A., & Kosciw, J. G. (2014). Predictors of US teachers' intervention in anti-lesbian,
21 gay, bisexual, and transgender bullying and harassment. *Teaching Education*, 25(4), 410-426. doi:
22 10.1080/10476210.2014.920000
- 23 Greytak, E. A., Kosciw, J. G., & Boesen, M. J. (2013). Educating the educator: Creating
24 supportive school personnel through professional development. *Journal of School Violence*, 12, 80–
25 97. doi: 10.1080/15388220.2012.731586

1 Greytak, E.A., Kosciw, J.G., Villenas, C. & Giga, N.M. (2016). *From Teasing to Torment:*
2 *School Climate Revisited, A Survey of U.S. Secondary School Students and Teachers.* New York:
3 GLSEN.

4 Guasp, A. (2012). *The School Report. The experiences of gay young people in Britain's*
5 *schools in 2012.* London, England: Stonewall.

6 Guasp, A. (2014). *The Teachers' Report. Homophobic bullying in Britain's schools in*
7 *2014.* London, England: Stonewall.

8 Heinze, J. E., & Horn, S. S. (2009). Intergroup contact and beliefs about homosexuality in
9 adolescence. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 38*(7), 937-951.

10 Herek, G. M. (2000). Sexual Prejudice and Gender: Do Heterosexuals' Attitudes Toward
11 Lesbians and Gay Men Differ? *Journal of Social Issues, 56*(2), 251-266. doi: 10.1111/0022-
12 4537.00164

13 Herek, G. M. (2004). Beyond "homophobia": Thinking about sexual prejudice and stigma in
14 the twenty-first century. *Sexuality Research & Social Policy, 1*(2), 6-24.

15 Herek, G. M., & Capitanio, J. P. (1996). "Some of my best friends": Intergroup contact,
16 concealable stigma, and heterosexuals' attitudes toward gay men and lesbians. *Personality and*
17 *Social Psychology Bulletin, 22*, 412-424. doi:10.1080/00224499509551780

18 Herek, G. M., & McLemore, K. A. (2013). Sexual prejudice. *Annual Review of*
19 *Psychology, 64*, 309-333. doi: 10.1146/annurev-psych-113011-143826

20 Higgins, A., Doyle, L., Downes, C., Murphy, R., Sharek, D., DeVries, J., ... Smyth, S. (2016).
21 *LGBTIreland Study: An Exploration of Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender and Intersex Lives in*
22 *the Republic of Ireland.* Dublin: GLEN and BeLonG To Youth Service.

23 Hillier, L., Jones, T., Monagle, M., Overton, N., Gahan, L., Blackman, J., & Mitchell, A.
24 (2010). *Writing themselves in 3: The third national study on the sexual health and well- being of*
25 *same-sex attracted and gender questioning young people.* Melbourne: Australian Research Centre
26 in Sex, Health and Society, La Trobe University.

1 Hunt, C. J., Piccoli, V., Carnaghi, A., Di Blas, L., Bianchi, M., Hvastja-Stefani, L., ... &
2 Cavallero, C. (2016). Adolescents' Appraisal of Homophobic Epithets: The Role of Individual and
3 Situational Factors. *Journal of Homosexuality*, *63*(10), 1422-1438. doi:
4 10.1080/00918369.2016.1158000

5 Ioverno, S., Baiocco, R., Nardelli, N., Orfano, I., & Lingiardi, V. (2016). Contrasting the
6 homophobic bullying within the Italian schools: The "itgetsbetter@rome" project experience. In S.
7 Russell & S. Horn (Eds.), *Sexual orientation, gender identity, and schooling: The nexus of research*
8 *practice and policy*. Oxford, England: Oxford University Press.

9 ISTAT (2012). *La popolazione omosessuale nella società italiana* [The homosexual
10 population within Italian society], 1-20. Retrieved from <http://www.istat.it/it/archivio/62168>

11 Keiller, S. W. (2010). Masculine norms as correlates of heterosexual men's attitudes toward
12 gay men and lesbian women. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity*, *11*(1), 38.

13 Kilianski, S. E. (2003). Explaining heterosexual men's attitudes toward women and gay men:
14 The theory of exclusively masculine identity. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity*, *4*(1), 37. doi:
15 10.1037/1524-9220.4.1.37

16 Kimmel, M. (1997). *Masculinity as homophobia. Toward a new psychology of gender*, edited
17 by M. Gergen and S. Davis. New York: Routledge.

18 Kosciw, J. G., Greytak, E. A., Giga, N. M., Villenas, C., & Danischewski, D. J. (2016). *The*
19 *2015 national school climate survey: The experiences of lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, and*
20 *queer youth in our national schools*. New York: GLSEN.

21 Kreuz, C., Turner, A., Goodnight, B., Brennan, C., & Swartout, K. (2016). Openness, Anti-
22 Gay Attitudes, and Intervention: Predicting the Time to Stop Anti-Gay Aggression. *DISCOVERY:*
23 *Georgia State Honors College Undergraduate Research Journal*, *3*(1), 4. Retrieved from
24 <http://scholarworks.gsu.edu/discovery/vol3/iss1/4>

25 Lingiardi, V., Falanga, S., & D'Augelli, A. R. (2005). The evaluation of homophobia in an
26 Italian sample. *Archives of sexual behavior*, *34*(1), 81-93.

- 1 Lingiardi, V., Nardelli, N., Ioverno, S., Falanga, S., Di Chiacchio, C., Tanzilli, A., & Baiocco,
2 R. (2015). Homonegativity in Italy: Cultural issues, personality characteristics, and demographic
3 correlates with negative attitudes toward lesbians and gay men. *Sexuality Research and Social
4 Policy, 13*, 95–108. doi: 10.1007/ s13178-015-0197-6.
- 5 McCabe, P. C., Rubinson, F., Dragowski, E. A., & Elizalde-Utnick, G. (2013). Behavioral
6 intention of teachers, school psychologists, and counselors to intervene and prevent harassment of
7 LGBTQ youth. *Psychology in the Schools, 50*(7), 672–688. doi: 10.1002/ pits.21702.
- 8 McGarry, R. A. (2008). *Troubling teachable moments: Initiating teacher discourse on
9 classroom homophobic speech* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Pennsylvania).
- 10 McIntyre, E. (2009). Teacher discourse on lesbian, gay and bisexual pupils in Scottish schools.
11 *Educational Psychology in Practice, 25*, 301-314. doi: 10.1080/02667360903315115
- 12 Meaney, G. J., & Rye, B. J. (2010). Gendered egos: Attitude functions and gender as
13 predictors of homonegativity. *Journal of Homosexuality, 57*(10), 1274-1302.
- 14 Meyer, E. J. (2008). Gendered harassment in secondary schools: understanding teachers'
15 (non) interventions. *Gender and Education, 20*, 555-570. doi: 10.1080/09540250802213115
- 16 Mishna, F., Newman, P. A., Daley, A., & Solomon, S. (2008). Bullying of lesbian and gay
17 youth: A qualitative investigation. *The British Journal of Social Work, 39*(8), 1598-1614. doi:
18 10.1093/bjsw/bcm148
- 19 Nappa, M. R., Palladino, B. E., Menesini, E., & Baiocco, R. (2017). Teachers' Reaction in
20 Homophobic Bullying Incidents: the Role of Self-efficacy and Homophobic Attitudes. *Sexuality
21 Research and Social Policy, 1-11*. doi: 10.1007/s13178-017-0306-9
- 22 Norman, J. (2004). *A survey of teachers on homophobic bullying in Irish second-level
23 schools*. Dublin: Dublin City University.
- 24 Novick, R. M., & Isaacs, J. (2010). Telling is compelling: The impact of student reports of
25 bullying on teacher intervention. *Educational Psychology, 30*(3), 283-296. doi:
26 10.1080/01443410903573123

- 1 O'Higgins-Norman, J. (2009). Straight talking: Explorations on homosexuality and
2 homophobia in secondary schools in Ireland. *Sex Education, 9*(4), 381-393. doi:
3 10.1080/14681810903265295
- 4 Ollis, D. (2010). 'I haven't changed bigots but...': reflections on the impact of teacher
5 professional learning in sexuality education. *Sex Education, 10*(2), 217-230. doi:
6 10.1080/14681811003666523
- 7 Parrott, D. J., Adams, H. E., & Zeichner, A. (2002). Homophobia: Personality and attitudinal
8 correlates. *Personality and individual differences, 32*(7), 1269-1278. doi: 10.1016/S0191-
9 8869(01)00117-9
- 10 Perez, E. R., Schanding Jr, G. T., & Dao, T. K. (2013). Educators' perceptions in addressing
11 bullying of LGBTQ/gender nonconforming youth. *Journal of School Violence, 12*(1), 64-79. doi:
12 10.1080/15388220.2012.731663
- 13 Pettigrew, T. F., & Tropp, L. R. (2006). A meta-analytic test of intergroup contact
14 theory. *Journal of personality and social psychology, 90*(5), 751. doi: 10.1037/0022-3514.90.5.751
- 15 Pizmony-Levy, O., Kama, A., Shilo, G., & Lavee, S. (2008). Do my teachers care I'm gay?
16 Israeli lesbian school students' experiences at their schools. *Journal of LGBT Youth, 5*, 33-61. doi:
17 10.1080/19361650802092408
- 18 Ploderl, M., Faistauer, G., & Fartacek, R. (2010). The contribution of school to the feeling of
19 acceptance and the risk of suicide attempts among Austrian gay and bisexual males. *Journal of*
20 *Homosexuality, 57*, 819-841. doi: 10.1080/00918369.2010.493401
- 21 Poteat, V. P., & Espelage, D. L. (2007). Predicting psychosocial consequences of homophobic
22 victimization in middle school students. *The Journal of Early Adolescence, 27*(2), 175-191. doi:
23 10.1177/0272431606294839
- 24 Poteat, V. P., & Vecho, O. (2016). Who intervenes against homophobic behavior? Attributes
25 that distinguish active bystanders. *Journal of school psychology, 54*, 17-28. doi:
26 10.1016/j.jsp.2015.10.002

- 1 Prati, G., Coppola, M., & Saccà F., (2010). *Report finale della ricerca nazionale sul bullismo*
2 *omofobico nelle scuole superiori italiane* [Final report of the national study on homophobic
3 bullying in Italian high schools]. Bologna, Italy: Arcigay Associazione lesbica e gay italiana.
- 4 Prati, G., Pietrantoni, L., & D'augelli, A. R. (2011). Aspects of Homophobia in Italian high
5 schools: Students' attitudes and perceptions of school climate. *Journal of Applied Social*
6 *Psychology, 41*(11), 2600-2620. doi: 10.1111/j.1559-1816.2011.00842.x
- 7 Prati, G. (2012). Development and psychometric properties of the homophobic bullying
8 scale. *Educational and Psychological Measurement, 72*(4), 649-664. doi:
9 10.1177/0013164412440169
- 10 Rivers, I. (2000). Social exclusion, absenteeism and sexual minority youth. *Support for*
11 *learning, 15*(1), 13-18. doi: 10.1111/1467-9604.00136
- 12 Rivers, I., & D'Augelli, A. R. (2001). The victimization of lesbian, gay, and bisexual
13 youths. In A. R. D'Augelli & C. J. Patterson (Eds.), *Lesbian, gay, and bisexual identities and youth:*
14 *Psychological perspectives* (199-223). New York: Oxford University Press.
- 15 Robinson, J. P., Espelage, D. L., & Rivers, I. (2013). Developmental trends in peer
16 victimization and emotional distress in LGB and heterosexual youth. *Pediatrics, 131*(3), 423-430.
- 17 Russell, S. T., Day, J. K., Ioverno, S., & Toomey, R. B. (2016). Are school policies focused
18 on sexual orientation and gender identity associated with less bullying? Teachers'
19 perspectives. *Journal of school psychology, 54*, 29-38. doi: 10.1016/j.jsp.2015.10.005
- 20 Russell, S. T., Kosciw, J., Horn, S., & Saewyc, E. (2010). Safe Schools Policy for LGBTQ
21 Students. Social Policy Report. Volume 24, Number 4. *Society for Research in Child Development.*
22 doi: 10.1002/j.2379-3988.2010.tb00065.x
- 23 Sairanen, L., & Pfeffer, K. (2011). Self-reported handling of bullying among junior high
24 school teachers in Finland. *School Psychology International, 32*(3), 330-344. doi:
25 10.1177/0143034311401795

1 Sakalli, N., & Ugurlu, O. (2003). The effects of social contact with a lesbian person on the
2 attitude change toward homosexuality in Turkey. *Journal of homosexuality*, *44*(1), 111-119. doi:
3 10.1300/J082v44n01_06

4 Saroglou, V., Lamkaddem, B., Van Pachterbeke, M., & Buxant, C. (2009). Host society's
5 dislike of the Islamic veil: The role of subtle prejudice, values, and religion. *International Journal*
6 *of Intercultural Relations*, *33*(5), 419-428. doi: 10.1016/j.ijintrel.2009.02.005

7 Sears, J. T. (1992). Educators, homosexuality, and homosexual students: Are personal
8 feelings related to professional beliefs? In K. M. Harbeck (Ed.), *Coming out of the classroom*
9 *closet: Gay and lesbian students, teachers, and curricula* (pp. 29–79). Binghamton, NY: The
10 Haworth Press.

11 Shamloo, S. E., Carnaghi, A., Piccoli, V., Grassi, M., & Bianchi, M. (in press). Imagined
12 intergroup physical contact improves attitudes towards immigrants. *Frontiers in Psychology*.

13 Smith, P. K. (2000). Bullying and harassment in schools and the rights of children. *Children*
14 *& Society*, *14*(4), 294-303. doi: 1.1111/j.1099-0860.2000.tb00184.x

15 Smith, S. J., Axelton, A. M., & Saucier, D. A. (2009). The effects of contact on sexual
16 prejudice: A meta-analysis. *Sex Roles*, *61*(3-4), 178-191. doi:10.1007/s11199-009-9627-3

17 Swanson, K., & Gettinger, M. (2016). Teachers' knowledge, attitudes, and supportive
18 behaviors toward LGBT students: Relationship to Gay-Straight Alliances, antibullying policy, and
19 teacher training. *Journal of LGBT youth*, *13*(4), 326-351. doi: 10.1080/19361653.2016.1185765

20 Swearer, S. M., Turner, R. K., Givens, J. E., & Pollack, W. S. (2008). “You’re so gay!”: Do
21 different forms of bullying matter for adolescent males? *School Psychology Review*, *37*, 160–173.

22 Sykes, H. (2004). Pedagogies of censorship, injury, and masochism: Teacher responses to
23 homophobic speech in physical education. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, *36*, 75-99. doi:
24 10.1080/0022027032000148306

1 Szalacha, L. A. (2004). Educating teachers on LGBTQ issues: A review of research and
2 program evaluations. *Journal of Gay & Lesbian Issues in Education*, 1(4), 67-79. doi:
3 10.1300/J367v01n04_07

4 Tausch, N., Hewstone, M., Schmid, K., Hughes, J., & Cairns, E. (2011). Extended contact
5 effects as a function of closeness of relationship with ingroup contacts. *Group Processes &*
6 *Intergroup Relations*, 14(2), 239-254. doi: 10.1177/1368430210390534

7 Taylor, C., Peter, T., McMinn, T. L., Elliott, T., Beldom, S., Ferry, A., ... Schachter, K.
8 (2011). *Every class in every school: The first national climate survey on homophobia, biphobia,*
9 *and transphobia in Canadian schools.* (Final report). Toronto, ON: Egale Canada Human Rights
10 Trust.

11 Toomey, R. B., McGuire, J. K., & Russell, S. T. (2012). Heteronormativity, school climates,
12 and perceived safety for gender nonconforming peers. *Journal of adolescence*, 35(1), 187-196. doi:
13 10.1016/j.adolescence.2011.03.001

14 Turner, J. C., & Oakes, P. J. (1986). The significance of the social identity concept for social
15 psychology with reference to individualism, interactionism and social influence. *British Journal of*
16 *Social Psychology*, 25(3), 237-252. doi: 10.1111/j.2044-8309.1986.tb00732.x

17 UNESCO. (2012). *Review of homophobic bullying in educational institutions.* Paris: Author.

18 UNESCO. (2016). *Out in the open: Education sector responses to violence based on sexual*
19 *orientation and gender identity/expression.* Paris: Author.

20 Vega, S., Crawford, H. G., & Van Pelt, J. L. (2012). Safe schools for LGBTQI students: How
21 do teachers view their role in promoting safe schools?. *Equity & Excellence in Education*, 45(2),
22 250-260. doi: 10.1080/10665684.2012.671095

23 Viki, G. T., Culmer, M. J., Eller, A., & Abrams, D. (2006). Race and willingness to cooperate
24 with the police: The roles of quality of contact, attitudes towards the behaviour and subjective
25 norms. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 45(2), 285-302. doi: 10.1348/014466605X49618

1 Williams, T., Connolly, J., Pepler, D., & Craig, W. (2005). Peer victimization, social support,
2 and psychosocial adjustment of sexual minority adolescents. *Journal of Youth and*
3 *Adolescence*, 34(5), 471-482. doi: 10.1007/s10964-005-7264-x

4 Wyss, S. E. (2004). 'This was my hell': the violence experienced by gender non - conforming
5 youth in US high schools. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, 17(5), 709-730.
6 doi: 10.1080/0951839042000253676

7 Yoon, J. S. (2004). Predicting teacher interventions in bullying situations. *Education and*
8 *Treatment of Children*, 37-45.

9 Zack, J., Mannheim, A., & Alfano, M. (2010). " I didn't know what to say?": Four Archetypal
10 Responses to Homophobic Rhetoric in the Classroom. *The High School Journal*, 93(3), 98-110. doi:
11 10.1353/hsj.0.0047
12

Table 1. Mean scores, Standard Deviations and Cronbach's alpha for measures used in the study

Scale	Subscale	<i>M</i>	SD	α
Sexual Prejudice	ATGL ¹	1.61	.68	.86
	Sexual stigma ¹	1.38	.62	.76
	Gender non-conformity of LG individuals ²	.40	.74	
	Acceptability of same-sex sexual behaviors ³	1.21	.60	
Perceived offensiveness of homophobic epithets⁴	Offensiveness of homophobic labels addressing LG	3.66 ^a	.62	.91
	Offensiveness of category labels referring to LG	2.01 ^b	1.21	.97
Perceived offensiveness of slurs⁴	Offensiveness of hard slurs	3.67 ^a	.58	
	Offensiveness of light slurs	2.83 ^c	.80	
Homophobic bullying observed by school staff⁵		1.22	.33	.84
Personal reactions to homophobic bullying⁶	Personal intervention in the case of homophobic bullying	2.72 ^a	.80	.78
	Personal legitimization of homophobic bullying	1.79 ^b	.78	.82
Perceived colleague reactions to homophobic bullying⁷	Perceived colleague intervention in the case of homophobic bullying	2.73 ^a	.75	.74
	Perceived colleague legitimization of homophobic bullying	2.15 ^b	.75	.90

Note Means with different letters in the same scale differ significantly at $p < .001$.

Range

^{1,2} From 1 (= *strongly disagree*) to 4 (= *strongly agree*).

³ From 0 to 2, higher values indicate a lower acceptance of these behaviors.

⁴ From 1 (= *not all*) to 4 (= *very much*).

⁵ From 1 (= *never*) to 4 (= *always*).

^{6,7} From 1 (= *never*) to 5 (= *always*)

Table 2. Summary of Intercorrelations among ATGL, sexual stigma, gender non-conformity, acceptability of same-sex behaviors, HBO, category labels, homophobic labels, hard slurs, soft slurs, colleague intervention in case of and colleague legitimization of homophobic bullying, personal intervention in case of and personal legitimization of homophobic bullying.

Measure	1.	2.	3.	4.	5.	6.	7.	8.	9.	10.	11.	12.	13.
1. ATGL													
2. Sexual Stigma	.73**												
3. Gender non-conformity	.15*	.16*											
4. Acceptability of same-sex behaviors	.51**	.58**	.22**										
5. HBO	-.01	.09	.01	.02									
6. Category labels	.21**	.26**	.05	.22**	.13*								
7. Homophobic labels	-.18**	-.21**	-.06	-.10	-.16**	.11							
8. Hard slurs	-.05	-.07	.02	.01	-.09	-.03	.43**						
9. Soft slurs	.01	-.01	-.01	.02	-.11	.08	.34**	.35**					
10. Colleague intervention	-.07	.11	-.01	.05	.17*	.19**	.06	.05	.10				
11. Colleague legitimization	-.02	-.02	-.04	-.04	.23**	.07	-.09	-.06	-.06	.11			
12. Personal intervention	-.17*	-.02	-.03	-.02	.05	.10	.15*	.18**	.21**	.74**	.07		
13. Personal legitimization	.07	.11	-.02	.08	.14*	.06	-.21**	-.14*	-.10	.18*	.52**	.06	

*Note: *p < .05, **p < .01.*

Table 3. Complete Model of the regression analyses on personal legitimization of homophobic bullying

	B	SE	t	sr²	VIF
Intercept	-.12	.05	-2.32*	–	
Participants' gender	.006	.09	.06	.004	1.12
Participants' age	.04	.04	.86	.05	1.20
Colleague intervention in case of homophobic bullying	.06	.05	1.36	.08	1.13
Colleague legitimization of homophobic bullying	.33	.05	7.18**	.44	1.14
Sexual prejudice index	.11	.05	2.30*	.14	1.23
HBO	.02	.05	.48	.03	1.15
Category labels	.02	.04	.53	.03	1.22
Homophobic labels	-.07	.05	-1.50	-.09	1.36
Contact with LG individuals	-.09	.04	-2.27*	-.14	1.12
Hard slurs	-.05	.05	-1.04	-.06	1.37
Soft slurs	-.05	.05	-1.08	-.07	1.31

Note: * $p < .05$, ** $p < .001$

Table 4. Complete Model of the regression analyses on personal intervention in the case of homophobic bullying

	B	SE	t	sr²	VIF
Intercept	-.030	.06	-.49		
Participants' gender	.007	.11	.06	.003	1.11
Participants' age	.004	.05	.08	.004	1.22
Colleague intervention in case of homophobic bullying	.66	.06	11.91**	.64	1.13
Colleague legitimization of homophobic bullying	.03	.05	.55	.03	1.15
Sexual prejudice index	-.08	.05	-1.50	-.08	1.22
HBO	.01	.05	.23	.01	1.15
Category labels	.03	.05	.60	.03	1.22
Homophobic labels	-.003	.06	-.06	-.003	1.36
Contact with LG individuals	-.08	.05	-1.62	-.08	1.12
Hard slurs	.09	.05	1.68	.09	1.40
Soft slurs	.08	.06	1.38	.07	1.37

*Note: *p < .05, **p < .001*