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Introduction

The study you are reading is the result of the voluntary and non-profit oriented co-operation of the Education Group of the Colectivo de Gays Lesbianas Bisexuales y Transexuales de Madrid (Madrid Association of Gays, Lesbians, Bisexuals and Transsexuals) (COGAM). Since 1997, this group has been working intensively in order to prevent, locate and solve situations of potential bullying at school based on the affective-sexual orientation or the gender identity of students. This activity has taken place within the programme Red de Educación para el fomento de la diversidad, la igualdad de oportunidades, la paz, la convivencia en las aulas y la educación en valores (Education network for the promotion of diversity, equal opportunities, peace and coexistence in the classrooms and education in values) and is articulated through talks and workshops for students of primary and secondary schools as well as for parent associations and also training of teachers.

The deep social commitment of the volunteers of the Education Group, after the publication of the report “Homofobia en las aulas 2013. ¿Educamos en la diversidad afectivo-sexual?”, (“Homophobia in the classrooms 2015. Are we educating in affective-sexual diversity”) allowed an intense monitorization of homophobia levels in the Region of Madrid to be carried out. An intense cooperation with educational centres, to whom we would like to express our acknowledgement and recognition for their engagement in the respect of affective-sexual diversity and genders identity, our volunteers have been able to experience at close hand the discrimination, intolerance and hate still present among students towards lesbian, gay, bisexual and transsexual people. The fear of punishment of the difference, the panic of becoming visible as LGBT to their school mates, teachers and relatives, the solitude caused by the expulsion of the group, the suffering caused by physical or verbal violence as well as threats, blackmail and cyberbullying and other forms of violence integrate the extensive amount of testimonials the Education volunteers have collected through their experiences in the classrooms.

This research, in which 5,605 secondary education students in the CAM and 30 teachers have taken part, aims to convey to the education community the suffering of these students and reflects upon the series of obstacles which prevents teachers in fulfilling the need we have (and experience as a most basic one) to prevent, detect and stem the suffering of the youngsters subjected to LGBT-phobic violence.

We the members of the Cogam Education Group are deeply convinced of the immense ability of students to become the force to change their own environment. To reach this goal, the education community must work in a joint and systemic way has such a powerful tool as the educación en valores morales para la convivencia democrática (education in moral values for a democratic coexistence). We must aim at wiping out intolerance and violence from our classrooms and our society by promoting the development of students as tolerant citizens and teaching them how to live within the respect of Human Rights, which are, after all, nothing but the values of freedom, equal rights, equal opportunities and solidarity.

Eduardo Benítez Deán.
Research Coordinator.
Theoretical frame and background.

Affective-sexual diversity and gender identity diversity are a reality in all communities. People are diverse and the presence of gay, lesbian, bisexual and transsexual (LGBT) individuals is no longer news for most people. With time, most societies, particularly the Spanish one, have reacted to the demands of the LGBT community and have adapted to the spirit of times, tolerance and respect. The sensitivity towards political correction has integrated different diversities. Racism, sexism, xenophobia and homophobia are identified as negative features which must be eradicated from the behaviour patterns in order to obtain a comprehensive, plural and open society. A society, thus, rich in human resources.

However, the acceptance of diversity is an aim which cannot be obtained with just a couple of laws and goodwill. It is a task which demands education, learning assessment of the human potentials and virtues and acceptance of difference. While this is a long learning process, the first years of our lives are the period in which we acquire the resources which will help us to interact and evolve within the community (Allemand, Steiger, & Helmut, 2015).

As the successive frame laws on education reflect, the educational period is a core part in the process of gaining skills and abilities allowing a development and growth of our human potentials as well as our development as individuals based upon the democratic principles of coexistence and basic rights and freedoms (Spanish Constitution, Section 28).

The education is so important that even the United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child determines that the states must act to allow the education of the children to develop “the child's personality, talents and mental and physical abilities to their fullest potential and the development of respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms” and “for the principles enshrined in the Charter of the United Nations […]” (sec. 29).

Children, teenagers and youngsters are expected to acquire social abilities and learn the values the society respects and promotes during their attendance at the educational institutions. Paying intensive attention to their education is basic to establish whether they are acquiring the needed skills but also social values; among these, tolerance, respect of the neighbours and of their diversity.

COGAM is carrying out a work of public interest in defence of Human Rights, and in particular in defence of the rights of the LGBT community. As previously mentioned, our activities include education and training. Thanks to this work in the classrooms, our association is in touch with the reality of students and has had the chance to establish the facts the reports on education and homophobia have been predicting.

In 2005, COGAM carried out the first research based on direct surveys in Madrid about the situation in the classrooms, a survey we called Homophobia in the education system (“Homofobia en el sistema educativo”). This study shows that, just like all over Europe, classrooms are not a safe space for LGBT teens. As subsequent studies, it shows that mockery and exclusion are an uninterrupted reality for a minority of the students. Insults have been trivialised and in the case of the LGBT-specificity, they are particularly harmful since their victims typically cannot rely on the support of their families since their sex-affective difference is in most cases unknown
at home. Homophobic bullying is thus more harmful than other types of bullying.

In 2006 the International Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Trans and Intersex Association in Europe (ILGA Europe), presented a report (Takács) on how the European youngsters face discrimination and exclusion in their daily lives, school included. It also establishes a direct link between homophobia-based school bullying and school failure, poor academic performance and serious consequences at a psychical level.

That very year a study on violence against children by the United Nations Organisation pointed out that children spent more time being taken care of by educational institutions than at home and, therefore protection against violence in education centres should become a priority. One of the forms of violence the pupils are exposed to is the bullying at the hands of other pupils. As in, e.g., gender violence and ultimately homophobia (Pichardo, 2008).

This violence entails a higher exposure to social, emotional and cognitive disorders which will accompany the individual a lifetime as well as health and social exclusion problems (COGAM-FELGTB, 2012).

As a result of the research works available, in 2010 the Instituto de la Juventud (Youth Institute, federal-run agency), considered the need to carry out a study with more funding aiming at obtaining a more in-depth knowledge of the opinions and attitude of the Spanish teenagers about sexual diversity, particularly on stereotypes and prejudices against lesbians, gays, bisexuals and transsexuals (LGBT). This study (Santoro, 2010) confirms the result of previous works, underlining the fact that homophobic attitudes and behaviour patterns are indeed frequent and reflecting the dangers of homophobia in the education system as a direct cause of exclusion, school bullying and physical and psychical violence among teenagers.

According to the works mentioned, in spite of the great advance of tolerance towards LGBT individuals which has taken place in the last few years, “schools and high schools are hostile environments where violence or threats are almost constantly present” (Santoro, 2010) but the educational institutions will turn a blind eye to this kind of aggression. Teachers avoid discussing sexual diversity issues due to their own homophobia or to the lack of adequate work material and training. Insults, homophobia and discrimination, often camouflaged as jokes, do persist, which hinders solidarity to develop since discrimination is not perceived as such.

Studies confirm that difficult as things may be for homosexuals at education centres, bisexual individuals suffer from an even greater lack of understanding while transsexual people are the ones to experience more refusal and lack of empathy.

1 The word “homophobia” includes hate and refusal towards non-normative homo- and heterosexual individuals. The meaning has been enlarged to include not only homosexuals but also bisexuals and transsexuals. Given the purposes of this study, we have chosen the synonymous but more inclusive word “LGBT-phobia”, the hate or refusal towards any individual who is or may be perceived as lesbian, gay, bisexual or transsexual.

2 The paper “Abrazar la Diversidad: Propuestas para una educación libre de homofobia y transfobia” (Embracing diversity: proposals for education free of transphobia and homophobia) was presented in November 2015; it is an online reference handbook providing tools to work on sexual-affective diversity at all educational levels. (Pichardo, 2015)
from Spanish youngsters, the stereotype being focused on “excessive people” (Ibid).

The United Nations Human Rights Council voted the resolution 17/19 in June 2011, the very first on human rights, sexual orientation and gender identity. Such resolution opened the way for a report elaborated by the United Nations High Commission on Human Rights\(^3\) which showed the need of implementing measures to put an end to violence and discrimination, including sexual orientation and gender identity, which are also defined as violations of international norms on Human Rights. More precisely, LGBT people have a specific risk of being victims of violence due to their sexual orientation and/or gender identity. These attacks are based on a correction or punishment imposed upon those who are allegedly defying the gender norms.\(^4\)

Our direct contact with teenagers in workshops run by COGAM-Education on prevention of LGBT-phobic bullying allows us to consider the information of the different studies mentioned and carry out our own check. In 2013 the COGAM Education group, thanks to the effort of our members and volunteers, produced a study in the classrooms aimed at assessing the evolution of the homophobia levels (COGAM, 2013). Most Spanish youngsters are tolerant with LGBT diversity but nevertheless, seven years after the first study COGAM made the results were still alarming due to a high rate of homophobic attitudes\(^5\): more than 30% of LGBT individuals suffer discrimination.

With this report, once again, COGAM-Education, in continuity with the work of the previous team, provides a fresh look at the situation of classrooms, a report which focuses on the evolution of LGBT-Phobia in Madrid high schools. This work adds its own insights and adjustments aimed at investigating new issues providing keys to fighting against homophobia.

---

\(^3\) Report of the High Commissioner of the United Nations for Human Rights “Leyes y prácticas discriminatorias y actos de violencia cometidos contra personas por su orientación sexual e Gender identity” (A/HRC/19/41).


\(^5\) This study focused on homophobic attitudes towards non-normative heterosexual, bisexual or homosexual individuals.
Objectives “LGBT-phobia in the classrooms 2015”

With this study, the Education group of COGAM aims at delving deeper into the socio-educational dynamics present in the situations of LGBT-phobic intolerance episodes at the CAM classrooms. The specific targets of this study are:

- Comparing the parameters obtained for the LGBT-phobia values in the educational community during the school year 2012-2013 with the one of the school year 2014-2015
- Getting to know the current situation of LGBT-phobic verbal aggression in education centres.
- Determining the possible reasons why the LGB students will not become visible in their classrooms and the connection thereof with the assimilation of LGBT-phobic prejudices.
- Underlining the reality and opinions of the trans* students of the sample.
- Considering potential connections between sexist and transphobic prejudices and the LGBT-phobic behaviour of the students.
- Assessing the level of acceptance of the students of non hetero- or non-cisnormative family models.
- Analizing the impact of the hetero patriarchal standards on gender issues on the LGBT-phobic behaviour and attitudes of the students.
- Assessing the impact of the socioeconomic level in the dynamics of LGBT-phobic bullying.
- Getting to know in depth the opinion of the teachers about their own ability to react to situations of LGBT-phobic intolerance.

In following publications:

As a part of our research work, committed with social changes of volunteers of the COGAM education group, a parallel research line has been started focusing on LGBT-phobic cyberbullying, which will soon be published, and in which we will:

- Analize the real dimension of LGBT-phobic aggressions based on Technologies of Information and Communication (TIC) among the students in the CAM (cyberbullying).
- Try to define the temporal features and online spaces where this cyberbullying takes place.
- Get to know the ways and forms of bullying which are more frequently used to display LGBT-phobia on the Internet.
- Get a deeper insight of the opinions of teachers about their ability to response to situations of LGBT-phobic intolerance on the Internet.
- Show the opinion and ability of government institutions dealing with education issues to respond to hate.
Methodology

This is an education research based on the sociological method of quantitative social research methods. The results shown are of two different samples: students and teachers.

The sampling technique used with the students was a survey of 21 closed questions and a space at the end where the students were offered the opportunity to express their opinions or comment on their personal experiences. 5 of the 21 items were on identification (3 dichotomies, 1 numeric and 1 multiple choice single answer) and 11 were based on a Likert-like scale, adapted in order to simplify it for the students. This scale varies slightly from the one used in 2012-2013; disagreement degrees have been suppressed and the approach made is one of a higher or lower degree of agreement. When possible, the items have been formulated avoiding complicated syntax or verbs with negative connotations.

The volunteers of the COGAM Education group, who had received appropriate training in order to ensure an adequate result, carried out the sampling during the school term 2014-2015. Since our talks are being requested by the educational centres themselves, a probabilistic sampling is just impossible. This is why we chose a quota sampling in order to make it as representative as possible. Finally, 5,605 students of 39 education centres of the 5 Area Directorates of the Madrid Region who requested to talk part in our talks programme took part in the survey (see description of the students sampling). 98% of the centres who asked to take part in the talks programme are state-run, while private or private and partially subsidized centres are actually only a 2% of the demand we received.

We must also stress the commitment of the centres who took part in the programme with an education respecting affective-sexual diversity and take into consideration that in some of them the teachers themselves had already taken some action about it prior to our workshops. It seems rather likely that, should the education centres who did not request to take part in our talks programme be taken into account, the levels of LGBT-phobia shown in this study would increase.

On the other hand, the questionnaires of the survey were filled in after the talk in order to ensure the understanding of the vocabulary used. The concepts taught during the workshop helped to complete the questionnaires properly. This is why the activity took also place at the end of the class, since we assume that the students had previously a very low degree of knowledge on the issues; we do nevertheless assume that this choice may potentially influence the results of the survey.

As far as the teachers' survey is concerned, we also chose a quantitative methodology with closed and open questions. The size of this sample is 30 teachers in the all the Area Directorates of the Madrid Region. 12 of them were in the Orientation Department, 10 were teachers specialized in teaching only one subject while another 6 were specialized in one subject whilst also being group tutors and 2 were exclusively group tutors.

The program used for the tabulation of the data was Microsoft Office (2007).
## Description of the sample of students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample size</th>
<th>Madrid Region Term 2013/14</th>
<th>Research sample 2014/15</th>
<th>Research sample 2012/13</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of students in state-run Centres, ESO, PCPI and FPB.</td>
<td>133.701</td>
<td>5.605</td>
<td>5.272</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Students state-run Centres ESO PCPI, FPB.</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>4.19%</td>
<td>4.11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount of centres of Secondary education</td>
<td>342</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% centres of Secondary education</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>11.40%</td>
<td>10.79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of classrooms</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>297</td>
<td>252</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cultural diversity</th>
<th>Madrid Region Term 2013/14</th>
<th>Research sample 2014/15</th>
<th>Research sample 2012/13</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of foreign students in general education schemes in Public Centres from 1st grade to ESO</td>
<td>101.365</td>
<td>1.328</td>
<td>1.317</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% foreign students</td>
<td>16.2%</td>
<td>23.68%</td>
<td>24.98%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cultural diversity</th>
<th>Madrid Region Term 2013/14</th>
<th>Research sample 2014/15</th>
<th>Research sample 2012/13</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of foreign students in general education schemes in public centres, in private centres and in partially subsidized centres, from 1st class to ESO</td>
<td>132.473</td>
<td>1.327</td>
<td>1.317</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Female ESO</th>
<th>Male ESO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Romania</td>
<td>24.743</td>
<td>151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morocco</td>
<td>19.647</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecuador</td>
<td>16.376</td>
<td>205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>7.640</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colombia</td>
<td>6.605</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peru</td>
<td>6.278</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominican Republic</td>
<td>5.580</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bolivia</td>
<td>5.406</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulgaria</td>
<td>3.157</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>2.861</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other nationalities</td>
<td>34.180</td>
<td>503</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Students by biological sex</th>
<th>Madrid Region Term 2013/14</th>
<th>Research sample 2014/15</th>
<th>Research sample 2012/13</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female ESO</td>
<td>48.7%</td>
<td>49.07%</td>
<td>49.51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male ESO</td>
<td>51.3%</td>
<td>50.93%</td>
<td>50.49%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Grade

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Madrid Region 2013/14</th>
<th>Research sample 2014/15</th>
<th>Research sample 2012/13</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number students in state-run centres, ESO, PCPI, FPB and High School diploma</td>
<td>199,620[^1]</td>
<td>5,605</td>
<td>5,272</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESO State-run centres</td>
<td>126,731[^3]</td>
<td>5,074</td>
<td>4,927</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1º ESO</td>
<td>36,589[^4]</td>
<td>371</td>
<td>564</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2º ESO</td>
<td>33,095[^3]</td>
<td>1,255</td>
<td>1,318</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3º ESO</td>
<td>29,969[^3]</td>
<td>1,609</td>
<td>997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4º ESO</td>
<td>27,078[^3]</td>
<td>1,839</td>
<td>2,048</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCPI/FPB</td>
<td>6,970[^4]</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>311</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School Diploma</td>
<td>65,919[^3]</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not assigned[^3]</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Area Directorate (DAT)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Amount of students in ESO, PCPI and FPB</td>
<td>118,794</td>
<td>5,605</td>
<td>5,272</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital</td>
<td>38,019</td>
<td>2,265</td>
<td>2,401</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North</td>
<td>9,931</td>
<td>388</td>
<td>612</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>38,660</td>
<td>1,179</td>
<td>1,457</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East</td>
<td>21,338</td>
<td>1,370</td>
<td>737</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>10,846</td>
<td>403</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[^1]: Including 3 private-run and partially subsidized centres with 638 students, 194 students preparing high school diploma and 143 from other training programmes (basically middle level grade vocational training cycles).
[^2]: Students whose legal tutors were born abroad.
[^3]: Including other training programmes (basically middle level grade vocational training cycles)
[^C]: Structural General Data Bank (DESVAN), CAM Institute of Statistics. Data of the City of Madrid and metropolitan regions North, South, East and West.
**Results and discussion**

1. **Gender identity and sexual-affective orientation of the students.**

1.1 Gender identity

9 students who declare to be transsexuals integrate our sample, namely: three transsexual boys (see glossary), attending the 1st, 2nd and 3rd grade of ESO and six transsexual girls in the 3rd and 4th year of ESO, PCPI/FPB and other training programs (see 1).

The real prevalence of the trans* (see glossary) identities in Spain is unknown so far. The studies quoted more often base their estimates on clinical data of transsexual people over 15 years of age having received a <<clinical diagnosis of gender disphoria>> (Gómez Gil et al., 2005)\(^6\).

Such estimates will typically only consider the individuals having received hormonal and/or surgery treatment (Herrero and Díaz de Argandoña, 2009; Domínguez, García and Hombrados, 2011). Such studies thus do not reflect the real number of trans* people (see glossary) or the variety of experiences of the transsexual people (Platero, 2014). These figures are just representative of the prevalence and incidence of the transsexual people having received both a <<diagnosis>> of gender disphoria and <<symptoms>> of anatomic disphoria.

The Spanish associations of families of transsexual minors (e.g. the website of the association Chrysallis, entry on the prevalence of transsexuality) demand figures which will not make the reality of their trans* children invisible or simplify it and, backed by an extensive bibliographic revision, (Olyslager & Conway, 2007; Reed et al., 2009; Horton, 2008; Fielding et al., 2012 among others), consider that the actual data on transsexual children might show a prevalence of 0,1% (1/1000) or higher.

In our study we establish that the proportion of sexes shown by other investigators García & Hombrados, 2011) remains the same, the number of transsexual female students (70% approx.) being higher than the one of transsexual males (30%). [1]. As far as prevalence is concerned, our figures match the ones quoted by the associations of families of trans* children, according to which transsexual students is 0,16% of the total of the sample, with a prevalence of 1,6/1000 students.

If we take the above mentioned figure as starting point we may estimate that, considering the number of students of ESO and PCPI/FPB in state-run centres in the Madrid Region (Data and figures of Education, 2015), the number of transsexual students might be 214. This means that with 344 state-run centres teaching ESO, **60% of the centres teaching ESO might have each a transsexual student.** According to the annual statistics of the LGBT Programme of the Madrid

---

\(^6\) COGAM’s Education Group and its Educational Research Team do not share the pathologizing approach the terminology of clinical studies conveys about transsexuality (Roselló, 2013). This is why we are writing it in italics and encourage the clinic and health staff to require and search specific training in good practices in order not to pathologize, stigmatize or socially exclude trans* people.
Regional Government, in the year 2014, 28 people under 18 consulted them about gender identity issues. A newspaper article published in 2014 (Larrañeta, 2014) showed that in the Gender Identity <<Disorders>> Unit of the Ramón y Cajal Hospital 45 under-age people had been taken care of. According to Violeta Herrero, spokesperson for COGAM’s Transsexuals Group and volunteer for the Daniela Foundation, the figure of under-age trans* receiving any type of healthcare related to gender issues in the Madrid Region is slightly above one hundred. Anyway, the official figures are clearly too low when compared to the evidence shown by this and other studies so it is highly likely that there is a higher number of trans* students who, in the best working hypothesis, do not need any health care or, in the worst case scenario, are not receiving the healthcare they should.

Is the education community ready to ensure that these students will experience a positive environment during their Secondary education, an environment which will respect and promote the free construction of their identity? According to the research works made so far, not only the environment is not yet ready to accompany the trans* minors in their development (Platero, 2010; Platero, 2014) but also makes their everyday life more difficult by the use of segregated spaces (e.g. toilets, activities, sports, etc.) (Puche, 2012).

Given the fact that in the questionnaires used the students were asked binarily about their biological sex (male or female) and their gender identity (boy or girl) and no other alternatives where offered about their gender identity (see glossary) this study might not accurately reflect the amount of students who will not fit in the traditional gender roles. This means that probably the rate of students with trans* identities in the CAM education centres is higher than the one above mentioned. In order to avoid simplifications or standardizations of the reality of the students of this sample, from now on we will refer to these students as trans* and not solely as transsexuals (see glossary).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transsexual girl</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0,11%</td>
<td>0,00%</td>
<td>0,00%</td>
<td>0,19%</td>
<td>0,05%</td>
<td>0,00%</td>
<td>0,70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transsexual boy</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0,05%</td>
<td>0,00%</td>
<td>0,08%</td>
<td>0,06%</td>
<td>0,05%</td>
<td>0,00%</td>
<td>0,00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cisexual girl</td>
<td>2.745</td>
<td>49,02%</td>
<td>48,92%</td>
<td>52,63%</td>
<td>46,36%</td>
<td>49,37%</td>
<td>48,19%</td>
<td>74,13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cisexual boy</td>
<td>2.846</td>
<td>50,82%</td>
<td>51,08%</td>
<td>47,29%</td>
<td>53,39%</td>
<td>50,52%</td>
<td>51,81%</td>
<td>25,17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>5600*</td>
<td>100,00%</td>
<td>100,00%</td>
<td>100,00%</td>
<td>100,00%</td>
<td>100,00%</td>
<td>100,00%</td>
<td>100,00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1. Detail of the sample by gender identity and studies (*5 replies could not be classified according to the criteria of this table).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender identity</th>
<th>% of the sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cisexual students</td>
<td>99,84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transsexual students</td>
<td>0,16%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2. Percentages of representation of the transsexual and cisexual individuals in our sample.
1.2 Sexual-affective orientation of the students.

In this sample, 6.4% of the students declare they are LGB, 47% of whom declare they are homosexual and 53% bisexual (see glossary) while 4.4% of the students state they do not know what their sexual-affective orientation is [Figure 1a]. Among the LGB students [Figure 1b] girls are more present since 2.43% of the sample are bisexual and 1.6% are lesbians while bisexual and gay boys are 0.94% and 1.41% in that order. Such figures are similar to the ones shown by the study COGAM made in the school year 2012-2013 (COGAM, 2013, page 13).

![Figure 1. A) % of students by sexual orientation in the sample. B) Detail of % of LGB students in the sample.](image)

Analysing by school grade allows us to realize that the amount of students who do not define their sexual-affective orientation (see glossary) tends to decrease with time [Figure 2 and Figure 3] (from almost 8% of the students in 1st grade of ESO to only 2% in High School Diploma). In accordance with the lesser doubts of the students, throughout the ESO we can appreciate an increase both of the students defining themselves as heterosexuals and of those defining themselves as LGB. [Figure 2].

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Heterosexuals</th>
<th>Homosexuals</th>
<th>Bisexuals</th>
<th>DNK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Boys DNK</td>
<td>0.94%</td>
<td>1.60%</td>
<td>2.61%</td>
<td>2.43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girls DNK</td>
<td>2.43%</td>
<td>1.81%</td>
<td>1.41%</td>
<td>1.60%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Gays</th>
<th>Lesbians</th>
<th>Bisexual boys</th>
<th>Bisexual girls</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Boys</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girls</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If we consider the reduction of the rate of students declaring not knowing what their orientation is and the increase of those declaring themselves as LGB or heterosexual from one grade to the next during the ESO [Table 3], we may appreciate that between 1st and 2nd grade, the amount of students defining their orientation is similar between LGB and heterosexuals. However most of the students defining their orientation from 2nd to 3rd grade define themselves as LGB and in 4th grade most of the students defining their orientation declare to be heterosexuals. If we consider the ESO as a whole we may say that among the students defining their orientation throughout the ESO, a rate slightly above 50% are LGB.

Although the end of the ESO and the transition to High School Diploma do not show large differences in the number of the students still not having defined their sexual orientation [Figure 2] (it could very well be that this rate of students didn't find yet an option reflecting their affective and or sexual attraction to other individuals -or the lack thereof- among the options in our survey and thus identify themselves with other affective-sexual orientations (see glossary) not considered in this survey), it is worth mentioning that the rate of students declaring to be LGB almost doubles, while the rate of those declaring to be heterosexual decreases. As we will see later on, it could very well be that during their High School Diploma the LGB students find spaces with more freedom and security allowing them to acknowledge their own difference of the canon imposed by heteronormativity (see glossary). This means that the actual figure of
students in Secondary Education identifying themselves with a sexual-affective orientation other than the heterosexual might be higher than 8.6% (6.4% LGB* ½ 4.43% NS) and thus be as high as 15.1% of the students. This last figure is similar to the one obtained in 2008 by the education area of the FELGTB in a research with a sample of 4.500 youngsters (FELGTB, 2009).

Figure 2. % of students classified by affective-sexual orientation in the sample. Detail by school grade.

Table 3. Percentage of difference of the number of students declaring not to know their orientation, to be LGB or be heterosexual in the transition from one grade of ESO to next.

When we detail by gender the rate of students not defining their orientation [Figure 3], we appreciate that although in the first grades of the first cycle of ESO (1st and 2nd grade of ESO; this study uses the organisation of the educational system before the LOMCE) the rates are similar for boys and girls. In the second cycle the rate of boys still not having defined their sexual orientation is significantly higher than the girls' in each grade and in High School Diploma the largest increase compared to the 4th Grade of ESO among LGB students is the one of gay and bisexual boys. As we will discuss in this study, there seems to be a gender bias which more specifically (but not only) in the case of boys hampers the development of self-identification with a non-normative orientation throughout the ESO.

Figure 3. % of LGB students of the sample. Detail by grade and gender.
2. Education centres. A hostile environment for sexual-affective diversity and gender identities.

2.1 Perception of the students of an LGBT-phobic environment. Social rejection as a way of discrimination.

When asked about how students being or looking LGBT are being treated (see glossary), in general less than 40% of the students (38,62%) thinks they are being treated equally while 32,48% thinks they are being discriminated. Comparing these figures with the results obtained in 2013 (COGAM, 2013; page 19) we should stress that, although the perception of the students believing that LGBT individuals are being discriminated against is very similar (32,25%), the rate of students replying they don’t know has decreased (27,78% in 2015 against 42,67%), while the rate of students ticking the option “just like the others” increases. This might show that the education environment seems to evolve in a positive way as far as educating in respect of the sexual-affective diversity is concerned and a higher rate of students might be able to realize which attitudes and behaviour entail a discriminatory or equalitarian treatment, the majority of them opting for the egalitarian. Nevertheless, we must underline that the degree of discrimination persists and entails serious consequences, as we will discuss later on.

Figure 4. Perception of the treatment given in schools to students who are or “look” LGBT comparing 2013-2015.

The “I don’t know”reply [Figure 5] tends to decrease throughout the ESO. In the 1st Grade, the lack of knowledge is hight but the majority feeling is one of equality (approx. 60% of those aware of the situation). In 2nd and 3rd Grades, the students have more experience and the rate of those replying to this question increases; almost 50% of those aware of it and reply choose the option “they are being discriminated”. The amount of those considering that LGBT students increases slightly from 2nd to 3rd and 3rd to 4th grades but this becomes particularly evident in the transition to the Secondary education. The perception of equality seems higher among students

---

7 Since neither gender identity nor affective-sexual orientation (see glossary) are noticeable features, it is unlikely to come across somebody “looking” LGBT. By using this approach, the aim is that students reply considering all the cases of LGBT-phobic intolerance (see glossary) he or she may have noticed, either based upon the certitude of the orientation or identity or the victim or on LGBT-phobic prejudices such aggression might arouse (see glossary).
included in the “others” category. The FPB is similar to 1st grade of ESO but with a higher degree of discrimination.

When asked about the possibility of becoming visible to their fellow students if the person surveyed were LGBT, if we compare the years 2013 and 2015, we may notice that the number of those who would not know what to do diminishes, while the amount of students who would come out of the closet increases and the amount of those staying in diminishes. A higher rate of the students shows less doubt and expresses a higher expectancy of acceptance of LGBT students; alas, the number of students still perceiving a hostile environment for the visibilisation does not decrease. One out of three students of ESO would not come out to their fellow students if he/she were LGB. We will find the explanation in the item where we deal with LGBT-phobic aggressions in classrooms.

Although the trend is visibilizing and accepting LGBT individuals, this might be somewhat shallow. We are, in other words, facing an “I-respect-you-but don’t-accept-you” attitude. An example of this is this comment we may have heard so many times: “I am tolerant, I even have gay friends” which actually means nothing but: “I am so tolerant I even allow them to be my friends”.

![Figure 5](image5.png)  
**Figure 5.** Perception of the treatment in High Schools to pupils being or “looking” LGBT detailed by grades

![Figure 6](image6.png)  
**Figure 6.** If you were lesbian, gay or bisexual would you come out to your fellow students? Comparative 2013-2015.
When replying to the question “If there were a transsexual school mate the rest of the class would accept him/her”, almost **70% of the students show some degree of discrepancy about the absolute acceptance** [Figure 7]. Although more than half totally agree (32,22%) or rather agree (26,39%) we may conclude that **transphobia is still big unsolved issue in classrooms**.

![Figure 7. Acceptance of transsexuality in classrooms.](image)

At the end of the day, although the situation seems to have somewhat improved we compared to 2013, there is still a high degree of rejection in the classrooms of LGBT individuals. One out of three students would not come out and two out of three have doubts about the degree of acceptance of the fellow students towards a trans* person. We should bear in mind that the LGBT-phobic discrimination leads to the exclusion of the LGBT students (IGLYO, 2013) and this is a violation of the terms of the **Article 26 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights** (UNGA, 1948) and the **section 14 of the Spanish Constitution**.

### 2.2. Aggression as extreme expression of LGBT-phobic intolerance.

An **alarming 7% of the students of this survey declares having witnessed LG-phobic-based physical aggressions (kicking, hitting, etc.) in their education centres** [8a]. We should bear in mind that physical violence is an extreme sign of hate and intolerance, which ought never to take place in our society and even less in an educational environment. **COGAM, FELGTB** and other organizations such as **Movimiento Contra la Intolerancia** (Movement against Intolerance) [see also: 13] institutions such as the **Ministerio de Interior** (Ministry of Home Affairs) and **Fuerzas y Cuerpos de Seguridad del Estado** (Police forces) recommend to **teach the students to report aggressions** and stress the need **not to play down** such aggressions. Parents, teachers and institutions must be aware of such in order to put an end to violent behaviour by punishing it and make it loose its legitimacy. Underestimating or relativizing such a serious issue as school violence will only contribute to perpetuate the scourge of hate and intolerance in our society.

On the other hand, LGBT-phobic verbal aggressions such as <<maricón>> [fag] or <<bollera>> [dyke] are even more present in classrooms since they have been witnessed by 59,68% of the students. In other words, **6 out of 10 students have witnessed LGBT-phobic verbal aggressions**. We must here stress the fact that hate is built through language tarnished with intolerance; allowing our children to learn and use this hate construction equates to planting the seed of violence in our society. **Avoiding this is not a question of political correctness; it is about**
teaching respect of Human Rights. Using such wording associating it with negative connotations, be it with a joking attitude or with the intention of hurting the person receiving it is, at the very least, a denigration of the individuals identifying themselves with the orientations socially related to them. In a direct or indirect way, consciously or not, the idea of what deserves tolerance and social recognition or what does not deserve it is reinforced. We face the same situation again: turning a blind eye, playing downs or relativizing such expressions of intolerance will only contribute to show an image of tolerance towards what should not be tolerated.

We must stress the fact that that 12,22% and 10,04% of students reply “I don’t know” when asked whether they have witnessed verbal or physical aggressions in that order. Maybe these students have also witnessed physical aggression but are unsure about them being caused by the affective-sexual orientation or gender identity of the victim. This means that LGBT-violence at schools might actually be more than 10% higher than the figures of this survey.

The 8B shows that the aggression most frequently witnessed is the verbal one; the physical aggression is less frequent and when the student witnesses it it is connected with verbal aggression. However, there are cases recorded of physical aggression having taken place without the student having witnessed verbal LGBT-phobic aggression, which might make its identification more difficult. This might help to explain the rate of students choosing “I don’t know”. In addition, although the questionnaires are anonymous, the fear of punishment or of causing some conflict in the education environment might lead these students to try to hide the reality behind such an ambiguous reply.

It should also be taken into account that there are, along with the aggression considered in this survey, so many other types of LGBT-phobic violence which might limit the development and experience of freedom of the LGBT-students (insult, mockery or imitation, ignorance, isolation, threat, sexual aggression, cyberbullying to name a few) (COGAM-FELGTB, 2012). We still have a long way to go before we will have truly tolerant classrooms, free of prejudices and fears.
3. The education community seen through the eyes of the students who do not meet hetero- and cisnormative canons.

In the previous chapter we have provided evidence of the students’ perception of LGBT-phobia levels in their educational centres. In this section we will discuss the percentages of LGBT-phobic bullying victims.

According to the approach of the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE), those committing hate crimes and incidents act due the fact that the victims belong to a certain group (or are perceived as belonging to) of such individuals to a certain group (OSCE-ODIHR, 2013). As UNESCO says, not only the LGBT students are the victims of the transphobic and homophobic bullying but this also concerns other students who are perceived as individuals who do not fit into gender roles and stereotypes, even if they do not consider themselves to be LGBT. This is why we will consider, in general, all the students who do not meet the hetero- and cisnormatives canons (see glossary) as likely victims of these hate crimes. We will also get a deeper insight of the specific perception of the LGBT students as a target group of such.

We must however point out that the opinions mentioned in this section are not applicable to the personal experience of each and every one of the LGBT students of the Madrid region (e.g. the vast majority of our sample attends state-run centres). We must also take into account that most of the students identifying themselves as LGBT in this study will not come out to their fellow students but are still able to auto-identify themselves as such. They have thus made significant advances in the process of accepting their own difference (COGAM 2005; COGAM 2006) in relation with the prevailing hetero- and cisnormative canons (Platero, 2014).

*Homophobic bullying is “a moral outrage, a grave violation of human rights and a public health crisis”*

Ban Ki-moon, United Nations General Secretary

3.1 Victims of LGB-phobic aggression at Secondary Education centres in the CAM.

As seen before, LGBT-phobic verbal and physical aggression is a fact known and seen by a high percentage or students. Some of the witnesses are also the very victims: **1 out of 100 students of Secondary Education have suffered the LGBT-phobic aggression themselves and 3 out of 10 say they have suffered verbal aggression** for being or “looking” LGBT.[ 9a]. If we compare the figures with the ones of 2013, an increase in the amount of victims may be determined, which will be discussed later on.
If we analyse these results specifically for LGB students, the figure looks rather diluted and we can say that 5% of the LGB students report having suffered physical aggression based on their sexual-affective orientation [Figure 10]. There are no relevant differences in the number of victims when comparing the study carried out in 2013 (COGAM, 2013, page 44) although the percentage of LGB students having witnessed this aggression increases slightly. As pointed out before, the inclusion of the “I don’t know” option in this edition allows us to realize that more than 9% of the students do not know whether they have witnessed LGBT-phobic aggression. This suggests the possibility that these students may have witnessed aggression but cannot say whether the reason was the affective-sexual orientation of the victims. This is not as unusual as it seems since some of the students report they have been victims of physical aggression [9b] without verbal abuse; it is then likely that the physical aggression based on affective-sexual orientation or gender identity is not easy to identify as such by the witnesses. The investigation of each and every aggression must be investigated in depth in order to establish whether they are hate-based.

If the figures on physical aggression are alarming, the figures on LGBT-phobic verbal aggression are just as alarming, if not more. Our previous study did not discuss them but other researchers have (FELGTB-COGAM, 2012) and they show that 17% of the LGB students are victims of verbal aggression at their education centre. It is even more surprising to read that only 21.84% of the LGB students interviewed report not to have heard LGBT-phobic insults in their school environment. 8.62% of them state that they do not to know whether they have heard them, which may show a lack of specific training of the students to identify LGBT-phobic abuse as such. However, the very fact is that practically 2 out of 10 LGB students hear insults referring to their affective-sexual orientation and between 70% and 80% of LGB students listen how their affective-sexual orientation is used as an insult at their education centre. This can just not be played down and must be treated in its adequate dimension. Words can be weapons as powerful as fists and students should thus be taught to use them with precaution. Using the
sexual-affective orientation as an insult while such orientation is part of the identity and self-perception of the students may lead to deep suffering (regardless of whether the insult is aimed directly or indirectly at the person receiving it) and lead to fatal consequences (FELGTB-COGAM, 2012).

If we classify the percentage of victims by their affective-sexual orientation we may appreciate that the higher rate of physical aggression [Figure 11a] is the one of males whose affective-sexual orientation is not the normative one; the females are thus less affected by this kind of aggression. As we will discuss further on this situation is the consequence of a gender-related effect, which was already considered in the previous study (COGAM, 2013, page 45). Homosexual men are more likely to be the victims of physical aggression, followed by bisexual boys and those who do not define their orientation. In the case of women, it is exactly the opposite since the most aggressed ones are those who do not define their orientation or identify themselves as bisexual, followed by lesbians. There is also a rather small possibility of heterosexuals being aggressed because they “look” LGBT. When compared to 2013, the increase of aggression towards bisexuals stands out (3,19% -figure not published in 2013- against 9,8% in 2015) and the decrease of aggression towards lesbian women (COGAM, 2013, page 46). It thus seems that in the case of males the differences opposing the heteronormativity are more punished in the case of males (see glossary) while in the case of women it is rather the lack of definition that is punished. This last fact is compatible with the mentioned gender effect we will detail later on.

In the case of verbal aggression, [Figure 11b] bisexual students stand out, since a third of them reports being victims of such abuse. They are followed by homosexual men as one of the groups most frequently punished verbally. This bias towards masculinity when choosing the target of the insults shows again the relevance of transgressing the traditional gender roles in the LGBT-phobic school bullying. The consequence is a certain form of control that becomes more persistent in the case of the students who “partially fail to meet” such gender prerogatives (COGAM, 2013, page 15) and which at the end of the day express turns into biphobic verbal aggression. Since the bisexual students have an affective and/or sexual attraction towards women, they are perceived within the canons of masculinity. This is why such aggression might have a corrective rather than punitive aim, in order to avoid the student deviating from the pre-
set canon. Thus bisexual students face a very strong oppression in order to force them to make them meet senseless and unachievable goals and preventing from experiencing their orientation freely.

In the case of gay students, the ones subjected to more kicking and hitting, this violence might be aimed at humiliating and excluding the victim; the gay boy is then used as scapegoat by the clear definition of borders, which can just not be overstepped. Whatever the aim, the result is just as harmful.

We must also stress the fact that a not neglectable at all percentage of women who do no classify themselves as heterosexual also suffers this kind of abuse. In this case, the percentage of women most affected by verbal violence does not correspond with the ones not opting for a sexual orientation but with bisexual girls, followed by lesbians and then by the ones not defining themselves. The data shown in further sections might support the hypothesis that the sexual dehumanisation of women and the related gender violence might be connected with.

The belief of the possibility of gaining sexual advantage of the lesbian or bisexual women leads then the boys to try to obtain such objective through the sexual bullying. Such coercitive mechanism is just the same used towards heterosexual women in order to induce their autoobjectivation and submission to the masculine rule. Dehumanizing behaviour and comments, along with the traditional gender stereotypes and gender experiences have proven to predict psychological distress among bisexual and lesbian women (Bonino, 1998; Bonino, 2004; Szymanski et al., 2011). The frustration caused by the inability to reach the goal might unleash gender violence that, according to these results, would affect more the women the abuser thinks he is more likely to gain as sexual benefit from; that is, those who do not view themselves as lesbians and the ones identifying themselves as bisexual.
The detail by grade of the victims of LGBT-phobic violence matches the results obtained in 2013 (COGAM, 2013, pages 45 and 47) and reveals that the percentage of victims of physical aggression reduces in the second cycle of ESO when compared to the first [Figure 12a and b]. The increase in the amount of victims compared to 2013 we mentioned is probably a consequence of the increase in the amount of victims among heterosexual victims of all grades and, to a lesser extent, also due to the higher rate of LGB victims among the students of ESO 2\textsuperscript{nd} grade in the sample. In the other grades, the amount of LGB victims shows rates similar to 2013. Although the sample does not include victims in PCPI/FPB, we may notice that the number of witnesses of this aggressions in this programmes is significantly high [Figure 12e]. The presence of LGB victims among PCPI/FPB students can simply not be ruled out. In the case of verbal aggression, the situation is similar [Figure 12c and d] to the trend of physical aggression.

The smaller percentage of witnesses and the lack of victims in high school diploma grades seems to show that a lot LGBT-phobic aggression is less frequent. This is not the case of verbal aggression, whose percentages are similar to the ones recorded in the ESO grades. In spite of the alleged perception of equality among the students included in the category “others”, the graphics show high percentages of victims among the LGB and the heterosexual students of this group. We therefore assume it is likely that there are high levels of violence among these students; this might explain why specific discrimination towards LGB students is not perceived, although de facto there is indeed such.
Figure 12. A) % of LGB victims of physical aggression. B) % of heterosexual victims of physical aggression. C) % of LGB victims of verbal aggression. D) % of heterosexual victims of verbal aggression. E) Victims of LGBT-phobic physical aggression. F) Witnesses of verbal LGBT-phobic physical aggression. By grade. No data available of physical aggression for High School Diploma grade or Others for the year 2013.
3.2 Perception of discrimination by LGBT students.

In spite of the figures mentioned above, the opinions of LGB students on how they are treated at their education centres seems to show a more positive vision than the one given in the 2013 study (COGAM, 2013, page 19) [Figure 13]. The reduction of the percentage of students questioning the treatment received or reporting feeling discriminated (from 38,01% to 31,7%) is quite striking; logically the percentage of those reporting a perception of equal treatment increases. Thus, although more than a fourth of the LGB students feel discriminated, this figure would seem to suggest an improvement of the target of obtaining a safer educational environment for LGB students.

![Figure 13. Replies of the LGB students to the question: “How do you think this High School treats people being or “looking” LGBT?”](image)

If we analyse the opinions of the LGB students and consider their affective-sexual orientation [Figure 14] we notice that homosexual students have a more optimistic vision than their bisexual fellow students. The reason is probably the higher levels of behavioural biphobia (shown before [Figure 11]) and cognitive biphobia among the Secondary education students. Such fact, already consigned in the 2013 study, is based on the lack of information and the prejudices considering bisexuality as an indefinite condition between homosexuality and heterosexuality (COGAM, 2013, page 15).

A small percentage of the students LGB or having replied “I don’t know” say that they are being treated “better than the others” at their centre. If we analise their replies to 7 other items reflecting perception of LGBT-phobia at their centre, there seems to be no correspondence between such perception of a real “better” treatment towards LGBT people and the replies supplied (for instance, 72,72% of them have witnessed verbal or physical aggression towards LGBT individuals in their educational centre and the remainder of the replies show a high degree of rejection towards a fellow student in their classroom who might be a transexual). And 50% of the trans* (see glossary) students report that their fellow students treat LGBT individuals worse while 25% of them think the treatment is the same.
If we take a closer look at the degree of acceptance experienced by trans* students of this sample in their classroom [Figure 15a], we note that most of them (66.66%) perceive some degree of transphobia from their fellow students. However most of them do not face a direct rejection. Maybe the coexistence with the diversity of gender identities promotes a higher degree of understanding and tolerance among their fellow students.

We must however bear in mind that 22.2% (2 out of 9) of trans* students in this survey have suffered verbal aggression for being or “looking” LGBT [Figure 15b]. These stats might be interpreted erroneously if we consider verbal aggression to trans* students to be infrequent. But the fact is that while trans* students make up 0.16% of our sample they are also 1.2% of the victims recorded in this study. In other words, a trans* student is 7.5 times more likely to suffer verbal aggression than the rest of the population; thus the very fact of being transsexual seems to be one of the reasons used by the aggressors when selecting their victims [Figure 15c]; had we had a greater representation of trans* students, the percentage might have increased notoriously, as shown in other researchs (e.g. in the USA more than the half of the students not identifying with any gender suffered verbal aggression in 2011 (Kosciw et al., 2012).
3.3 Vulnerability and feeling of helplessness.

3.3.1 Situation of defencelessness of victims of LGBT-phobic aggression.

More than 60% of the victims considered in this study report that their teachers do not take enough action against LGBT-phobic aggression [Figure 16]. This percentage increases in case of students victims of double aggression (physic and verbal). Although the percentage is quite similar in the case of victims of verbal and physical aggressions, we must stress the higher rate of physically aggressed individuals choosing the most negative options (do not agree at all or agree somewhat) for the way their teachers have acted. This shows an intense feeling of defencelessness of the victims towards their school centres. On the other hand 60%-70% of the victims (depending on the kind of aggression) considers to some extent that their family would not accept their LGB condition [Figure 16]. This is especially evident in victims suffering physical aggression. In this case, the percentage of those experiencing higher levels of family rejection increases. This situation, along with the lack of protection from teachers, shows an extremely concerning condition of helplessness of under-aged victims of LGBT-phobic aggression.

Such facts, along with the perception of indifference of the teachers and/or the shame of disclosing their situation to their families, probably conclude in a significant lack of confidence of the minor towards his/her family and teachers. Thus, this condition is reduced to silence (COGAM-FELGTB, 2012), which can only entail serious consequences, physically or psychically, for a teenager forced to deal with such aggression in deepest loneliness (COGAM-FELGTB 2012). It then appears as essential that the pertaining agencies, whatever their level of competencies at social or educational levels may be, implement as many measures as they can in order to teach teachers and families respect towards affective-sexual diversity. If we aim at eradicating violence from the classrooms, the society as a whole must acknowledge sexual-affective and gender identities diversity as an added value and not as a problem difficult to deal with. Quality training is needed for an education respectful of sexual-affective diversity and helping to prevent and intervene against LGBT phobic aggression is the first step towards stopping the suffering of under-aged people.
3.3.2 Perception of the teachers’ performance by LGBT students

Just as much as the very victims [Figure 16], 60.5% of the LGB students do not feel totally protected by the teacher [Figure 17]. We find similar percentages with heterosexual students, who (51%) think that teachers do not act enough in order to defend their LGBT fellow students. This lack of protection of the LGBT students, along with other issues to be commented later on, provides an educational frame more or less allowing the LGBT-phobic behaviour and aggression recorded in this study; as a consequence thereof, such practices perpetuate generation after generation. It is nevertheless worth mentioning that the perception of the intervention of teachers has improved substantially when compared to the school year 2012-2013 (COGAM, 2013, page 40); the most negative perceptions (do not agree at all and I somewhat agree) being chosen less by the students surveyed. Such improvement might explain the increase of the perception of equal treatment of the LGB students mentioned before [Figure 13]. Even if the perception of a safe school environment has improved, we can not say that physical aggression has decreased; the consequence is we must still work on this issue to reach a complete intervention on the part of the teachers (see chapter 5 for a more in-depth insight).
If we analyse this item considering the sexual-affective orientation [Figure 18] we notice that in all cases the percentage of students feeling totally protected by their teachers is lower than 52%. The case of bisexual students is remarkable, particularly bisexual boys, whose percentage is actually only 14% of the students. We must consider this along with the high rates of biphobia among the students to explain the high percentage of bisexual students who feel discriminated in their education centre [Figure 14]: not only are they insulted and aggressed by their fellow students [Figure 11] but they also feel deeply the lack of protection from their teachers.

This fact is a likely consequence of the invisibility which hegemonic heteronormativity (see glossary) imposes upon all other sexual-affective orientations; this invisibility becomes particularly serious in the case of bisexual students since their orientation is the one more often undervalued and construed as a condition of indecision (COGAM, 2013, page 15) or a phase [FELGTB, 2012]. Obviously, since adolescence is a stage of experimentation and definition of the identity, the teachers might well tend to consider (based on the mere presumption of universal heterosexuality) that these students are simply experimenting with their own sexuality but are actually heterosexuals. This might well be the case with some of the students in this study stating they experience physical or loving attraction to boys and girls. Nevertheless the moral damage inflicted with insults, humiliations or denigration does not depend at all on the sexual-affective orientation of the victim. The law determines that the teacher is obliged to react against any LGBT-phobic aggression or insult, regardless of the sexual orientation of the student, LGBT or not (BOE [Boletín Oficial del Estado- Spanish Law Gazette] Law 1/1991, January 7th 1991; Fanjul 2011).

We must also stress the case of students who do not define their orientation, who also feel that they can not really rely on the intervention of teachers. The boys who do not define their orientation are the ones with more negative replies (14.9%); they complain about an absolute lack of attention from teachers. Besides, after bisexual boys, girls who do not define their orientation are the ones who complain the most (8.08%). Probably among them we could find LGB people who do not define their orientation, not because they are not sure about it but because of the fear caused by the lack of a safe school environment.

Almost half of gays and lesbians (although they do perceive the intervention of teachers to a higher degree) believe the teachers do not intervene hard enough to defend them.

As far as the intervention of teachers is concerned, men of all categories (particularly bisexual boys) show lower levels of confidence than women. This might be representative of the fact that men tend to tolerate violence more at a social level (Bonino, 1998; Bonino, 2004; Szymanski et al., 2011; Omar, 2011). This is why we feel providing teachers with training about the respect of traditional gender roles and their socio-cultural construction is crucial, in order to avoid such pattern of insults or aggression among men to become normal and thus acceptable. Our coexistence takes place in what calls itself a civilized society and, therefore, no aggression of any type should be allowed or tolerated ever, even less in the educational environment (UNESCO, 2011).
As far as trans* students having taken part in this study are concerned, it should be stressed that the majority of them feel they are totally supported by their teachers. This may be the reason why the percentage of aggressed trans* in our sample is rather low [Figure 15b]. We believe that in the cases considered in this study, coexistence and assumption of the diversity of gender identities by the teachers promote a safe environment for trans* people.

3.3.3 Acceptance of affective-sexual diversity by the families of LGB studies.

Lower levels of acceptance than the ones recorded in 2013 have been detected at the families of LGB students. The percentage of students feeling that their family fails to accept their orientation has risen from 50 to 57% and the opinions have moved to higher degrees of rejection.⁸ [Figure 19].

The higher degree of absolute acceptance comes from homosexual students followed by bisexuals and then those who do not define their orientation. Among the students who report a more radical rejection from their families (option do not agree at all) the male students come first ahead of women, a trend which has not changed since the school year 2012-2013 (COGAM, 2013, page 38); the percentage of boys who do not define their sexual orientation and expect absolute rejection from their family environment is significantly high. They are followed by women who do not define their orientation. We do feel that the high levels of perception of a lack of intervention from teachers [Figure 18] along with lower percentages of frontal rejection towards sexual-affective diversity in their families might explain partially the fact that in this survey they do not define their sexual-affective orientation. After those who do not define their orientation come bisexual boys (15,38%) and gay boys (14,67%). It is also worth mentioning that bisexual girls also report a high degree of family rejection (somewhat agree 28,57%, do not agree at all 12,78%). This high degree of biphobia at family level is also a constant trend which we could already identify in 2013 (COGAM, 2013, page 38). Lesbian

---

⁸ In 2013 this item asked the students about the rejection they might receive from their families while in 2015 they were asked about the family acceptance. Maybe the different approach of the question made the student be more critical when considering the attitudes of intolerance towards diversity they perceive within their family.
students receive a lesser degree of square rejection than gays but their absolute acceptance is also smaller and remains at intermediate levels of family acceptance (rather agree: 26,14%).

Among the reasons which may lead to these different levels of family rejection, we may mention again the lack of recognition that bisexual teenagers face. Their families tend to think they are in a phase and tend to avoid facing the orientation of their children. This will only hamper the development of the under-aged since they will perceive the lack of a positive reinforcement, doubts or rejection of the free development of the personality from their loved ones. In the case of homosexual students, the invisibility of lesbians in the different social environments and the media, a direct consequence of the rejection and heteropatriarchal exclusion (Gimeno, 2003; Mugika, 2007; Momoito, 2013), may be one of the reasons why the families (lacking references and guided by stereotypes) show a lesser degree of complete acceptance than in the case of homosexual students. And the fact that the males face a higher degree of total rejection by their families than women may be due to the macho sexism dominating the heteropatriarchal societies (see glossary) in which the masculinization of the women) implicit in the prejudices about lesbianism and women's bisexuality) is less punishable at social level than the feminisation of the males (also deeply rooted in the prejudices on gay and bisexual men) ((Pichardo, 2012; Platero, 2014).

3.4 Fear, concealment and assumed LGBT-phobia

The results shown describe a complex educational frame, where the school centre is still perceived as a hostile venue by the LGBT students, due mainly to the lack of support from teachers and fellow students (Santoro et al., 2010). It may then be expected that the amount of students freely living their sexual-affective orientation is rather limited.

3.4.1 The Coming out of the closet of LGB students

Virtually 80% of LGB students have not come out (see glossary) in their educational environment [Figure 20]; they live their sexual orientation through hiding and fear of their environment finding out about it. In the study we carried out in 2013 the rate of LGB students still in the closet was similar (80,89%) to the one obtained in this year because, as it was the case with physical aggression, we can not say that a real improvement of safety in the school...
environment for LGB students has taken place (COGAM, 2013, page 48). This frightening figure which we will try to explain highlights a problem whose solution may only be found in an educational, systemic, multilevel intervention involving not only students and teachers as education agents but the whole of the education community.

![Figure 20. Percentage of LGB students having come out of the closet.](image)

In our case, Secondary Education, whatever the grade, the differences are not significant and the situation is hostile to the LGB student regardless of their school grade [Figure 21]. This is even more remarkable in the case of PCPI/FPB where more than 90% of LGB students do not dare to live their affective-sexual orientation freely. Less concealment may be found in the category “others” (including mainly middle or high level vocational training programs, whose students are mainly above 18. It should be remembered that LGBT-phobic aggression was not lower in this category than in the rest [Figure 12] which might show that these students may have decided to live their sexual orientation freely, assuming the risk it entails.

![Figure 21. LGB students having come out of the closet. Detail by grades.](image)

If we detail by the sexual-affective orientation, the replies of the LGB students to the question whether they have come out or consider coming out of the closet [Figure 22], we may notice that, as it was the case in our preceding report (COGAM, 2013, page 49), the higher percentage of students having come out of the closet was bisexual students. By contrast, in this study, the percentage of lesbians coming out the closet inverts: 19.32% lesbians (13.70% in 2013) and 14.67% gays (18.84% in 2013). The section 3.4.5 and the Annex II we may notice that the higher degree of assumption of LGBT-phobic prejudices is to be found among gay students (see glossary) and this might help to understand other figures.

When we analyse the responses from those choosing the “do not know” option when replying about their sexual-affective orientation [Figure 22], we find a most significant reduction of those considering coming out at school a feasible option and a high amount of students expressing their doubts about coming out to their fellow students. Considering the data of these students about the acceptance of their families [¡Error! No se encuentra el origen de la referencia.] if
they were LGB and the intervention of teachers [Figure 18], this suggest that the high degree of perception of LGBT-phobia in the socio-educational environment causes restrictions of the free development of sexual-affective orientation. This LGBT-phobia, assumed and accepted by these students (as shown in Annex II), might entail a delayed and insecure definition of their orientation.

We can also find among these students a small percentage stating having come out of the closet. It could very well be that these students do not feel represented in the categories “I feel attraction towards individuals of the same sex, of the opposite sex or sometimes towards boys or sometimes towards girls” and these are students who do not agree with this gender binarist categorisation (see glossary) prevailing over affective-sexual orientations and who might well be assimilated to the pansexuality (see glossary) concept. They might also not have defined clearly their orientation although they have declared to their fellow students that they are not heterosexuals. The representation of these students is 0,13% of the total of the sample.

"Being in the closet hurts." (Girl. Homosexual. 4th Grade ESO)

3.4.2 Visibility and LGBT-phobic aggression.

The figures mentioned before seem to suggest that becoming visible as LGBT in the educational environment entails a risk for the student who comes out. Such hipotesis is reinforced when we consider the figures of victims of physical or verbal aggression: those having come out of the closet are 3 times more likely to experience physical or verbal aggression (COGAM, 2013, page 48, (Figure 23a and b).
3.4.3 LGB students who stay in the closet

If we take a closer look into the opinions of LGB students who are in the closet and compare them with those of heterosexual students [Figure 24] we may notice that the amount of students showing their doubts about someone coming out in their class diminishes strongly among LGB students. This might suggest that LGB students see themselves compelled to make a drastic choice: come out of the closet or stay in. Although the heterosexual students, precisely because they are not LGB, may show a certain degree of uncertainty on the issue of whether they would come out themselves, it is also likely that a certain part of them lacks the ability to empathize and fail to approach the issue from the point of view of their LGB fellow students or imagine themselves as LGB people.

Half of the students who have no doubts on the issue would like to come out to their fellow students but have not done it for one reason or the other. Also, the other half of those students has made the choice of keeping their orientation secret. As far as heterosexual students are concerned, we must bear in mind that i) almost 40% have their doubts, while ii) more than half who have replied they would -or not- come out of the closet consider that their classroom is not a suitable environment. This seems to show the more than latent LGBT-phobia faced by those brave enough to try to live their orientation freely and visibly. Similar data was obtained in the study presented by COGAM in 2013.
Figure 24. Perspective of “coming out” of LGB students who still are in the closet and opinion of the heterosexual students about whether they would if they were LGB.

3.4.4 External motives determining the visibility of LGB students

In this edition of the study we have tried to get a deeper insight into the external reasons why the students decide, or not, to come out of the closet and become visible as lesbian, gay or bisexual to their fellow students. As we will show, these can be of a very different nature and there is not one single factor explaining why the students decide to come out of (or stay in) the closet and become visible as lesbians, gays or bisexuals. These factors may be diverse and there is not one single factor which explains by itself such choice. The attitudes towards sexual-affective diversity, the reactions of teachers, the family situation of the LGB student as well as their own prejudices seem to combine with other variables not considered in this survey to determine the free expression of their sexual-affective orientation or their higher or lower degree of repression (considering coming out, having doubts on the issue or refusing to do it).

Coming out of the closet and perception of discrimination

The coming out of the students in their own classroom does not seem to be conditioned by the general LGBT-phobia perceived in their education centre. It might, however, have an impact on their determination not to come out. Figure 25a shows how, along with the levels of LGBT-phobia, the percentage of students considering coming out of the closet or has doubts on the issue reduces noticeably while the amount of students deciding not to increases.

Figure 25. Impact of A) Perception of an LGBT-phobic environment, B) witnessing of verbal aggression and physical aggression on LGB students having come out of the closet. (Those who were the victims not included).
Leaving aside the general feeling of discrimination, let's consider now what happens with LGB students witnessing verbal or physical aggression [Figure 25b]. One might expect that the students witnessing aggression episodes to fellow mates they share affective-sexual orientation with (but are not victims themselves) tend to hide their orientation in order to avoid becoming victims of such abuse themselves. However we have recorded among the witnesses of aggression a higher percentage of LGB students having come out of the closet than students not having witnessed them; such percentage is even higher in the case of physical aggression.

Besides such students, who with great courage assume the risk of becoming even at the risk of suffering aggression, among the students who do not become visible we might also expect an increase of concealment in order to avoid aggression; this is the case for verbal aggression but in the case of physical aggression the percentage of students considering coming out of the closet increases while the percentage of those who would not come out decreases.

When we analyse whether the reason for this situation might be caused by a higher degree of intervention of the teachers in case of physical aggression and a lesser degree in case of verbal aggression, the reply is exactly the opposite; students witnessing physical aggression does not show a large degree of difference with those witnessing verbal aggression as far as the degree of intervention of teachers is concerned [Figure 26a]. Also in the case of students witnessing both kinds of aggression, the percentage of those witnessing physical aggression who reports a total commitment of the teachers reduces drastically. Actually the students having witnessed physical aggression show a more critic point of view and tend to express more negative opinions (options “do not agree at all” and “I agree somewhat”) when it comes to the lack of intervention of the teachers. Besides, when we compare these opinions of this group with the ones of the fellow students not having witnessed the aggression, we appreciate that those who think the teachers act not enough is higher among those having witnessed aggression of any kind than among those who haven't. The reason why both kinds of aggression take place might be also related with the fact that in both cases the students do not perceive the intervention of their teachers as sufficient.

Once we discard the role of the teachers, it's really the intervention of the students themselves depending on whether they have witnessed verbal aggression or not which might really make the difference in the percentage of LGB students having come out of the closet. Same applies to their likelihood to come out or stay in the closet.

If we compare the intervention of students having witnessed an extreme violence situation and the theoretical behaviour of those who haven't we can notice that the first group has more assertive opinions about their own behaviour [Figure 26b]. We should also notice that those having witnessed verbal aggression the percentage of those who theoretically would act against bullying and we also record more replies showing that they would rather not react or, to a lesser extent, that they would join the abuse. This is not the case of physical aggression; when this situation arises, students consider they are forced to take stand in favour or against bullying. The percentage of those students not reacting or showing doubts reduces while the percentage of defendants increases; so does the percentage of those joining or help with bullying. These facts will be discussed more in depth in section 4.1.
We do feel that, as far as this item is concerned, either because they feel backed by a larger number of fellow students or either because they feel the need to take one of the two sides (for or against bullying), the LGB student having witnessed physical violence may feel backed/pushed to show or considering showing his/her sexual-affective orientation to the fellow students. While when it comes to those having witnessed verbal aggression, the students may also feel the urge to take sides but, lacking the support of the fellow students and facing only passive or aggressive attitudes, fewer students will come out of the closet; and among them the students victim of physic aggression will come out in higher degree; among those staying in the closet the percentage of those considering coming out reduces while the percentage of those determined to stay in increases.

In short, violence situations may have an impact on the visibility of LGB students, either pushing them to become visible or either to remain hidden. It will be the attitude of the fellow students towards such aggressions which will determine the guarantees the student has to make his choice: whether he/she feels backed and safe, whether he/she takes in solitude a risk for his/her moral and psychological integrity or whether he/she allows fear to take control.

Such data do not only show the importance of improving the intervention of the teachers in preventing and acting against LGBT-phobic school bullying, but they also prove the ability and efficiency of students as intervention agents against such abuse and the importance of the role of students in generating a safe environment for LGBT students. This is why it is vital to provide the students with the adequate training against violence, stressing particularly the situations where the students, alas too much used to lack of respect to the point that they have trouble to identify this lack as such. Focus must also be put on the promotion of culture of non-violence and peaceful solving of conflicts and intolerance signs.
A) General opinion of students having witnessed physical and/or verbal aggression on the action of teachers when facing LGBT-phobia events. B) General attitude of students having witnessed physical and verbal aggression about this kind of events.

**Coming out and lack of intervention of the teachers**

When we consider the perception of a greater or lesser degree of intervention of the teachers when confronted with LGBT-phobic events and the impact on LGB students and their visibility in the classrooms [Figure 27], we may say that the **perception of the lack of intervention of the teachers has a clearly adverse effect on the coming out** of LGB students. The percentage of LGB students who would not come out of the closet (50%) or show their doubts about it (33,33%) is much larger than the percentage of those perceiving some degree of intervention from the teachers as in the case of students considering leaving the closet (11,11%) and those who have actually come out to their fellow students (5,56%).

Among the students perceiving the teachers take some degree of action we may appreciate a reduction of the opinions “I don’t know” and “I would not do it” in favour of those showing a positive attitude towards coming out or stating they have already. Nevertheless there is not such a thing as a linear tendency; we may then conclude that although **the complete lack of action of teachers provides the students with reasons not to leave the closet**, a higher degree of intervention does not explain by itself the reasons leading the students to become visible.

It thus appears as essential that **teachers should not wait until they have an LGB student in their class to express the rejection of the educational centre as such to LGBT-phobic intolerance displays or to start discussing the respect of sexual-affective diversity in the subject they teach.**
Figure 27. Relation between the perception of protection provided by teachers and coming-out of LGB students.

**Coming out of the closet and family LGBT-phobia**

Does the rejection by families of LGB students have an impact on how they freely experience their sexual-affective orientation outside of the family environment? We face here too a complicated reality since the family rejection is by far not the only factor which may have an impact on the choice of an LGB student to become visible in his school environment; trends are not proportional to a higher degree of family rejection towards sexual-affective diversity. We may however clearly notice [Figure 28] how the percentage of LGB students who would not come of the closet is higher in the case of those facing some degree of rejection by their families; the higher the degree of rejection by the families, the higher the refusal of visibility. Also students who perceived a higher degree of rejection by their families are the ones who will come out to their fellow students (15.22%) but the students facing some degree of refusal are also the largest group considering leaving the closet (30.34%).

This seems to show that a high level of family rejection will push the LGB students to strongly repress their own visibility in the school environment but also generates a strong desire for visibility (probably thereby trying to find the possibility for their identity to be reinforced and acknowledged) which does not take place (most certainly due to the consequences he/she might be facing if such visibility would also reach the family environment). Such perception is reinforced when we consider the percentage of students facing a lesser degree of family rejection (which is nevertheless still high) (option I agree somewhat). In this case, where the percentage of students who would not come of the closet reduces and the one of those showing some doubts about it increases (24.04%). In other words perceiving a high degree of family rejection but whose consequences are not be as extreme allow theses students to break a mental barrier generated by fear among the fellow students whose family would totally reject them and become visible as LGB in their educational environment in order to find the assurance and recognition they won't find in their own families.

The higher the degree of family acceptance (option rather agree) and probably with a lesser degree of longing for recognition and acceptance, the higher the level of doubts on the issue and the more moderate the percentages of coming out at school become (17.14%). But they will still be somewhat higher than the ones recorded among students facing absolute rejection.
So, assuming that a student becoming openly visible as LGB at school does not face other difficulties outside of the school is a mistake; this is why the school must do all it can in order to ensure the well-being of the LGBT under-aged in all aspects of their lives. Communication and training of the families must be conceived as a basic need to mitigate the suffering of the LGBT students.

Finally one of the highest percentages of students becoming visible at school (21.62%) comes from LGB students who do not perceive rejection of affective-sexual diversity by their families. However, although the refusal to come out of the closet at school and the percentage who shows doubts reduce, we also find a significant percentage of students considering coming out but who haven't (35.14). In this case we can not blame the fear of consequences at a family level so we must consider the tolerant attitude perceived in their families together with some other factors already mentioned. The result of this is that they do not find the right moment to come out safely.

![Figure 28](image-url) Coming-out of LGBT students in their school environment depending on the degree of family acceptance of the sexual-affective orientation.

### 3.4.5 Coming out of the closet and assumed homophobia

The daily presence of LGB students in environments where LGBT-phobia is a widespread and accepted rule has a direct impact on these students assuming LGBT-phobic prejudices and hate ideologies. Such an assumption of prejudices against their own identity and orientation has a deleterious impact on the student's self-perception (Pichardo, 2006). We can see in Annex II how the LGBT student, to a certain degree and depending on his/her precise orientation, assumes and a number of prejudices against his/her own affective-sexual identity.

We may appreciate higher levels of recognition and positive perception, as well as lower levels of assumed LGBT-phobia, among students having come out of the closet. These students have cross-examined their own prejudices in an act of self-assertion and empowerment which may be parallel to or be a consequence of their public presentation as LGBs.

Among the different stances of LGB students who do not come of the closet (considering coming out but not having done so, show doubts on the issue or having decided not to become visible) the percentage of students agreeing with the more LGBT-phobic options varies according to the
prejudice considered. In the case of the Figure 29 [Figure 29] degree of agreement with the items on the unfounded dislike caused by the vision of two men or two women kissing and in the case of the amount of agreement on the prejudice relating effeminacy in men or masculinity in women with homosexuality (see glossary), we may appreciate decreasing trends: from students deciding not to leave the closet, those showing doubts and those considering coming out but who have not done it yet and those having already come out of the closet. [¡Error! No se encuentra el origen de la referencia. a, b and f]. This shows that the more determined the student is to hide his/her sexual-affective orientation, the higher the likelihood that he/she will feel rejection and disgust to any display of homoerotism or sexual practice among individuals of the same sex. This includes his/her own sexuality and therefore difficulties to express affectivity towards the people he/she feels a physical/affective attraction for. Also social prejudices relating homo- and bisexuality and the trasgressing of the traditional gender roles appear as one of the fears which may have an impact on homosexual or bisexual students when they want to become visible as such (they do not want to be seen as effeminate men or masculine women).

The percentage of LGB students who believe that LGB people are not capable of being good parents is also higher among those not having come out of the closet (no great differences among the groups considered) [¡Error! No se encuentra el origen de la referencia.d]. In short for certain LGB students the self-assertion implicit in showing themselves as homo- or bisexual contributes to generate a competent and positive perception of him/herself as a part of a homoparental family.

We must also stress that some LGB students consider they should not have the same rights as their heterosexual fellow students [¡Error! No se encuentra el origen de la referencia.c]. This percentage is higher among those who believe they might come out to their fellow students but do not come out to the ones who have decided to stay in. This shows how harmful the assumed LGBT-phobia is, since students who might be living freely with their sexual-affective orientation are not doing it; not only out of fear of the reactions they might have to face but also because they consider that to some extent they do not deserve the same rights as the others. They are convinced that it is only fair that they deny themselves the chance to live their orientation freely.

So the tangible LGBT-phobia of education centres does not only have an extrinsic and coercive effect on the LGB students but is a risk factor putting their own psychological integrity (as in self-esteem, self-concept, more likelihood of certain psychopathologies related with the minorities stress, such as depression, anxiety, suicidal ideas to name a few) and their psychological-affective development in jeopardy (COGAM-FELGTB, 2012; Baiocco, 2014; Goldbach and Gibbs 2015).
Figure 29. A) I do not like seeing two boys kissing. B) I do not like seeing two girls kissing. C) Having the same rights. D) Be good parents. E) Homosexuals and Bisexuals might be heterosexuals if they’d really try. F) All effeminate boys/masculine girls are homosexuals.
4. Individual basis sustaining the LGBT-phobic behaviour.

4.1 Individual behaviour of the students when facing discrimination towards LGBT fellow students.

51% of the students do not act against LGBT-phobic bullying [Figure 30]: 33% of students state they object to a fellow student being molested because of being or “looking” homosexual or bisexual but will not react. 16,5% state they do not know how they would react (this percentage might conceal students laughing when an aggression takes place but who do not join in, as shown in our study in 2013) and almost 2% of the students who took part in this study states openly that they join the aggression. Such percentages are similar to the ones obtained in 2013 (COGAM 2013, page 21); this figure shows that the change of attitudes of the students on the perception of equality [Figure 4] is little less than cosmetic.

The fact that 2 out of 100 students openly acknowledge they take part in this kind of situations is a subject of serious concern. In the Figure 26 of the preceding item we may appreciate that the more violent the situation perceived by the students, the greater the urge to take sides in favour or against abuse. Violence and LGBT-phobic bullying are a social phenomenon which eventually involves the entire classroom. This is not about a conflict among equals or among a few students, but a situation of injustice and violation of rights in which all students take part in one way or another.

As mentioned already, in the case of verbal aggression, the theoretical response of the students differs with the way they actually respond in real life [Figure 26]: when facing the need to act against a verbal aggression, the percentage of those who theoretically would defend the victim and the percentage of those showing doubts decrease; these students will then either not react (although they do not like what’s taking place) or, to a lesser extent, participate in the bullying (1,36%). The fear of being stigmatized (see glossary) is probably one of the reasons which might have an impact on this careless and anti-social behaviour of more than 50% of the students.

When the situation becomes more violent and the physical integrity of the students is at risk, the percentage of students who are obliged to take sides in the conflict is high, while doubt or non-acting stances reduce. In addition, the number of those trying to defend the fellow student
increase but also the amount of those joining in the bullying action. This last group may be as much as... 10%! of the replies of students perceiving LGBT-phobic verbal and physical aggression in their educational environment (quite far from the 0,35% of the students who would harass fellow students for being or “looking” LGBT but who will reply purely theoretically since they have never been involved in such situations. In such a case of double aggression (physical aggression seldom takes place without the verbal one (see 8)) the percentage of defendants also reduces when compared to those who defend when the physical aggression takes place without the verbal one; the percentage of those who do not dare to act although they do not agree with what is going on increases.

As already proven in 2013 (COGAM, 2013, page 37) and in this study [Figure 31], the LGB students are also part of this trend. When witnessing aggression to their LGB fellow students, the hypotetical percentage of those who would defend them reduces and they tend towards more passive or doubtful positions. In a case of extreme violence LGB students, probably out of fear of being victim of aggression themselves, feel obliged to take active part in the aggression towards a fellow student with whom they share the orientation. We should also notice that among the LGB students the percentage of defendants is higher than the one recorded for the whole sample; this shows the need of encouraging emotional development (understanding, empathy...) among the students if we want a pro-social civic behaviour.

The gradual increase of violent attitudes of the students as they perceive a higher degree of LGBT-phobia in their education surrounding shows how easily the hate discourse and the rejection of diversity take roots in our classrooms. An early intervention in favour of education in respecting sexual-affective diversity and providing students with tools to cut short intolerance from their peer group are key elements in putting an end to violence in school (UNESCO, 2011; UNESCO, 2012).

If we consider the students selecting a different option than defending a fellow student from aggression [Figure 32] by grade, the high percentage of students in PCPI/FPB who choose not to defend a fellow student when they pick on him because he/she is or “looks” LGBT, more than 61% is quite remarkable when compared with students in high schools, where the percentage is around 38% and the average of all students slightly above 51%.
Although 1st grade of ESO shows a lower percentage than the other grades in Secondary Education and a slight upward trend in 3rd Grade of ESO, these data allow us to conclude that age and educational level and/or school failure have a significant impact on the behaviour of each student when facing situations of discrimination towards LGBT fellow students, since those in high schools selecting an option other than defending the aggressed fellow student drops significantly when compared to average, while in PCPI/FPB it will increase by more than 10%.

“Students of PCPI (Programas de Cualificación Profesional Inicial [Programmes for Initial Professional Qualification]) can not promote to 3rd Grade [of Secondary Education] and have already repeated the cycle once. They are the very symbol of school failure and show a higher degree of homophobia and victimisation. Segregation by school curriculum is negative; LGBT students in this environment will suffer more” (COGAM, 2013, page 24).

We must underline than 3.41% of bulliers have suffered verbal aggression, a percentage raising to 3.91% among the students who state they defend the victim [Figure 33]. Small as the difference may be, the difference of percentages of victims among those students who do not act to solve/worsen is remarkable for it shows that students defending the victims of bullying also expose themselves to a higher extent to the risk of becoming victims; it also shows than one of the reasons for some to become aggressors might be they have suffered aggression themselves and the episode was not solved in a positive way (the prey turns into the hunter).

However, only 0.61% of those taking part in the aggression state having been victims of LGBT-phobic violence while students who defend others suffering LGBT-phobic discrimination episodes are actually those suffering more physical violence: 13.10%! We appreciate again that students who does not remain passive when witnessing physical aggression are also more likely to suffer it.
“Most of my friends were LGBT and they picked on them and even beat them. I have defended them and have beaten to defend them. They are my friends and we all are people, regardless of their orientation. (Heterosexual Girl 3rd Grade ESO)”

Figure 33. Percentage of victims among the different patterns of action of the students when facing situations of intolerance.

4.2 Percept of LGBT-phobia and behaviour of the students.

The results shown so far about the perception of LGBT-phobia in the educational environment may be influenced by the degree of respect of the students towards sexual-affective orientation and gender identities diversity.

When asked whether they would come out of the closet if they were gays, lesbians or bisexuals, the percentage of students who would deny it more vehemently is to be found among bullies (53,95% to 26,44% and 42,45% of defendants and witnesses disliking the situation) [Figure 34]. The higher percentage of students showing less doubts and tend less to refuse downright the idea of leaving the closet are the defendants (from 80% of the majority to an still high 60%); that means those students acting in accordance with an autonomous and tolerant morale are the ones defending their own right and the right of their fellow students to experience an education which will not exclude sexual-affective and gender identities diversity, an education ensuring their full development in a free, safe and equalitarian socio-educational environment.

Figure 34. Students who think they would not leave the closet at their school if they were LGB or who have doubts about it.
Transphobia (see glossary) as an intolerant attitude is another of the facts related to the behaviour of the students. The group of bullies is the one showing a higher percentage of disagreement towards the acceptance of a transsexual fellow student in the classroom; it is as high as 90% among them and we also find really high percentages of those tending towards the most intolerant options (e.g. “do not agree at all” of these students against a maximum of 12.73% among the rest. [Figure 35]). The most active group defending those harassed for being or “looking” LGBT shows again a more positive attitude about the acceptance of potential transsexuals in their classroom and also the lowest percentage of disagreement, around 60%. We must also stress the high rate of transphobia perceived by students stating to remain passive towards aggression or showing doubts about how to react.

![Figure 35](image-url) Students who to some extent disagree with the acceptance a transsexual fellow student might have in their classroom.

To conclude, it should be stressed that the influence of the behaviour on the questions about the way the students being or “looking” LGBT are treated at high school: almost 60% of the students taking part in the bullying believe there is discrimination, compared to 30% of defendants or 39% who do not like it but won’t react [Figure 36].

By comparison with our 2013 study, (COGAM, 2013, page 19), the percentage of students who believe LGBT students are being discriminated at high school increases among those contributing to the bullying: the very bullies and the passive witnesses. In the first case, 10% more and in the second, an extra 6.5%.

The defending students are those who perceive a higher degree of equality at their education centre. It should also be stressed that although the percentage of students who think those being or “looking” LGBT are being better treated is the lowest in all cases, among the bullies there are twice as many people who think they do indeed get a better treatment; but, as we already showed in preceding items, such better treatment of LGBT students is not real.
The data shown allows us to say that students with LGBT-phobic behaviour, backed by the passivity and approval of the vast majority of their fellow students and the lack of a sufficient active intervention of teachers and the centre play a main role in the configuration of a hostile educational environment for the LGBT students. An environment where biased attitudes, hate, and discrimination, intolerant, violent, anti-social patterns appear as legitimate to an educational community who does not share them but whose lenient permissiveness harms LGBT students as much as the students acting this way, mostly out of ignorance and the lack of an adequate education respecting diversity, as we will show later.

4.3 Stereotypes and prejudices as a basis for the LGBT-phobic behaviour of the students.

4.3.1 Acknowledging sexual-affective orientations and non-normative gender identities.

Almost 60% of the students surveyed express their total disagreement with the idea that homosexuals and heterosexuals might become heterosexuals if they'd really try [Figure 37]. The rest, 40% believe that sexual orientation may be to a certain degree modified by trying hard enough. This graphic shows thus how dangerous prejudices are, already present in the letters of Apostle Paul in the New Testament, who consider homosexuality as a personal (sinful) choice, still present. Such prejudices were later transformed by psychiatry in the 19th century into a sexual psychopathology which could be cured \(^9\) (Ugarte, 2004; Platero, 2014), and this form of

---

\(^9\) “Errores de la ciencia” (Mistakes of science): Neither homosexuality nor bisexuality can be healed because they are NOT diseases. As the medical institutions have acknowledged by retracting the positions sustained in the past, they can not be modified by trying: the American Psychiatric Association withdrew homosexuality from their Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders Handbook (DSM) in 1973. In 1975 the American Psychological Association published an official reaction about this last move of the APA, declaring they endorsed it. Finally in 1990 the World Health Organisation (Spain being member thereof) excluded homosexuality from the International Classification of diseases (ICD). The American Psychiatric Association (who has made public statements to this respect in several occasions in the years 2000, 2011 and 2013) and the American Psychologic Association (APA, 1997, 2009 and 2010) both condemn any therapy aimed at curing/converting/repairing or changing the sexual-affective orientation given the lack of any scientific evidence whatsoever of their efficiency while there is indeed evidence of the serious side effects they may originate.
prejudice is still deeply rooted among youngsters. If we compare these results with those of
2013 for the same question (COGAM, 2013, page 15) we may appreciate that, although it does
remain high, the percentage of students who believe that sexual-affective orientation may be
modified, at least to a certain degree, has diminished (from 54.14% to 40.35%).

If we consider the results grade by grade [Figure 38], we may notice a sustained increase from
1st to 4th grades of ESO (from 35.64% to 72.13%) of the students who do not agree at all with
such assert, a fact we already recorded in 2013 but with percentages between 10 and 17%
lower than the current ones (COGA, 2013, page 15). This shows a positive, yet still insufficient,
trend parallel to the process of gaining maturity throughout their secondary education grades.
When we consider the figures of PCPI and FPB, the percentage of those denying that
homosexuals and bisexuals might become heterosexuals if they’d really try (52.70%) is below
average.

These results show there has been an improvement of the acceptance and acknowledgement of
non-normative sexual-affective orientations as “valid” ones; but still, two fifths of the students
share this prejudice. And this does entail risks.

COGAM provides free legal and psychological counselling to those people who may be or have been
victims of such bad practice. (By appointment. Telephone number +34 915 230 070).
The acknowledgement of the fact that homosexuality and by extension, bisexuality are not diseases meant a conceptual change in the social positioning when facing sexual-affective diversity. However, the stigma of pathologisation of homosexuality still lasts and it is even defended by some individuals of the clinic sector, who have renamed it this time “gender identity disorders” As much as it was the case with the non-heteronormative sexual-affective orientation (see glossary) these individuals will consider the diversity of gender identities as a set of deviations from a range of alleged normalities established by socio-cultural and cisnormative criteria (see glossary). However, the voices against pathologizing homosexuality are starting to be heard among the professionals accompanying trans* people (see glossary); progressively the diagnosis handbooks seem to echo them while showing less mainstream positions on the issue of gender identities diversity. It is highly likely that, given the recent and overwhelming evidence that social transphobia and not transsexuality per se (see glossary) is the factor responsible for the uneasiness about the gender-sex assigned (see glossary), in the years to come the scientific community will again acknowledge their mistake. Fortunately, we can also find professionals in the educational as well as in the health sectors who protect and accompany under age trans* without marking them with the stigma of mental disorder or disease (APA, 2011; Platero, 2014).

This, along with the (alas, not always positive) visibility and interest of the media which transsexuality has been experiencing in the last decade, seems to have a reflection on the attitude of students towards gender diversity (see glossary) since 90,79% of all students asked consider transsexuality not to be a disease [Figure 39a]. If we consider the results by grade we will realize that there is little variation [Figure 39b], although the percentage of students in PCPI and FPB supporting this idea is smaller (76,19%). If we compare these figures with the ones obtained in the school year 2012-2013(COGAM, 2013, page, 24), we may say that the percentage of students having stopped to consider transsexuality as a disease has increased by ten points. It thereby seems that significant advances have been made in the depathologisation of transsexuality among youngsters and, in the case of non-heteronormative sexual-affective orientations, the acknowledgement of non-cisnormative gender identities has improved.

10 Let’s remember that the association of the sexual-affective orientation and the gender identity is a part of a binarist monosexual model of gender and sexuality, which was reinforced in the transition of homosexuality as a model, which the Church had to avoid, prevent and repress, later on, a crime to be punished by the state, until its approach as a disease to be treated by medical science in the 19th century (Guasch, 1993; Gatti, 2015). This will be the point where every anatomy, sexual practice, affective and/or sexual orientation or gender expression not matching the binarist cisnormative system (see glossary) started to be considered as a symptom of some kind of disorder of the development, mental disease or degeneration placed under the umbrella-word “homosexuality”. This only reinforced, quite logically, the confusion between gender identity and affective-sexual orientation (Ugarte, 2004; Platero, 2014).
The differences in percentages between the degree of acknowledgement of non-heteronormative sexual-affective orientations [Figure 37] and the non-pathologisation of transsexuality [Figure 39] should simply be considered as the mere fact that transsexuality is more accepted among students than homosexuality or bisexuality. It is highly likely that, had the item been formulated as a possibility of changing towards cisexuality and not towards pathologisation, the percentage of acceptance of transsexuality as an option just as valid as homosexuality would have dropped significantly.

4.3.2 Tolerance towards the LGBT community

According to the declaration of principles on tolerance of the UNESCO (1995), “Tolerance is respect, acceptance and appreciation of the rich diversity of our world’s cultures, our forms of expression and ways of being human.” So mere respect (as in compliance or permissiveness) is not enough to allow us to say that among our students there is indeed tolerance towards sexual-affective and gender identities diversity.

The acknowledgement and understanding of rights equality as moral value demands that the students first go through a process of emotional and cognitive development leading to this virtue: tolerance.

When asked to assess the statement: “LGBT people must have the same rights as heterosexual people” [Figure 40a], **14,85% of the students believe to some extent that LGBT people should not have the same rights as heterosexual people**, a percentage which is almost identical to that two years ago. Although the percentage of students who totally agree (85,15%) is almost identical to the one of 2013, and the same happens with the ones who do not agree at all with such a statement (2,88% in 2015 against 2,68% in 2013) the reduction of the intermediate less homophobic responses (“I rather agree”) is rather worrying because there seems to be a certain increase of the students showing doubts about LGB people deserving the same rights (“I somewhat agree”) (COGAM, 2013, pages 21 and 22).
If we consider the detail by grades the percentage of students who think that LGBT people deserve the same rights [Figure 40b] increases along with the age of the students (from 79.12% in 1st Degree of ESO to almost 90% among students in 4th Degree and high school diploma). The proportion of students who somewhat disagree decreases from 1st to 4th degree of ESO and high school diploma (from 20.88% to 11.53% and 12.37%). The students in PCPI and FPB are the ones who believe less that rights should be equal for all (67.19%). These results show that the conscience of rights equality grows stronger along with grade, age and maturity of the students. However, students in PCPI and FPB, probably due to their condition of victims as the exclusion of the educational system, show less respect towards rights equality since they believe that they are also not being treated equally.

![Figure 40. Agreement of the students with the assertion "LGBT people must have the same rights as heterosexuals". A) Total sample. B) Detail by grade.]

If we compare the group of students who somewhat disagree in 2013 with the same in 2015 [Figure 41] we may appreciate that the generation of the 1st and 2nd grades of ESO in the school year 2012-2013 (the same generation in 3rd and 4th in 2015) has experienced a decrease of the degree of homophobia they had when they entered the Secondary Education. Nevertheless the 3rd grade students show a degree of homophobia a bit higher than it should considering the data available from preceding generations. Comparing the degree of homophobia of the students of 1st and 2nd degree of ESO and PCPI in 2015 and 2013, it is actually higher now. This seems to show that although homophobia tends to decrease in parallel with their passage through the educational system, it is actually increasing in the new generations. The idea of equal rights does not become a reality and even seems to be deteriorating. This denial of rights shown by a large group of youngsters might actually be related with the increase of hate crimes based on the sexual orientation or sexual identity (452 crimes in 2013 against 513 in 2014, this being the main hate crime in Spain (Ministerio de Interior [Ministry of Home Affairs], 2014) (see Annex I and Conclusions).

Considering the results, the percentage of students who do not deny equal rights to their LGBT fellow students is even higher than the one of students considering that homosexual or bisexual orientation may be changed by trying hard enough. In other words, we are facing a false tolerance: a certain part of the students acknowledges or shows tolerance about the idea of equal rights they get from the community but actually does not really acknowledge, accept and value the diversity of sexual-affective orientations and gender identities other than
**heterosexuality and cisexuality.** To quote the motto of the Madrid Pride 2015: “We lack real equality” COGAM Education Group workshops, and other measures thereof aimed at raising awareness and provide an elementary education in respecting diversity have proven to be useful in reducing prejudices and increasing the knowledge of the students, but they are insufficient if we aim at obtaining a change of attitudes of the students. We must once again insist and encourage the whole educational community (students, teachers, parents, mass media, government, institutions of any level, etc.) to take part in this process. Without permanent cooperation of all, hate and intolerance might find their way into our schools once again.

Figure 41. Agreement of the students with the assertion "LGBT people must have the same rights as heterosexuals". Comparison 2013-2015 detailed by grades.

Before we conclude this section, we want to stress the fact that **intolerant opinions or attitudes are directly related with a violent behaviour of the students:** 62,79% of the bullies show at least some degree of disagreement with the idea that LGBT people should have the same rights as heterosexuals, the negative views (“do not agree at all” and “I somewhat agree”) being alarmingly high among them. On the other hand, 91,07 of the students defending their fellow students against aggression totally agree with LGBT and heterosexuals having the same rights. This shows a clear parallelism between intolerant attitudes and the behaviour of the students [Figure 42]. Such parallelism was already established in 2013 and we now provide again evidence of the urgent need of educating in coexistence and tolerance (COGAM, 2013, page 22).
4.3.3 Prejudices, sexism and LGB-phobic violence.

78,57% of the students in this sample stating they are bullies are men and heterosexual [Figure 44]. Heterosexual women (9,52% of representation among bullies) are in second place while 11,91% of the students taking part in bullying state they are LGB or do not state what their orientation is. As seen before, the participation of LGB students appears when LGBT-phobia-based situations are extreme, probably in order to avoid being victims thereof [Figure 31]. As we will show further on, the fact that most of bullies are heterosexual and men is closely related with the heteropatriarchal system overwhelmingly present in our society and the violence it entails.
In this edition of “LGBT-phobia in the classrooms. Are we educating in sexual-affective diversity?” we have centred the focus on the influence sexism has on the cognitive and behavioural LGBT-phobia of the students. That is why, as shown in Figure 45, we have reformulated the item of 2013 in which we asked the students whether they felt displeasure (social disgust) when watching individuals of the same sex kissing to show their affection.

### Lacks of the affective education

As shown in [Figure 45], 64.42% of the students surveyed do not feel annoyed when they see two guys kissing. The groups of 2nd grade of ESO (60.42%) and PCPI/FPB (48.42%) [Figure 46a] are the only ones whose acceptance is below average; a striking 22.63% of PCPI/FPB students reject such an idea completely. The higher the degree, the lower the percentage of students feeling annoyed when seeing two guys kissing, from 2nd degree of ESO to high school diploma (9.78% to 6.74%); the proportion of those who do not consider it disgusting increases progressively from 2nd degree of ESO to high school diploma (60.42 to 69.43%).

Something similar happens with displays of affection between girls, although the degrees of rejection are lower [Figure 45]; between 2nd Degree of ESO and High School Diploma the acceptance increases progressively (from 66.69% to 80.83%) [Figure 46b]. The degree of acceptance among PCPI/FPB students is remarkably lower than among other students (only 62.30% approve totally). In spite of such trends, nowadays still 30% of the students show some
degree of rejection when confronted with displays of homosexual affection; this means that a high percentage of the students react with rejection and/or violence to certain displays of love or affection; this shows that there is still quite a lot of room for improvement in affective education issues, in the schools as well as in the social and family environment.

Figure 46. Replies of the students to: A) “I feel displeased when I see two guys kissing” B) “I feel displeased when I see two girls kissing”. Detail by grade.

Compared with the 2013 study [Figure 45], when 39.36% of the people surveyed acknowledged some degree of rejection when confronted with displays of affection between people of the same sex (COGAM, 2013, page 22), current results show that 27.75% (when it's about two girls) and 35.58% (when it's about two boys) of the people surveyed experience a certain degree of rejection. This means, after two years we can appreciate a reduction of the degree of rejection to two boys or two girls kissing. Nevertheless, the percentage of those experiencing disgust against displays of affection is still high.

Sexism and sexual objectification of women

The fact that displays of affection between girls are better accepted than those displays between gays [Figure 45], (72.75% and 64.42% in that order) might show that the education some of the students have received might contain relevant amounts of binary stereotypes of gender of the heteropatriarchal system (section 4.4 will discuss more in depth in relation with the cognitive LGBT-phobia of the students).

So, displays of affection between women, which “must be sensitive and affectionate”, are considered less punishable than those taking place between men, “who should be strong and not betray their feelings” (Bonino, 1998; Bonino, 2004). This is not only clear evidence of the persistence of the gender binary roles among the students (see glossary) but it can also be explained through the theory of the sexual objectification (SO) of the women, a theory which is very closely related to the environments where the gender binary roles predominate (see glossary), which are an integrating part of the heteropatriarchal system (see glossary) and according to which: women are objectified and treated as objects and therefore valued according to the use others will make of them. We may talk of SO when a woman’s body, or parts
of it, are separated from her as a person and she is considered, essentially, as an object of masculine sexual desire (Bartky, 1990; Szymanski et al., 2011).

In order to understand this macho phenomenology better and make the link with the behavioural LGBT-phobia of the students, let’s see what happens with their opinion if we analyse it according to their behaviour when confronted with LGBT-phobia situations in their educational centre [Figure 48]. First of all, we should stress the fact that among the students defending victims of LGBT-phobic violence the percentage of those not feeling any disgust when witnessing a display of homosexual affection is close to 80%. These students show a slight positive bias when it’s two women kissing, which suggest a certain degree of acceptance of the gender binary roles.

If we analyse the categories of the passive witnesses and those who say they would not know how to act (probably the same ones of the category “if-it-is-jokes-or-pranks-I-also-laugh” of our 2013 study, the values of the responses showing some degree of disgust raise significantly (while the most homophobe options come from students stating not to know how to react). Besides, the macho bias we could detect among the defendants increases remarkably; there is a difference of more than 10% for the highest disgust for the item of boys kissing compared to girls kissing.

Finally such macho bias becomes quite extreme among students acknowledging they are bullies. Here, the percentage of those expressing some degree of rejection towards two boys kissing is 84%, compared to 48,84 if it’s two girls kissing. Within this group we find an striking percentage of students declaring absolute rejection about two boys (51,14%) compared to two girls (17,44%); only the percentage of students totally rejecting two boys kissing is higher than all showing some disgust if it is two girls. Nevertheless, the percentage of those showing some disgust towards two girls kissing is also higher among this group.

In conclusion, we have proven so far how from the less prejudiced students and a less LGBT-phobic behaviour to those with highly LGBT-phobic behaviour and attitude we establish a progressive increase of social disgust and rejection towards homosexual displays of affection. Along with this rejection of the homosexual sexual-affective practice, we find a bias according to the gender of the participants. So, women showing affection towards other women seem to receive a lesser degree of disapproval than men who dare to kiss other men. This matches perfectly with the assumption among teenagers of gender binarist roles inherent to the heteropatriarchal system. In these roles, affection is restricted to the feminine universe and the woman is expected to provide care and love to everyone around her, regardless of their gender. This is not the case with men, who should only receive love because, should they provide it, they would clearly show their weakness, antithesis of vigour (strength or violence) which is the banner of masculinity according to such a values system. This is why a heterosexual guy aggressing a homosexual one serves to confirm socially the masculinity of the first one, since not only he will punish his homosexuality but also his femininity because showing affection
towards men is not like men\textsuperscript{11} but like women. It is just one of the many forms of the macho violence: “I punish you because you denigrate masculinity by acting like a woman” or, to quote some students, “despising gays makes you more macho” (FELGTB, 2009).

This is also proven by the **co-relation of the LGBT-phobic behaviour with the rejection of effeminate boys/masculine women**: 74.61% of the students acknowledging to be aggressors state that the agree to a certain degree with the idea that all effeminate men/masculine women are homosexuals [Figure 47], a result almost identical to the one obtained two years ago (75.42%; (COGAM, 2013, page 46). On the contrary, 77.59% of students who do not agree at all with such an assert defend their fellow students when they are aggressed; this value is higher than the one obtained two years ago (60.46%) (COGAM, 2013, page 46).

\[\text{So many times at school they have made homophobic gestures at me just because I was with the girls.}
\]
\[\text{This is why (if I were gay) I would never leave the closet and expose myself to my fellow students.}
\]
\[\text{(Boy, does not know. 4\textsuperscript{th} ESO)}\]

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{figure47.png}
\caption{Agreement of the students with the assertion “All effeminate boys/masculine girls are homosexuals.”
\textit{Detail by action profile when facing LGBT-phobia situations in their education centre.}}
\end{figure}

Once we have reached this point we might ask whether, in this case, gender binary roles might serve as a protective shield for lesbian and bisexual girls who, although they trespass the gender limits when they experience a sexual or affective attraction towards other women and be aggressed for that reason, but do not completely breach the canons of masculinity-femininity; this might reduce the aggression.

\[\text{11 This negative vision of affection between men appeared in the 18\textsuperscript{th} Century with the definition of masculinity as we perceive it nowadays. Until then, the effeminization of a male was viewed as a sign of refinement among women at the time. We must bear in mind that it was only in the 19\textsuperscript{th} Century that the idea appeared that homosexual practices were exclusive to a certain group of individuals who received a certain identity since any might practice them. It’s only then that the word “homosexual” became a noun applicable to a group of individuals (Gatti, 2015).}\]
To this respect it is worth explaining that this study has considered only aggressions of a physical and a verbal nature. Although in a lower percentage than men, women who are not heterosexual also suffer this kind of aggression and, as discussed previously, the systems reinforcing the power of masculinity by means of violence towards women and their sexual objectification seem to have a key role in the origin of this kind of aggression.

A number of studies have also proven that there are groups of women facing a higher risk of being sexually objectified, among them lesbian and bisexual women facing heterosexist (see glossary) SO-biased experiences. It is also lesbian and bisexual women who report being victims of a higher amount of sexual aggression from grown-up men (Szymanski, 2011). Thus, although lesbian and bisexual girls only suffer physical aggression or insult in a lesser proportion than gay and bisexual boys, they may be exposed to a kind of violence their male counterparts are not victims of: heterosexist sexual bullying.

Next Figure [Figure 49] seems to prove it; while the percentage of students taking sides in favour of a higher rejection of masculine homosexuality (and thereby of a lower rejection of the feminine one) is much higher among heterosexual boys stating they take part in bullying towards LGBT than among those declaring to be bullies but do not feel sexually attracted towards women; the percentage of those stating they feel an equal degree of disgust be it two boys or two girls reduces among the first group. The study made by the FELGTB in 2009 produced direct evidence on this when it showed that 30.9% of the heterosexual high school diploma students would try to flirt with a female fellow student should she become visible as lesbian. It did quote comments such as “seeing dykes getting laid turns me on”. It also showed the lack of training of the teachers to react against this kind of macho abused towards homosexual and bisexual female students.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Defendant</th>
<th>Passive witness who disagrees</th>
<th>DNK</th>
<th>Bully</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>A</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I do not agree at all</td>
<td>78,66%</td>
<td>15,78%</td>
<td>51,62%</td>
<td>15,91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I somewhat agree</td>
<td>27,30%</td>
<td>25,52%</td>
<td>17,05%</td>
<td>51,14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I rather agree</td>
<td>13,94%</td>
<td>14,70%</td>
<td>10,70%</td>
<td>51,14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I totally agree</td>
<td>5,97%</td>
<td>3,93%</td>
<td>3,50%</td>
<td>10,70%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>B</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I do not agree at all</td>
<td>81,97%</td>
<td>63,66%</td>
<td>65,92%</td>
<td>12,79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I somewhat agree</td>
<td>17,44%</td>
<td>24,41%</td>
<td>20,82%</td>
<td>16,60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I rather agree</td>
<td>12,35%</td>
<td>6,19%</td>
<td>6,70%</td>
<td>17,44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I totally agree</td>
<td>2,94%</td>
<td>2,45%</td>
<td>13,84%</td>
<td>27,90%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 48. Replies of the students to: A) “I feel displeased when I see two guys kissing” B) “I feel displeased when I see two girls kissing”. Detail by behaviour when facing LGBT-phobic situations.
Another form of violence lesbian and bisexual girls are exposed to as a direct consequence of the gender binary roles and also part of the catalogue of heterosexist arguments leading to their objectification is their invisibilisation (Gimeno, 2003), that is, the lack of acknowledgement or social recognition of their affective and/or sexual relation and their underestimation when compared with the relationship they might have with a man. The reason for this is twofold: on the one hand showing affection is exclusively related with femininity, which means that any display of affection between two women is not considered a display of love but the mere natural expression of their friendship or, at least a “display of deep friendship”; on the other, the phallus-centred prejudice according to which any sexual practice without, at least, a real phallus (or at least an instrument playing that role) is not a complete sexual practice. (Richardson, 2000). This is probably why 7.58% of the heterosexual guys feel more disgusted at two girls kissing than at two boys.

All these facts show the tight link between sexism and the behavioural LGBT-phobia of the students, and both are also directly related with the violent behaviour towards sexual-affective diversity.

4.3.4 Prejudices and transphobia

As far as transphobia is concerned, prejudices do play an important role in the motives of the aggressors: 58.14% of them considers that, at least to a certain degree, transsexuality is a disease [Figure 50]. On the contrary, 95.14% of the defendants totally disagree with such an assert. Aggressors seem to believe they have legitimate reasons to aggress individuals they consider being sick, which shows the link between social fear to individuals considered mentally sick and their social stigma. Compared to 2013 (COGAM, 2013, page 22), aggressors are still the ones more likely to consider transsexuality as a disease. Nevertheless some progress seems to have been made in the depathologisation of transsexuality among youngsters. Nevertheless there is still room for improvement in the normalisation and respect of non-cisnormative gender identities, as shown by the high number of violent attacks against trans* people where the sexual identity is a most usual and widespread discrimination factor (Ministerio de Interior [Ministry of Home Affairs], 2014).
“Nowadays I feel I am a woman but I don’t know what I will feel like in the future... I think it would shame me so much more and I would never tell”. Girl, not defined, 3rd grade ESO)

The relationship between pathologisation and social stigma becomes even more evident when we consider the prevalence of such an idea among the students compared with their opinion about the acceptance of a transsexual person in their own classroom [Figure 51]. We may thus identify how, as the rejection of a trans* person in the classroom increases, so does the perception of such as a sick individual. So, although the levels of pathologisation of transsexual people are low among youngsters [Figure 39], we may determine how intimately linked they are with the discrimination and exclusion of trans* individuals in their educational environment.

Figure 51. Students considering that transsexuality is a disease according with their agreement/disagreement with the assertion: a transsexual fellow student would be accepted by the rest of the students in the classroom".
4.3.5 Tolerance to non heteronormative family models. Prejudices and family discrimination.

The unfounded\textsuperscript{12} fears about the suitability of people not meeting the hetero- and cisnormative canons for caring of and raising their children or those under their custody are also part of the list of prejudices still to be found among the collective outlook of the Secondary Education students. Such fears are reinforced through the hegemony of a heterocisnormative ideological system imposing monosexuality as the only valid model of sex, gender and sexuality in order to maintain a certain social and economic structure which fails to represent the reality and needs of all the population (Platero, 2014; Richardson, 2000; Guasch, 2002). informal conversations at the centers. Had we been able to conduct this survey in schools with different type of owners and confessions, the degree of acceptance of family diversity would probably not have been so high.

Figure 52, shows that 77,75\% of the students consider that homosexuals and bisexuals can be good parents, a percentage which drops to 71,82\% when asked about the suitability of transsexual people as parents. Prejudices about the ability to raise a child seem to be higher against transsexuals than against homosexuals and bisexuals. Although the acceptance of family diversity is still insufficient, when compared to 2013 total support to homo parental families has increased slightly (from 73,53\% to 77,75\%).

When considering the detail by grades [Figure 53], we appreciate that support to LGBT-families increases along with grades and, accordingly, with the age and maturity of the students, from 73,61\% in 2\textsuperscript{nd} grade of ESO to 81,38\% in high school diploma. Again, students in PCPI/FPB are the most prejudiced (only 65,43\% consider that homosexual and bisexuals can be good parents). When considering parenthood of trans* people, we find again that the PCPI/FPB groups are the less supportive towards transsexual people (only 55,61\%) and that in 1\textsuperscript{st} and 2\textsuperscript{nd} degree of ESO the percentages are also lower (69,75\% and 67,90\%). This shows once again that the students in first degrees of Secondary education, with presence of students victims of exclusion or with less mature students, the students are in general more prejudiced, in this case in relation towards family diversity.

\textsuperscript{12} According to the American Academy of Paediatrics (2002), the American Psychiatrics Association (2013), the American Psychologists Association (2004; 2005), among other institutions [see a compilation under: 1, 2] and in Spain the Official Psychologists Chamber and the Office of the Children’s Ombudsman of the Madrid Region (2002), among others; the beliefs according to which gay and lesbian adult individuals are not suitable parents lack any empirical basis whatsoever; the research on the issue has proven that homosexual and bisexual people can be as suitable parents as heterosexuals when it comes to providing an adequate family environment to their children. It has also been proven that fears about the development of gender identity, sexual orientation, psychological health or social skills of children raised by homosexual or bisexual parents lack scientific support to endorse such beliefs. There is also no scientific evidence whatsoever that families with trans* parents are different in the relationship to their children when compared with any other family (See: LGBT parenting network, 2012; Platero, 2014; Stotzer et al., 2014). COGAM encourages researchers to avoid any heterosexist bias (APA, 1991) in their research and focus their attention on the social and educational needs of LGBT families. The COGAM Education group conveys two keys to the students in relation with any sexual practice whatsoever: consent in total freedom and health protection.
Figure 52. Agreement of the students with the assertion “LGBT people can be good parents”.

Figure 53. Agreement of the students with the assertion: A) “LGBT people can be good parents”; B) “Transsexual people can be good parents. Detail by grades.

Prejudices towards family diversity are also related with the LGBT-phobic behaviour of the students [Figure 54]: as we move from students showing a lesser degree of LGBT-phobic behaviour to those students trying to take part in bullying we come across higher levels of prejudice against LGB family diversity and particularly to those families whose father(s)/mother(s) is/are trans*. Only 31,76% of the bullies totally agree with the idea that homosexuals and bisexuals can be good parents while 86,14% of the defendants totally agree with it. The percentage of students who do not take action although they do not agree with bullying and who consider that bisexuals and homosexuals can be good parents is also high, 73,08%. 80% of the students surveyed who are also aggressors believe that transsexuals can not be good parents (to a higher or lesser degree). On the contrary, 81,47% of the defendants consider that transsexuals can be good parents.
If we analyze the percentage of students considering transsexuality to be a disease and their consideration about the ability of trans* people to be good parents [Figure 55] we can appreciate a clear co-relation: among students believing that transsexuals can be good parents, only 3,95% believe transsexuality is a disease. This percentage decreases along with the degree of acceptance, reaching up to 44,14% of those who think transsexuals are not good parents. This shows that pathologisation of transsexuality creates a discriminatory and judgemental bias about the ability of trans* people to be good parents.\textsuperscript{13}

\textbf{Figure 54. Agreement of the students with the assertion “LGB people can be good fathers” (LGB) or “Transsexual people can be good parents” (T). Detail by behaviour when facing LGBT-phobic bullying situations.}

\textbf{Figure 55. Students who consider that transsexuality is a disease by their degree of agreement with the assertion “transsexual people can be good parents”.}

\textbf{While we mustn't fear for the integration of LGBT families in the educational community} since generally the results of the researches on the issue show positive data and stress their ability to face the discrimination which might arise, (LGBT parenting network, 2012; Ruiz, 2013), prejudices against non cisnormative families are related to the higher degrees of LGB-phobic and, particularly, transphobic behaviour of students. This might make the inclusion of non normative families in the school centres difficult; this is the reason why we must educate in

\begin{footnotesize}\textsuperscript{13}\end{footnotesize} Contrary to popular belief, living the trans* identity mustn't result in feelings of uneasiness, anguish, or in any psychological disorder whatsoever. Furthermore, a non normative gender identity can be experienced exactly in the same, if not more, positive way than in the case of cisnormative identities. It's the situation of rejection, discrimination and transphobic hate which may lead to a person feeling anxiety, depression or other related disorders. This is not necessarily the case of every trans* person and it can certainly be overcome with social support and adequate psychological advice (Platero, 2014; APA, 2011).
respect and family diversity, adapt the environment, the organisation structures, proceedings and school functioning to the reality of all families part of the educational community.

4.4 Gender differences

Throughout the preceding items it has become evident that most of the results obtained in this study suggest the impact of gender binarism (see glossary) on the behaviour and LGBT-phobic attitudes of the students. We will try now to analyse this fact from a holistic perspective.

Masculinity and aggression

As seen in this and other researches (Generelo and Pichardo, 2005), LGBT-phobia is closely related with the gender roles acquired during the socialisation process. Traditionally masculine roles, hegemonic masculinity created very stereotyped masculine behaviours. (Kimmel, 1997) where the rejection of feminine by opposition to masculine leads towards LGBT-phobic attitudes or attitudes of rejection towards LGBT people. Fortunately, LGBT-phobic attitudes would appear to be being nuanced by the education and the normalisation of the LGBT community within our society. In spite of the progresses of the Spanish society, attitudes of boys and girls still carry the negative influence of traditional gender roles. As we will see further on, we have determined in this study levels of still high LGBT-phobia and that men (to a slightly higher degree than women) reject affection, LGBT behaviour of non normative expressions of gender and sexual orientations other than the normative ones.

We appreciate an interesting distribution of the students according to their gender when they reply to “What do you do when somebody picks on a fellow student who is or looks homosexual or bisexual?” [. Apparently boys are more likely to take part in the aggression against people who do not fit in with the general heterosexual genders rule (2,68%) while girls are quite unlikely to mock the victim (0,48%). Under the same question, girls state defending a person who is or looks homosexual almost twice as boys (61% against 37%). Women are then much more protective against LGBT-phobic bullying. Such perception, as we will see at the end of this section, does not necessarily mean that women are less homophobic or less LGBT-phobic from a cognitive point of view but they are an example of protection and non aggression. So boys are 25% less active when it comes to defend their LGBT fellow students. This result is similar to the one obtained in 2013 (COGAM, 2013, page 27).

Twice as many boys than girls (22% against 11%) choose the reply “I don't know”. As already mentioned, it is quite likely that this option includes the students who in 2013 chose the answer “if-it-is-jokes-or-pranks-I-also-laugh” along with the students who showed doubts in helping the fellow students. It is also possible that such behaviours are a result of the fear of being stigmatized (Goffman, 1970) which is so deeply rooted in the construction of masculinity: fear of being taken for a homosexual is a great barrier in the construction of masculine identity (Kimmel, 1997) since homosexuality is associated with lack of virility.

The students choosing the option “I don't like it but I take no action against” is also 11,6% higher than the girls. Doubts on how to react and this percentage might be explained by the confrontation of fear of rejection associated with contamination of the stigma combined with
the idea of political correctness ("rejecting a fellow student because of his/her sexual orientation is wrong"). So the percentage of guys choosing not to act but states in our survey that they are against such abuse may be due to the tension caused by two social contradictory commandments in the masculine identity: masculine and social morals. **On one hand, the rules of masculinity lead to refusing LGBT people but, on the other, Spanish society seems to recognize their rights.** Political correctness and assumption of rules might help to reduce rejection attitudes towards LGBT people. However, the idea of stigmatisation can be more significant in the case of young men so their behaviour will not actually turn into a real action against this bullying.

As said, in spite of the fact that a third of students defend their fellow students and most boys and girls will not encourage bullying behaviour against them (75 and 89% in that order) the response of boys promoting bullying by mockery is much higher than the one of women. Approximately one out of 40 students will not contribute to generate a safe environment for LGBT people. In the case of girls, we might think it is only one girl out of 200.

"They called a friend of mine “faggot” because he joined the girls. He does not like football and boys play football all the time or at least most of the time. That is why he is with girls.”

(Heterosexual girl, 2nd degree of ESO)

**Hegemonic masculinity. Control and punishment of other forms of expression of masculinity via physical violence**

The males tend to be significantly more aggressive but the fact is that not only they are the main aggressors but they are also the main group of victims of LGBT-phobic aggression [Figure 57 and Figure 11]. Aggression figures become more homogeneous (59% girls and 41% boys). But with a difference of victims of physical aggression of 69% of boys against 31% of girls, boys are the main aggressors but also the main victims of physical violence. **Being a boy who does not fit in with the rules of gender and sexual orientation exposes him to physical aggression twice as many as girls in the same situation** (which does not mean girls will not be victims of other forms of violence as already mentioned; we will also discuss this issue further on). The process of masculine socialisation has beyond doubt an impact in this distribution. As we will see now, males have attitudes slightly more LGBT-phobic but, as just seen, it could be that some of them
have a great influence upon the rest of the students, which may distort patterns and condemning, mainly boys, to the threat of aggression. Maybe this constant threat of aggression for those not following the normative clichés of gender and sexual orientation is the reason behind the high rate of males who do not defend their LGBT fellow students. As a rule, a few will impose their LGBT-phobia upon a salint mass of fellow students, mainly upon others to whom school environment is hostile towards their sexual or gender identity. Becoming noticed may result in becoming victim of aggression. For boys this is twice as likely as in the case of girls.

“Once I was talking with a gay fag and some boys came and they insulted him and stroke him down, I defended him.” (Heterosexual girl, 3rd degree ESO)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Physical aggressions</th>
<th>Verbal aggressions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Victims 2013</td>
<td>27,91%</td>
<td>31,37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victims 2015</td>
<td>72,09%</td>
<td>68,63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>40,85%</td>
<td>59,15%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Girls
Boys

Figure 57. Detail of victims of LGBT-phobic aggression by gender.

Gender and attitudes confronted to sexual affective diversity and diversity of gender identities

As mentioned in a previous chapter, two of the questions showing more clearly the process of creation of LGBT-phobia around the construction of the gender are “I feel disgusted when I see two boys kissing” and “I feel disgusted when I see two girls kissing”. If we analyse this by gender of the people surveyed (Figure 58), we may also notice that the cognitive link between sexism and LGBT-phobia of those with intolerant behaviour applies actually to all the students.

In the case of girls, seeing two boys kissing or two girls kissing makes no big difference and their tolerant response is 78% and 75% in that order, while only 22% and 24% of girls report disgust when they see two boys or two girls (in that order) kissing. In the case of boys there is indeed a rather noticeable difference depending on the gender of the kissers. 49% of them feel disgusted when seeing two boys kissing while only 30% of them state disgust at two girls kissing. The difference according to the gender of those kissing is almost 20%.

We obviously meet here the issue of construction of masculinity through the image of women perceived as a source of desire (Osborne, 2009). This construction reaches the masculine outlook through pornography which displays women as objects and not as subjects (Arcand, 1993). When analysing this we should act quite carefully because sexism mixes up with LGBT-phobia are to the point that it might seem that boys are more tolerant to lesbian or bisexual girls expressing their love than towards gay or bisexual boys. This is utterly wrong; it is about the construction of masculine outlook based upon the subordinate position of women, who then lose the condition of subjects and turn into objects showing their identity and sexual-affective
orientation (Szymanski et al., 2011). This reality means that we must consider not only bullying based on LGBT-phobic grounds but add to it bullying motivated by gender or sexism grounds.

“I really don’t care what people like, I do not discriminated but I feel disgusted when they do that type of thing in front of me (kissing and so on...)”. (Heterosexual boy)

![Disgust when watching two boys kissing vs. two girls kissing](chart.png)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Boys</th>
<th>Girls</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Disgust when watching two boys kissing</td>
<td>51.18%</td>
<td>25.26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disgust when watching two girls kissing</td>
<td>70.05%</td>
<td>19.19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10.63%</td>
<td>78.09%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12.93%</td>
<td>14.82%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 58. Degree of disgust of the students when viewing two men or two women kissing. Detail by gender.

The statistic trend shows men being more LGBT-phobic, but it must be nuanced. In five items, the difference is of around 10% [Figure 59]. When asked “Homosexuals and bisexuals might be heterosexuals if they tried hard enough”, “LGBT’s should have the same right than heterosexuals”, “I think transsexuality is a disease”, “Transsexual people can be good parents” and “LGBT people can be good parents” the students responded in a rather homogeneous way; while males tended to provide more LGBT-phobic replies, actually only 10% more than females. Such homogeneity continues the trend COGAM already detected in the 2013 study (pages 27 and 28). We may then think that although men are slightly more LGBT-phobic, they still are close to the mainstream opinion, which shows that education and teaching of respect and tolerance towards sexual-affective diversity also reaches males. And since the opinions of their female fellow students are not very radical, this allows this difference to be addressed through the otherwise necessary education in gender relationships.
In short, **males are slightly more LGBT-phobic than women and show a lower degree of acceptance towards sexual-affective diversity**. So girls are friendlier towards sexual-affective diversity. However, in general, as shown by other studies (Pichardo, 2009, COGAM, 2013), homophobia is not part of the majority opinions of boys. We mustn't discard the possibility of finding allies and defendants among them. Furthermore, most of the people are tolerant. Unfortunately, the high percentage of people showing some degree of LGBT-phobia is still alarming. The slight difference between boys and girls underlines the importance of gender
stereotypes we still are providing youngsters with; stereotypes with a direct impact on their conceptions of gender men and women still reproduce since they both are heavily constrained by them. Males, being more constrained than women by traditional gender rules, not only reproduce more aggressive LGBT-phobic and aggressive behaviour but are also the main victims of such behaviours. LGBT youngsters study in environments where they are rejected. Working upon gender stereotypes and upon the repetition of traditional masculinity patterns is urgent in order to prevent the still high levels of LGBT-phobia, since the presence of a single student per group (due to the high degree of tolerance of bullying in classrooms along with the fear of stigmatisation) is enough to generate environments hostile to individuals diverse in terms of sexual-affective orientation or gender identity.

4.5 Cultural diversity

“Globalisation appears as an opportunity for exchanges and enrichment between people and nations but also creates new tensions in the social coexistence. We notice the appearance of new forms of intolerance and aggression. On the one hand, we experience the fascinating proximity of so many cultures but on the other hand, we also experience the increase of xenophobia, racism and discrimination based upon differences of colour, sex or ethnic features. Cultural diversity, instead of being considered as common heritage of the humanity and a chance for growth, becomes a threat and is used as an excuse for intolerance and discrimination” (UNESCO, 2005).

The Delors Report states that “education has a double mission: teaching the diversity of human species and contributing to raising awareness about the similarities and the interdependence between all human beings”. Later on the same report says that “education must take in charge a difficult task: transform diversity into a positive factor of mutual understanding among individuals and human beings” (Delors, 1966)

The fact that both the Delors Report and the Universal Declaration on Cultural Diversity put the focus on this function of education is due among other factors to the fact that cultural diversity has not always be considered as a development factor in the educational practice but rather as a problem to tackle with. COGAM believes that diversity is enriching. The significant increase of cultural diversity in the Spanish schools in the last fifteen years has enriched the Spanish educational system and Spanish society as a whole.

If we analyse the degree of acceptance of sexual-affective diversity of students of families whose parents come from the nine most represented countries in this sample [Figure 60], we must stress the fact that students whose parents come from Morocco are the ones expecting less support from their families: 81% expect no or very little support from their parents and only 11,71% believe they would have total support. Students with Chinese parents, while they believe they would receive the lowest support, expect a lesser degree of frontal rejection than the ones of Moroccan descent. Nevertheless, the percentage of students who expect a total acceptance is even lower. It is alarming that 91,67% of the students with Chinese parents say their families would not accept them totally if they were LGBT.
Only 25% of the students whose parents come from Romania or the Dominican Republic would get total acceptance from their families. Students also report, in that order that they expect to receive a greater degree of disapproval from their parents/tutors.

Students whose parents come from Bolivia, Ecuador, Colombia or Peru find greater levels of acceptance and a more nuanced position, with the exception of Ecuador, where we find more downright rejection by the families. Higher degrees of acceptance and lower levels of family rejection are those of students with Spanish parents.

Except precise cases (e.g. Peru), the ranking of citizenships by the expectancy of LGBT-phobic rejection is similar to the one obtained in the 2013 study (COGAM, 2013, page 33) [Figure 60b]. However, the extreme reduction among all national groups of levels of family acceptance and the increase of higher expectancy of rejection of parents/tutors of the non normative sexual-affective orientation of their children is alarming. Something which, as we already discussed, might be related with the delicate situation at national level in Spain about the rights equality and hate crimes towards LGBT people (See Table 4 and annexes I and III).

**Figure 60. Acceptance of the family if the student felt attracted by someone of his/her own sex. Detail by citizenship of parents/tutors.**

A) Results of this study: they have been sorted from left to right according to the percentage of students who state they would be totally accepted. When two or more groups had similar percentages of acceptance, we have given priority to citizenships tending to higher levels of disagreement (the students would face more open rejection).

B) Results of the study made in 2013; the presentation order of the original graphic has been altered to make the comparison easier.
Even if we find differences in terms of family acceptance, we do not determine great differences about stereotypes and prejudices of students depending on the origin of their parents/tutors. As already proven in the 2013 study (COGAM, 2013, page 29), LGBT-phobic prejudices are slightly higher in the case of students with foreign parents when compared to students with Spanish parents. But we must now consider the detail by countries of origin.

Considering the rejection to displays of homoaffectiveness stated by the students, we can conclude that **LGB-phobia is a bit higher among the students with Moroccan, Dominican or Chinese parents than in the case of students with South American or Spanish parents** [Figure 61]. In general, a kiss among two people of the same sex is more rejected if it’s about two men than two women, irrespective of the origin of the parents. The importance of this gender effect varies slightly depending on the country of origin considered but no general conclusions can be drawn given the nature of this sample and the variability of factors which may have an impact on this.

“It’s not totally discrimination but a small cultural clash”

Heterosexual Girl, Dominican Republic, 4th Grade of ESO

![Figure 61. Replies of the students to the items: A) I dislike seeing two guys kissing”. B) I dislike seeing two girls kissing”. Detail by origin of the parents/tutors (the percentage of boys-girls is close to 50% in all cases, excepted in Morocco, Dominican Republic and Bolivia, where the number of girls is higher than the number of boys).](image)

When it comes to pathologisation of transsexuality [Figure 62], although the degree of disagreement is high in all cases, results similar to the previous one are obtained. **Such belief is slightly more widespread among students whose parents come from Morocco or the Dominican Republic, countries where gender reassignment is illegal.** [Table 4], than in the case of students whose parents come from South America or Spain.
As far as acceptance of family diversity is concerned [Figure 63], students whose parents come from countries where homo-parenatal adoption is allowed (Spain and Colombia) [Table 4] show higher percentages of total agreement with the idea that LGB people can be good parents. Highest level of rejection to the idea of parenthood of LGB people may be found among students whose parents come from China.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prosecution</th>
<th>Legal recognition of homosexual couples</th>
<th>Adoption</th>
<th>Law allows gender reassignment</th>
<th>Anti-discrimination laws</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Morocco</td>
<td>imprisonment</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>Legal</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romania</td>
<td>Legal</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominican Republic</td>
<td>Legal</td>
<td>Forbidden by the constitution since 2000</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bolivia</td>
<td>Legal</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>(in the pipeline)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecuador</td>
<td>Legal</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>(in the pipeline)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colombia</td>
<td>Legal</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peru</td>
<td>Legal</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>Legal</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4. Acknowledgment of rights of LGBT people in the main countries of origin of parents of the students having taken part in this study.
If we consider the behaviour of the students when facing situations of LGBT-phobic bullying in their education centre [Figure 64], we may observe that students stating perceiving a higher degree of LGBT-phobia from their families (Morocco, China and Romania) are also the ones more likely to take part in LGBT-phobic bullying at the education centre. We must also stress the fact that in most cases (except those where we notice the most LGBT-phobic behaviour) the percentage of bullies is lower among the children of foreigners than among the children of Spaniards. Actually we detect an even higher percentage of defendants among children of non-Spanish parents.

It is also remarkable that the percentage of students with Spanish parents having seen somebody insulting others (calling someone fag or dyke, etc.) is a slightly higher (58,1%) than among students with foreign parents (51,7%). However, while physical violence is the less frequent form of bullying, the percentage of students with foreign parents (8,15%) having seen somebody beating another person because the victim was or “looked” LGBT is higher than the one of students with Spanish parents (5,09%). Also the number of victims among students with foreign parents is slightly higher. **We must bear in mind that students with foreign parents, as well as students with different cultures, ethnic origin, different skin colours, may be victims of LGBT-phobia as well as xenophobia, racism or discrimination or multiple intolerance.**
Different studies, such as the one coordinated by the Observatorio Español del Racismo y la Xenofobia – Spanish Monitoring Centre on Racism and Xenophobia (Oberaxe, 2014) show that the valuation of cultural diversity is still in a consolidation phase; the intermediate positions about the enrichment the presence of children of immigrants to their classes are a majority. This proves the need to implement and improve measures promoting the inclusion of the immigrant students and who fight racism, xenophobia and LGBT-phobia from the very educational community.

4.6 Socioeconomic status

A novelty of this study is the analysis of the socioeconomic status of the students and its likely impact on the responses to the questions of the survey. We used the economic indicator “Municipal gross available income per person” (Renta disponible municipal per cápita.) (Source: Instituto de Estadística y Contabilidad Municipal de la Comunidad de Madrid - Institute of Statistics and Municipal Accountancy of the Madrid Region) of the cities or districts where the education centres taking part in this study were located. We have classified them in four different categories, codified as “High”, “High-Average”, “Low-Average” and “Low”, whose maximum and minimum values may be seen on Table 5.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Municipal gross available income per person</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>&gt;19.537€</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High-Average</td>
<td>&gt;16.691€ and &lt;19.537€</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low-Average</td>
<td>&gt;13.522,20€ and &lt;16.691€</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>&lt;13.522,20€</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5. Classification of school centres by the municipal income per person of the city they are in.

Although no relevant trends have been found related with the items aimed at determining the LGBT-phobic prejudices of the students (rejection of two people of the same sex kissing, pathologisation of transsexuality, ability of LGBT people to be good parents and link between effeminization in men/masculinity in women and homosexuality), slight trends may be observed with the items aimed at determining the degree of tolerance of the students in relation with sexual-affective diversity allow us to establish slight trends[Figure 66]. The lower the
socioeconomic status of the city where the education centre is located, we find a slight reduction of the percentage of those believing that LGBT people ought to have the same rights as heterosexuals. The percentage of those believing that sexual-affective orientation may be changed by trying hard enough also increases slightly.

We also find among the average-low and low levels a higher percentage of students declaring openly that they take part in LGBT-phobic bullying by contrast with those of higher status. [Figure 67]. The reduction of the percentage of those who do not act and the increase of those defending are also remarkable among students with a high socioeconomic status compared with the rest. We do record a slight increase of the percentage of the defendants, which corresponds to the increase of those stating they are bullies.

Before formulating conclusions on the aforementioned findings, let's consider the graphics of Figure 68. Although the amount of students stating having witnessed verbal aggression grows accordingly with what has been shown with other results (the lower the socioeconomic status, the more witnesses), the number of students reporting having been abused verbally or physically for being or “looking” LGBT does not match with this trend [Figure 68a]. Furthermore, if we consider the highest socioeconomic status we will find the higher amount of victims of verbal aggression, followed by the low socioeconomic status. Finally the levels high-average and low-average show intermediate percentages. This shows that in this figure, as well as in the preceding figures political correctness might be playing an important role by creating a bias in
the results shown in these graphics and that reactions of intolerance, verbal violence and passivity might actually be just as frequent in the high socioeconomic status environments as in the environments with lowest incomes.

When it comes to physical violence [Figure 68b], the percentage of students stating having been victims themselves shows few differences regardless of the socioeconomic status with a slightly growing trend from high-average to low levels, a trend reinforced if we consider the increase of the percentage of witnesses. If we add the slight increase of the options showing some degree of intolerance for the items of the Figure 66 along with the fact that the percentage of defendants increases only slightly with this trend [Figure 67], this might actually suggest links between a lack of economic resources, aporophobia (see glossary) and LGBT-phobic physical violence. Differences are however too small to allow us to draw strict conclusions in this respect.

When we consider the highest socioeconomic status, the percentage of victims of physical aggression is similar to the one of the low-average status, something which would not make much sense if we consider the variable of socioeconomic status as an explanation to LGBT-phobic behaviour. Again, there may be a certain bias due to political correctness and to the number of witnesses. Other factors not considered in this survey and not directly related with the socioeconomic status (e.g. political or religious ideology) might have an impact upon the affective-sexual or gender identities diversity

In any case and as a general conclusion to this chapter we may say that no relevant evidence has been found allowing us to state that socioeconomic status has an impact on students having LGBT-phobic behaviours or becoming victims of such.

Figure 68. Students having witnessed situations of A) verbal and B) physical LGBT-phobic violence in their school centre. Detail by socioeconomic level.
5. Response of teachers and family environment of the students to LGBT-phobic discrimination.

To end this study we would like to consider some of the aspects we saw from a marginal angle when discussing the results already shown. Such aspects deal with the family and teacher environments, where the student is educated, or isn't, in the respect and tolerance towards sexual-affective and gender identities diversity.

5.1 Opinion of the students on the action of teachers.

As has already been seen, LGB students [Figure 17 and Figure 18] and also the victims of physical and verbal LGBT-phobic aggression [Figure 16], state that teachers do not act enough against LGBT-phobic bullying situations. Besides, when LGB students perceive a complete lack of action on the part of their teachers [Figure 27], the percentage of students who dare to become visible drops sharply. We will try to get a deeper insight into the attitudes students perceive from their teachers towards sexual-affective and gender identities diversity and the impact this may have upon their own behaviour.

52% of the students surveyed show a certain disagreement with the idea that teachers support the students being insulted for being or “looking” LGBT [Figure 69], while the remaining 48% believes without a doubt that teachers defend them. Among the 28% of those who do not totally agree (a percentage showing a rather medium to high rate of agreement), we must stress that 5,41% consider that the students victim of this kind of aggression have no support at all from their teachers; also 19% show a rather low rate of agreement with the text of the question. If we compare these results with those obtained during the school year 2012-2013 (COGAM, 2013, page 40), the prospects look rather positive since the number of students showing a medium degree of agreement with this item drop remarkably, the opinions of the students shifting drastically to a positive view about the work of the teachers in this respect. So, although the perception of the action of the teachers against LGBT-phobic aggression seems to increased compared to preceding school years, it still seems necessary that teachers become aware and keep in mind their responsibility on this issue; it also seems necessary that they are provided with training and resources in order to prevent and deal in an explicit way with LGBT-phobic behaviour.

![Agreement with the assertion: “If a student is insulted because he is or ‘looks’ homosexual, teachers defend him/her.”](image-url)
As in the previous study (COGAM, 2013, page 40), the opinion of the students seems unanimous: if we consider the gender of the students [Figure 70], no large differences are recorded; only a maximal difference of 3%. Boys to an slightly larger extent believe that teachers defend the student suffering homophobia-based verbal bullying (49,4% state their total agreement) compared to 46,46% of girls. On the other hand, the origin of the students isn’t a variable with an impact on the results when answering this question [Figure 70]: the maximal difference is 3% when comparing answers of Spanish students with those provided by students of foreign descent. 47,49% of the Spanish students believe that the students do defend other students victim of verbal aggression because they are or “look” LGBT (53% state some disagreement) against 49% of the students of foreign descent (51% of which state some disagreement).

Figure 70. Replies to the item the assertion: “If a student is insulted because he is or ‘looks’ homosexual, teachers defend him/her. Detail by gender and origin of the parents/tutors of the students (no relevant differences between the different degrees of disagreement have been recorded).

Considering the socioeconomic profile of the city or district of the students [Figure 71], no significant differences have been recorded on the perception of the action of teachers. Nevertheless, the students in municipalities with average incomes are the ones showing more confidence in their teachers (some 50% admit beyond doubt that the teachers defend the LGBT students victims of verbal abuse), compared to those in municipalities with either high or low income (44,8% and 47,65%, in that order). We should also stress that among the students who do not rely at all on the action of their teachers we find those from municipalities with lower income; they state their disagreement with the assert that their teachers act against LGBT-phobia based attacks. We should bear in mind that it was actually in municipalities with highest and lowest incomes where we find the highest percentages of students verbally aggressed [Figure 68]; this result might provide an explanation for it.
When we analyse the data by grades [Figure 72], we appreciate a trend in the negative perception of the attitude of teachers, which becomes particularly acute in the higher degrees, where students report an insufficient action by the teachers (in percentages above 50%). This trend had already been determined in the previous report “Homophobia in classrooms” 2013 (COGAM, 2013, page 41), where it was said that the higher the degree in ESO, the more the students believe that teachers react against this verbal violence attacks if a male student is effeminate/if a female student is masculine. This trends reverses in high school diploma and the percentage of those perceiving a higher degree of action increases when compared to the last year of ESO. The percentage of students in PCPI/FPB who totally disagree about whether the teachers take action is remarkably higher than in the rest of groups. This trend may be approached in several ways: on the one hand, a higher degree of experience of the secondary school allows a more precise and critical perception of the action taken by teachers. On the other, it could also be that the measures implemented by the teachers in the first cycle of ESO are different from the one of the second cycle or high school diploma. In any case, teachers and educational centres must convey an explicit rejection of the displays of LGBT-phobic discrimination of their students.

However, the improvement in the defence of LGBT students against aggression is an established fact when we analyse the data by grade; also the percentage of students showing some disagreement in all the educational stages is lower when compared to the school year 2012-2013 (COGAM, 2013, page 41), [Figure 73]. The reduction of the number of students in PCPI/FPB considering that the teachers do not act enough is already quite striking, moreover if we consider that this number was alarmingly high in 2013. This result might suggest an improvement in the action of the teachers. It seems that teachers have changed their way to act and are more aware in order to avoid this unfair situation which took place in their classrooms. However, this process must continue in the years to come since the percentage of students stating lack of action is still too high.
If we compare this data with the attitude of the students towards an LGBT-phobia act [Figure 74], we may conclude that the feeling of impunity of the students at the school centre may lead them to be more likely to commit acts of LGBT-phobic violence: the students joining the LGBT-phobic act, laughing at and insulting the victim, consider to a higher degree that teachers won’t do “anything” about it (23,26%) while the students who won’t join perceives a higher degree of action from the teachers to that respect: 52,98% of the students actively defending the victim state beyond doubt that the teachers will do the same, and only 3,78% of the defendants believe they won’t react. Finally, the students taking a more passive attitude against the LGBT-phobic act (since they state that “they don’t like it but won’t do anything”) 42,65% of them say that the teachers always defend the victim against the remaining 57,35% who show a certain level of disagreement. This result confirms again the imperious necessity of teachers as well as the different structures of the educational centre to stand up clearly against the LGBT-phobic discrimination, conveying this decision to the students as well as to the whole education community. Feeling backed by the institution helps the student to avoid LGBT-bullying; the silence of the institution, on the other hand, is construed as tolerance towards such acts, which conveys the idea of an institutionalized LGBT-phobia.

Figure 73. Agreement with the assertion: “If a student is insulted because he is or ‘looks’ LGBT, teachers defend him/her. Detail by grades; results of the preceding and the current research are shown.

Figure 74. Agreement with the assertion: “If a student is insulted because he is or ‘looks’ LGBT, teachers defend him/her. Detail by behaviour of the students when facing LGBT-phobic situations.
5.2 Ability of the teachers to react

In order to know the possible reasons why such a high percentage of students consider teachers are not acting enough, a questionnaire was sent to 55 secondary education centres to be distributed among the teachers. However, only 30 replies were received from teachers from 15 different education centres of the different DAT in the CAM, 13 of which stated they were counsellors or staff of the Counselling Department (CD), 9 as subject teachers; 6 were not only subject teachers but also group tutors while only 2 as group tutors.

Of course, such a sample is not representative of the work of all the teachers of the CAM. Also those who answer do it because they have reasons to be proud about the care they provide to LGBT people through their work. May this testimonial of 30 professionals (the majority of whom try to promote respect for sexual-affective and gender identities diversity) serve to show good practices and targets to be reached at short term.

Documents of the education centre and attention to diversity

The teachers were asked about the papers regulating the functioning of the educational centre they work at and the degree of attention provided to sexual-affective diversity, gender identity and LGBT-phobic school bullying.

Although they were teachers whose centres cooperate with COGAM Education Group and therefore have an institutional interest in working upon the respect of sexual-affective diversity, only half of them (working in 7 out of the 15 centres represented) stated that papers such as the Educational Project of the Centre or the Co-existence plan mention specifically the institutional rejection of discrimination based on sexual-affective orientation or gender identity in their school centre. [Figure 75]. If the institution, in an official way, shows no opposition (as it is the case in the vast majority of them), the choice of acting, preventing and fighting it depends solely on the choice of the teacher, counsellor or tutor, since there are no explicit guidelines at an official level. The rejection of discrimination towards the LGBT students must be visible in order to be effective. Institutions with unequivocal positions ease greatly the task of those working for them and legitimise them when measures should be implemented. Where there is a void or lack of energetic action there is also a problem, particularly with prevention. The Spanish Penal Code of 1995 (section 22.4) defines the aggravating circumstances of any crime or offence. Prejudices considered by the Penal Code as aggravating circumstances are: ideology, religion and beliefs; ethnic, racial or national origin; sex; sexual orientation or sexual identity; and disease or disability. Educational centres are not only asked to educate in accordance with the law but to take sides explicitly against LGBT-phobic bullying, since this explicit position is in itself a form of prevention and a clear message for the bully.

When asked whether the papers of the centre (e.g. Tutorial Action Plan) include activities involving the students in preventing and reporting LGBT-phobic school bullying [Figure 75], 63% of they say they do, 20% say they don't and 17% do not know or do not reply. Educating in sexual-affective and gender identities diversity as well as in preventing and reporting is part of
the education called transversal; therefore 100% of the education centres ought to include such activities.

So was it mentioned in the preamble of the preceding LOE: “Among the aims of education are the full development of the personality and affective abilities of the students, training in respecting fundamental rights and freedoms and effective equality of chances for men and women, the acknowledgement of sexual-affective diversity as well as a critic evaluation of the inequalities in order to surpass the sexist behaviours”; and also in Section 98 Permanent training: “Educational attention to diversity” and Section 117 Educational project: “… the transversal treatment of the areas, subjects or modules of the education in values”.

Such a concern is also covered in the education law currently in force LOMCE, although in a less precise way: “Preamble: One of the basic principles of the Spanish educational system is the transmission and implementation of values encouraging personal freedom, responsibility, democratic citizenship, solidarity, tolerance, equality, respect and justice as well as values helping to overcome any kind of discrimination (...). It considers as essential the preparation for an active citizenship and the acquisition of social and civic competencies stated in the Recommendation of the European Parliament and the Council of 18 December 2006 on the key competences for a permanent learning. (...) such need is approached transversally by incorporating civic and constitutional education to all the subjects during the basic education, so that the acquisition of social and civic competences is included in the daily dynamics of the teaching and learning processes, thereby enhancing by means of a joint approach, its transference ability and its orientating nature”.

Section 124. Rules of organisation, functioning and co-existence: “(... ) Corrective measures must fit the offences. Actions against personal dignity of other members of the educational community being based upon or resulting in a discrimination or bullying due to gender, disability or belief, in sexual orientation or identity or racial, ethnic origin, or religious, disability or belief, or committed against the most vulnerable students because of their personal, social or educational features will be deemed as a very serious offence (...)”.

In the educational context, the diversity concept is typically presented with a very large approach; yet the measures aimed at protecting diversity at the education centres will not include each and every case. The sexual-affective and gender identities diversity is one of the issues typically remaining unseen and untouched in the education centres, invisible to teachers when tackling with diversity.

One of the usual definitions of diversity entails the individual educational needs of each and every one of all the students to be able to access the learning experiences they need to socialize. Such needs have their origin in cultural, social, gender and personal differences. The LGBT-students are fully affected by such definition, to a much larger extent than the mere differences of their gender or affective-sexual orientation. When we say cultural differences we typically consider a cultural majority against cultural minorities with less social impact. The social discrimination based upon sexual-affective orientation and gender identity has been and still is a fact in our society and is subjugated to a majority culture, the heteronormativity. To what
respect and how firmly can we say that our school contributes to socialisation of LGBT people if they are not even acknowledged as part of the diversity enriching our schools?

The Plan de Atención a la Diversidad [Plan for Care of Diversity] of the educational centres offers the largest room for manoeuvre to that respect. General, ordinary and extraordinary measures allow the treatment of respect and tolerance of sexual-affective and gender identities diversity, providing thus the LGBT students with the care they may need. When asked whether their centre had some project/program specifically designed to that aim (for instance, a tutorial service aimed at LGBTs) 55% of the teachers said there was no such thing or they did not know about it and less than half of them (45%) were aware of the existence of this too [Figure 75].

![Figure 75. Opinion of the teachers about the inclusion of sexual-affective and gender identities diversity in the documents of the school centre.](image)

**Tutorial action and care at the DO**

Two groups of questions were specifically aimed at knowing the tasks considered and the resources available for the tutorial action and the Department of Orientation (DO) with respect to sexual-affective diversity, gender identities and action against a case of LGBT-phobic bullying. Tutorial work is a pedagogic one aimed at mentoring, accompanying and following up the students in order to help each and everyone to orientate towards his/her integral formation considering his/her personal characteristics and needs. **Orientation and tutorial work must be done by all teachers**; there is a position with more precise functions in order to reach the coordination of the group and keep in touch with the families: the teacher – tutor (López, 2010). Among his/her functions are: helping to solve the demands and worries as well as intermediate, assisted by the student representative and the deputy student representative, with the other teachers and the educational team; the coordination of complementary or out-of-school activities, providing the parents, the rest of the teachers and the students of the group with any relevant information regarding the school or complementary activities and the school performance, among others (ROC, 1996).

Only 4 of the 8 tutors having replied to our survey state that they coordinate the action of the teachers in order to tackle the needs of sexual-affective and gender identities diversity in their classes. 3 state they don’t and one chooses the “don’t know-do not reply [Figure 76]. 7 out of 8 discuss sexual-affective diversity with their students in the tutorials, making specific activities, discussions, informal conversations and/or, should answer questions about this issue. Half of them do discuss the issue of sexual-affective and gender identity diversity with the families, a crucial aspect as we will see in the next item. Half of them don’t.
Among the DO staff, whose function is contributing to and coordinating the development of the cognitive, professional, academic, social, emotional, moral, etc., aspects of the students by working in team with all the teachers (particularly the tutors), the families, the centre management, the social agents, etc., 11 out of the 13 teachers surveyed consider that the DO provides some specific attention to those LGBT students requesting it. The two others do not know or do not reply. Also 92% of them (12 out of 13) state that the DO considers intervention in order to prevent the LGBT-phobic school bullying and the respect of sexual-affective diversity. We may then conclude that the staff responsible for orientation who took part in the survey is aware of the needs of the LGBT students and also of the potential bullying situations and try to deal with them [Figure 76].

Those results show that these high schools are committed to providing education based on the respect of sexual-affective diversity and show good practices, with a fair degree of communication between the DO and the teachers and of both with the students when discussing these issues; nevertheless, this is restricted to the work of the tutor and the DO with the students, but neither all teachers nor the families get actually involved.

What about the subjects taught?

As we have just seen, the coordination between the tutors and the rest of the teachers seems to falter even in the most involved centres. However, the commitment of the DO and the group tutors with the respect for diversity seems to reach a substantial part of the subject teachers, who reply they try to approach these issues within the subject they teach or even with a coordinated approach of their didactic department, with 89% and 71% in that order [Figure 77]. Educating and working for the respect of sexual-affective and gender identities diversity is a task to be carried at all levels. So the fact that not all the didactic departments are committed is extremely serious.

Figure 76. Replies of the tutors and the staff of the Department of Orientation (DO) on their work about the sexual-affective and gender identities diversity.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Works sex-aff. diversity with families (Tutor)</th>
<th>Teachers coord. care for sex.-aff. diversity in the group (Tutor)</th>
<th>Approaches it in tutorials (Tutor)</th>
<th>Specific attention to LGB who request it (Orientation Department)</th>
<th>OD considers intervening to prevent bullying and to educate in respect to sex-aff. diversity (OD)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 76. Replies of the tutors and the staff of the Department of Orientation (DO) on their work about the sexual-affective and gender identities diversity.
Figure 77. Replies of the subject teachers when asked whether the Didactic Department asks to work on sexual-affective and gender identity diversity in the classes and whether they actually do.

**Other initiatives to work on sexual-affective and gender identities diversity**

The following group of questions was aimed at knowing other possible initiatives intending to promote the respect towards sexual-affective and gender identities diversity in the centre and prevent LGBT-phobic school bullying.

**Posters and brochures** (e.g. as a part of a “week of sexual-affective diversity”) is a way to increase awareness and obtain precise information helping the teachers in a simple and quick way. The education centre must provide space for the display of such graphic and/or written material. According to the replies of teachers, orientation staff and tutors, **47% of centres do not provide any such material** while 10% just do not know. 43% says their centre does [Figure 78]. Something similar applies to the **centre library**: books and the promotion of reading are an excellent tool to promote tolerance and increase the knowledge of the students and their families (e.g. via reading workshops and conversations with the families). **47% state that their library has no material regarding** the reality and/or needs of the LGBT students; 10% do not know and 43% say yes.

We may conclude that **LGBT material at the disposal of centres is quite limited and insufficient and that promotion of tolerance towards sexual-affective diversity seems limited to the classroom of the teachers and tutors who are committed to the issue at an individual level but does not reach the whole centre, while the valuation of diversity does not become a movement of change in the micro-society of the education centres.**

Figure 78. Replies of the teachers on the availability of material available dealing with sexual-affective and gender identities diversity at the education centre.
Do the teachers have enough information and training?

As seen above, the DO staff, as well as tutors of subject teachers, tries to face these issues in their everyday life but... do they have specific training allowing their interventions to be as successful as they could?

The majority of the tutors consider they have not received the resources or the information needed to work on sexual-affective and gender identities diversity and intervene in bullying cases with LGBT students as victims (5 out of 8) and the figure is even higher in the case of the staff of DO; the majority of the DO staff state they do not believe they have received the resources or the information needed to help tutors and intervene in cases of bullying/counselling of LGBT students (11 out of 13) [Figure 79].

In order to obtain good attention and quality interventions, if teachers are not trained adequately they should at least be provided with material allowing them to access this specific knowledge. The results obtained when asked whether the DO has written or audiovisual material related with the need of LGBT’s is anything but encouraging. 6 of the centres do not have any such material at all and only 5 out of the 13 orientation professionals have been provided with it.

In spite of this lack of supply of material of the educational centres of the Madrid Region, be it at general level or in the DO, (maybe only due to their cooperation with the COGAM Education Group) they do have information on LGBT groups which may be offered to the students or their families in 12 of the Departments of Orientation.

Perception of LGBT-phobia among teachers

We also asked whether the LGBT teacher (if he/she is or should he/she be) would consider coming out of the closet at the school centre in order to be a positive reference to the students and colleagues. We appreciate that, although most of the teachers work in favour of sexual-affective and gender identities diversity [Figure 80], 26% of them do not know or do not want to reply. Although the amount of those who would come or have come out of the closet (56%) is
higher almost half of them show doubts or would not do it; the reason for it might be the prejudiced and LGBT-phobic environment. If there were no such rejection, probably 100% of the workers of the centres would not have an issue with coming out of the closet.

When we analyse the opinion of the DO staff on whether the coordination instances of the centre (CCP, etc.) would accept a proposal to work on the respect of sexual-affective diversity and gender identity in order to prevent LGBT-phobic school bullying, 69% said “yes”, 23% do not know/do not reply and 8% said “no”. The tutors were also asked whether they considered that the institutionalized framework they work in is suitable to deal with the issue of sexual-affective diversity and gender identity and intervene in cases of bullying/counselling of LGBT students, half of them stated they do not have the suitable institutional frame; this might also explain the lack of coordination with the rest of the teachers.

This draws the picture of a complex educational frame where some teachers try to provide the students an education in the respect of diversity, although too often the very teachers and the very organisation of the educational centre are hindering their work in favour of tolerance.

![Figure 80. Replies of the teachers when asked if they would come out of the closet if they were LGBT in order to become a positive reference at their education centre; of the tutors when asked whether they consider the current frame adequate to work on sexual-affective diversity; of the staff of the DO when asked whether the coordination organs would accept an educational proposal to prevent LGBT-phobic bullying.](image)

Conclusion on the work of the teachers

The institutional frame does not always legitimise teachers when acting to reject LGBT-phobia explicitly and the very teachers will actually be afraid of being shown as LGBT at the education centre. The coordination of the tutors is not as intense as it should due to the lack of a suitable institutional framework. The families remain apart and the treatment of sexual-affective diversity is not viewed by all the didactic departments as a priority. The work of the teachers depends exclusively on their own interest and individual commitment to deal with these issues, a task they carry out too often without specific training or material resources to support it and which typically takes place solely in the classrooms but does not reach the educational community as a whole.

As shown on several occasions, the material, protocols and ideas exist already (see the guide “Abrazar a la Diversidad” - Embracing Diversity; our website or the adaptation in Spanish made
by COGAM of the project “Crossing diversity”). Individuals specialized in these issues can be
found in some primary or secondary education centres and in LGBT groups with a professional
and experienced education group. Nevertheless willingness and real political and
administrative measures are necessary to allow the staff of all the education centres to get in
touch with such specialists and provide the staff with the necessary resources.

5.3 Rejection of sexual-affective diversity

In the preceding items we have mentioned to what extent victims of LGBT-phobic physical
aggression are particularly vulnerable since they do not have enough support from their families
[Figure 16]. It has also been shown that family acceptance is not homogeneous for all the
sexual-affective orientations [Figure 19]. Also, the rejection LGB students meet within their
families has been considered to be one of the deciding factors on the coming out at the
education centre [Figure 28]. In this section we will try to enlarge the analysis to all the students
in order to know the attitudes the students perceive within their families towards sexual-
affective diversity and gender identities and the impact this may have on their own behaviour.

Half of the students (51%) show doubts to some extent when asked if they would be accepted
by their families if they felt attracted by a person of the same sex; the other half (49%) perceive
a total acceptance within their family environment [Figure 81]. We must put the focus on the
increase of the students who believe they would not be fully supported by their families when
we compare these figures and those of our previous study (COGAM, 2013, page 33). We do not
know the exact reasons which might have an impact on the increase of LGBT-phobia the
students perceive within their families but the fact is that this increase corresponds to a
succession of LGBT-phobic events, either at national or international levels (see Annex I).

This kind of hate crime (see glossary) dehumanize the LGBT community and might be
reactivating LGBT-phobic ideologies in the Madrilian society and reinforcing the many
stereotypes and prejudices at social level about non normative sexual-affective orientations and
gender identities. For instance, as in the trend to link homosexual males with effeminate
manners, promiscuity and emotional unrest (Strelkov, 2004), marked and punished by sexism
traditions. This fact must be confronted with the positive response taking place within the
school; so students might be receiving contradictory feedback from the family and the teachers.
It is thus essential that families and teachers work together to chase intolerance from the
school. It is urgent that all authorities publicly condemn hate crimes based on the sexual-
affective orientation or gender identity. Adequate funding must be provided for the
implementation and maintenance of political, judiciary, educational, social and cultural
measures in order to protect the LGBT community and chase the hate ideologies from the
family environment of the students of the Madrid region and obviously of the rest of the
country.
This study has not perceived significant gender-based differences [Figure 82] although the percentage of boys who believe they would not receive any support from their families is 4,5% higher than the girls'. As already shown [Figure 60], the descent of parents/tutors does seem to make a difference to the perception of family support for homosexuals or bisexuals; and youngsters with Spanish legal tutors state they would receive a higher degree of support and acceptance when compared to their fellow students whose parents come from another of the 8 countries most represented in this study.

“I am a Lesbian. I’m afraid of coming out of the closet because of my parents but I know my school mates will support me, but I have got to wait to be sure for real.”

(Homosexual Girl, 3rd Grade, ESO)

Although the results do not show great differences about family acceptance based on the socio-economic profile of the city or district of the students [Figure 83], those coming from cities with high or high-average incomes state they feel they would receive more family support in case they were homosexual or bisexual; the increase of students who feel they would face a frontal rejection from their families if they were LGB is particularly significant when we compare highest and lowest incomes. This fact might be related to the political correctness we discussed already and is also consistent with the trends established for the amount of witnesses of verbal aggression.
If we analyse the data by grades [Figure 84], between the 1st and the 4th grade of ESO, it remains stable with about 50% of the students believing their families would totally support them if they were attracted by somebody of their own sex, while the other half feels diverse degrees of rejection. The more pessimistic are the PCPI/FPB students because they consider to a higher degree that their families would not support them (28,57% compared to date of between 16,55% and 8,25% in other degrees); this might explain the high levels of prejudice and LGBT-phobic behaviour established for these programmes in the preceding items of this study. They are also those who expect a lowest degree of family support (30,16%, compared with between 43,17% and 50,25%). We also identify a trend of less “do not agree at all” responses from the first to last grades of secondary education and high school diploma, which leads to an increase of intermediate responses. This trend could very well be one of the reasons explaining the lower degree of LGBT-phobia as the age of the students increase, as shown in preceding items, but it might also be a more optimistic vision the students have of the reaction of their family, conditioned by their vision of sexual-affective diversity.

If, as in the case of the action of teachers, we compare this data with the attitude of the students facing an act of LGBT-phobia [Figure 85], we may determine that the expectancy of lack of support from their families if they were LGBT (and thus a higher degree of family LGBT-phobia) may lead them to commit a higher amount of acts of LGBT-phobic violence: students who join an LGBT-phobic act, laughing at the victim and insulting him consider (with percentages much higher than those of the other students) that they would not receive any support at all from their families. The students not joining the LGBT-phobic act are those who perceive a lower degree of family LGBT-phobia. Last but not least, those students taking a more passive attitude towards an LGBT-phobic assault state they expect a lower degree of family tolerance towards
non heteronormative orientations than those who declare they would defend the victim. Such results, replicated in comparison with the preceding study (COGAM, 2013, page 33), confirm that the level of LGBT-phobia perceived by the students in their family environment is a decisive factor of the behaviour and the attitudes they will develop towards sexual-affective diversity. This is why implementing training and information measures directed towards parents and/or legal tutors of the students is crucial. Otherwise, the activity of the teachers in this respect will be facing the prejudices and hate ideologies which might be present in the, otherwise so important, family environment.

“My family is rather conservative and I don’t know if they would accept me if I had a same-sex orientation. In my class and at school I feel that LGBT people are considered as different.”

(Homosexual girl, 4th grade, ESO)

This study shows again the evidence (COGAM, 2013, page 37) of the impact family rejection does have on the behaviour of the very LGB student. The higher the family rejection, the clearer the trend is of the students to tend less to defend their LGB fellow students against LGBT-phobic aggression [Figure 86]; while most of the students choose the option “I don’t like it but I don’t do anything”, those who face a higher degree of rejection from their families choose the option “I don’t know”. This proves that a rejection of the family to sexual-affective diversity means that LGB students will assimilate and assume LGBT-phobia and will be unable to react when facing situations of school bullying based on sexual-affective orientation or gender identity. Also, the percentage of LGB students stating they take part in LGBT-phobic bullying increases remarkably among those who expect frontal rejection by their families. This probably happens because of the “fear of stigmatisation”, which causes a student (whatever his/her sexual orientation) not to react or even not joining the action against another student in order to avoid becoming a victim him/herself or be identified as LGB. So, frontal family rejection towards sexual-affective diversity may turn LGB students in tormentors of their own LGB fellow students.
Final reflection for the educational community

Socialisation and affection are the main engines in people's lives. Adolescence is a key moment for the affective-social development and several extremely diverse factors have an impact on it such as family, friends and the whole community. They provide the teenagers with patterns, models and referents. Lesbian, gay, bisexual and trans* students suffer because they can not find their own space in this complex map, which entails a strong alienation and a feeling of deep loss. Along with this, the puberty development of this stage may entail a real martyrdom for trans* students because of the transphobia still present at the education centres. What are the responses provided to LGBT students? Who is in charge of responding to their needs within the educational community?

They will find few responses to those questions in their text books, where sexual-affective and gender identities diversity have been wiped out and made invisible in history, literature or biology. In the unlikely event of a mention, it will be vague and not necessarily correct. School libraries won't provide any further information since they lack books discussing these issues. Subjects like ethics, citizenship or philosophy might provide appropriate spaces for questioning the hegemonic heteronormativity and cisnormativity but they do not reach all students and their position has become more than precarious since the current education law has completely devaluated their roles. What happens with transversality if all teachers state they lack the specific training to face these issues? Where can the referents be found if not among family and friends and if LGBT teachers do not dare to become visible as such? What happens with care of sexual-affective and gender identities diversity, inclusive education and prevention of LGBT-phobic bullying if they depend solely on the conviction, the willingness and the individual initiative of the teachers?

We live in a knowledge society and can just not afford to think that the students won't consider these issues or think that if we (the education community) do not provide the responses they will not look for them by themselves. Students will seek responses to their worries using the means within their reach; they will obtain information not adapted to their educational needs, incomplete or distorted by intolerant speeches based, to a good measure, upon the supremacy of the heterosexual white male, who displays attitudes considered masculine. The consequence
thereof is a variable discrimination depending on the case; the more such factors are present in a student, the more the discrimination will increase. Education centres provide the opportunity to teach and experience coexistence on equal footing of all diversities in theory and in practice. Human beings are social beings per definition; this is why we draw the attention to the fact that isolation and exclusion are real dangers threatening children who do not seem to conform to the dominant pattern of their gender and/or sexual-affective orientation. Whenever did civic and professional ethics conceive such a negligence as letting down a child right in the middle of his/her social-affective development and expose him/her to the need of attempting to form his/her own identity by confronting his/her personal needs with the most ferocious of LGBT-phobias he/she may come across?

Education is not only the responsibility of the family and the educational institutions, but it is a joint task of society. We all educate and we all have a responsibility within the society, which is actually a large educational community Parents, legal tutors, teachers and non-teaching staff in educational centres, mass media and other institutions, of public or private nature, we all are educational agents. Only measures seeking cooperation and creation of real networks against LGBT-phobia, involving the society as a whole, will end with the plague of intolerance, violence and hate speech against sexual-affective and gender identities diversity.

The volunteers of the COGAM Education group are willing to assist and we encourage all citizens to defend freedom, equality and solidarity as essential values for democratic coexistence and social inclusion of the LGBT’s Getting our youngster to acknowledge such values is an act of justice and solidarity towards those who have been or are victims of any kind of LGBT-phobic violence. Acquiring such compromise and actively taking part in the transformation of our society, contributing to development of this virtue called tolerance towards sexual-affective and gender identities diversity among the students is simply part of our responsibility as citizens.

COGAM Education Group
Conclusions

Once again, the results of this investigation show evidence: **tolerance towards sexual-affective and gender identities diversity is a virtue which must be promoted and made explicit via the compulsory curriculum, the training of the teachers and turn into a goal of the educational community as a whole** (UNESCO, 2012). Tolerance is the basis for developing pro-social attitudes and behaviours such as: solidarity, responsibility and justice towards bullying at school and violence inflicted on LGBT students. Such attitudes are inexorably part of the targets to be obtained in order to make the students turn into participating and actively engaged citizens who transform their reality by including therein the interculturalism and the social inclusion who are an integrating part of the democratic coexistence in non-violence and peace (UNESCO, 1995).

This is the only way to safeguard the right of LGBT students to experience the development of their sexual-affective orientation and their gender identity in a healthy way, on equal footing and ensure that our society does not perpetuate the hate crimes committed (ILGA, 2015; Ministerio del Interior, 2014; OSCE-ODIHR, 2014; FRA, 2013; FELGTB, 2013; see Annex III), throughout the times (Fone, 2000; Borrillo, 2001; Ugarte, 2003; Ugarte,2004; Tin, 2012;) against the licit and legitimate sexual-affective and gender identities diversity (**Yogyakarta principles, 2007**). The main findings of this study are:

**On gender identity and sexual-affective orientation of the students.**

- Prevalence of trans* students estimated by this study in the classrooms of the Madrid Region (CAM) is 1,6/1.000.
- 60% of secondary education centres in the CAM might have a trans* student.
- The percentage of non heterosexuals students in the CAM may be 15%.
- The total of students in the CAM identifying with a sexual-affective non heterosexual orientation might be up to 15,1%.
- There is apparently a gender bias in the case of boys which hampers the development of self-identification with a non normative orientation during the secondary education.

**On general perception of LGBT-phobia in the education environment.**

- Although a higher percentage of students shows less doubts and rather perceives equal treatment, the percentage of students perceiving discrimination remains unchanged.
- Students of intermediate courses of ESO and PCP/FPB perceive a higher degree of discrimination. A lower degree of LGBT-phobia is perceived in High School Diploma courses.
- Although a higher percentage of students show less doubts and expects to be accepted if they were LGBT, 1 out of 3 students in Secondary Education would not come out.
- 70% of the students consider that a transsexual student would not receive total acceptance in their classrooms.
- 7% of the students have witnessed physic LGBT-phobic aggression in their education centre.
- 6 out of 10 students have witnessed verbal LGBT-phobic aggression in their education centre.
- Sometimes LGBT-phobic aggression may not be identifiable as such since it occurs without LGBT-phobic verbal abuse.
On the experience of students in secondary education who will not meet the heterocisnormative canons.

- In comparison with 2013, a higher number of victims of LGBT-phobic violence was recorded. The victims of this increase are mostly heterosexual students.
- LGBT-phobic violence does not only affect LGBT students. Often heterosexuals who “look like” LGBT’s also suffer part of such violence.
- In this precise case, the heterosexuals are mostly victims of the increase of violence; that is, the percentage of victims increases, not because there are more LGBT victims than in 2013 but because there are more heterosexual victims.
- 1 out of 100 students of secondary education have suffered physical aggression because of being or “looking” LGBT.
- 3 out of 100 students of secondary education have suffered physical aggression because of being or “looking” LGBT.
- 5% of the LGB students have suffered physical aggression because of their sexual-affective orientation.
- 2 out of 10 LGB students have suffered verbal aggression because of their sexual-affective orientation.
- 70-80% of LGB students hear how their sexual-affective orientation is used as an insult in their education centres.
- LGBT-phobic violence, physical and verbal, is suffered by boys and by girls but boys are victims of it to a higher degree.
- There are high levels of biphobia.
- The number of victims is higher in the 1st than in the 2nd cycle of ESO.
- Given the persistence of aggression and the fact that 25% of LGB students still feel discriminated in their education centre, an increase in the perception of equality compared to previous years has been recorded.
- Half of the trans* students of our sample consider that their education centre discriminates LGBT people.
- Although in most cases the rejection is not open, the trans* students in our sample perceive transphobia in their classrooms.
- Trans* students have a high risk of suffering LGBT-phobic aggression.
- We have detected higher levels of rejection of LGB students by their own families when compared to 2013.
- LGB males are still the ones facing more open rejection by their families.
- High levels of biphobia are recorded in the families of bisexual students.
- Although they face less open rejection, lesbians have lower levels of total acceptance in their families than gays.
- Family rejection of sexual-affective diversity, along with the perception of lack of support of teachers and the assumption of LGBT-phobic prejudices may hamper the development of sexual-affective identity of the students.
- 80% of LGB students have not come out of the closet.
- Those leaving the closet must face a hostile environment at any education stage, particularly in PCPI/FPB grades and, to a lesser degree, in high school diploma grades.
Becoming visible as LGB in the educational environment multiplies by three the risk of suffering verbal or physical aggression.

Witnesses of physical or verbal aggression report the lack of intervention of the teachers.

While verbal violence is tolerated or ignored to a higher degree, situations of extreme LGBT-phobic physical violence force the students to take sides for or against the abuse.

Violence situations have an influence on the choice of LGB students on whether they become visible or not. They may choose coming out of the closet or staying in. What will happen depends on the attitude of the other students about the bullying.

The perception of a total lack of action by the teachers is a clear deterrent for LGB students who consider coming out of the closet.

The higher the family rejection towards sexual-affective diversity of their children, the higher the percentage of students who choose repressing their visibility at the education centre.

Levels of internalized LGBT-phobia are higher among students who have not left the closet in their education environment. There is a rejection of the own sexuality, fear of becoming the stereotype of LGB person, perception of a lesser ability to act as father/mother or even internalizing the idea that they deserve less rights than the rest.

**On the individual behaviour of the students when facing LGBT-phobic bullying situations.**

- 51% of the students do not react against bullying.
- 2 out of 100 students openly acknowledge their participation in bullying episodes. The more violence is perceived in the education centre (up to 10% for physical violence), the more this percentage increases. Age and educational level diminish the degree of violence of the students. The inherent school failure and feeling of social exclusion (e.g. PCPI students) contribute to a more violent response of the students. Almost 80% of the students who admit taking part in bullying are heterosexual men.
- In situations of extreme violence LGB students may join bullying against students sharing their own sexual orientation (probably in order to avoid being themselves victims of aggression).
- Defending LGB fellow students entails a high risk of suffering verbal and physical aggression.
- Those defending their fellow students against LGBT-phobic bullying are those who contribute to a higher degree to the generation of a safer and freer educational environment. If students perceive a lower degree of discrimination, they would be more ready to come out of the closet and would accept more a transsexual fellow student.
- Students with LGBT-phobic conducts play a relevant role in the construction of a school environment hostile to LGBT students.

**About stereotypes and prejudices as basis for LGBT-phobic behaviour.**

- Prejudices and intolerant attitudes against LGBT people are directly related with LGBT-phobia and violent behaviour of the students.
- Although there has been an improvement since 2013, 40% of students still consider that sexual-affective orientation may be changed by trying hard enough. The percentage of those
agreeing with the idea diminishes as the students grow older; the percentage of those agreeing with this idea is remarkably high in PCPI/FPB.

- The depathologisation of transsexuality among youngsters has improved since 2013; the percentage of students who does not consider transsexuality as a disease is about 90% in all grades (except PCPI/FPB).
- 15% of the students still believe LGBT people should not have the same rights as heterosexuals; this percentage is lower in the first grades of ESO. The percentage is remarkably high in PCPI/FPB.
- Some of the students show false signs of tolerance when they state they respect rights but then fail to consider other sexual-affective and gender identities orientations just as “valid” as heterosexual or cosexual orientations.
- Almost 30% of the students show displeasure (social disgust) when two people of the same sex kiss. This percentage is higher in the first levels of ESO and PCPI/FPB. And the percentage is also higher when two men kiss (compared to two women kissing).
- Gender stereotypes and sexism are directly related with behavioural LGBT-phobia of the students: the more LGBT-phobic the behaviour of the students is, the more they tend to agree with the idea that effeminacy in boys or masculine looks in girls are directly related with homosexuality and the more they will tend to react against two boys kissing (compared to two girls kissing). This gender difference is actually more usual among heterosexual bullies than among bullies who are not sexually attracted to women. The reaction is thus probably linked to the objectification of women and the heterosexist sexual bullying.
- Pathologisation of transsexuality is directly related to the discrimination and exclusion of trans* people at their education centre and and generates a discriminatory bias of the opinions of the students about the ability of trans* people to be good parents.
- The respect towards homoparental families has increased slightly but is still insufficient (77,75%). Trans* parents obtain a lower degree of acceptance (71,82%). Prejudices against family diversity are higher in the first grades of secondary education and PCPI/FPB.

About gender differences.

- Although boys are slightly more LGBT-phobic as much as their knowledge and attitudes are concerned, the conception of masculinity within the binarist framework leads to a higher degree of participation of boys in violent acts and also to them becoming the main targets of the aggression.
- Boys are more likely to take part in the aggression (1 out of 40) and select more passive or doubtful options than girls, who will tend to defend the victim of bullying more than boys and are less likely to take part in the bullying (1 out of 200).
- Political correctness and the assumption of rules might be hampering the rejection and violence attitudes promoted by a traditional approach to masculinity.
- Being a boy who will not fit in the gender and sexual orientation patterns exposes him to physical aggression twice as much than being a girl in the same situation.
- The girls consider there is no difference between the facts that two men or two women kiss. Boys consider there is a difference if two boys kiss. This exposes girls victims of LGBT-phobia to be victims of bullying and sexism violence.
About cultural diversity and socioeconomic level.

- There are differences in the level of family acceptance of sexual-affective diversity of the offspring depending on the origin of parents.
- Although there are differences about the family acceptance, no relevant differences were found about the stereotypes and prejudices of the students depending on the origin of the parents.
- Lack of acknowledgement of LGBT rights in the countries of origin of the parents may be related to their degree of agreement with certain prejudices.
- Students with foreign parents as well as those from different ethnic origins, different cultures or different skin colours may be victims not only of LGBT-phobia but also of xenophobia, racism, discrimination or multiple intolerances.
- No relevant evidence has been obtained allowing us to say the the socioeconomic level has an impact on the student having LGBT-phobic behaviour or becoming a victim of it.

About the response of teachers and relatives of the students against discrimination.

- Although it has improved when compared with 2003, still 52% of the students show their discrepancies with the idea that teachers support the students who are victims of LGBT-phobic insults. The percentage of discrepancy increases in the last grades of ESO and the total disagreement is relevantly high in PCPI/FPB grades.
- The feeling of impunity at the education centre experienced by some students may lead them to be more likely to commit acts of LGBT-phobic violence.
- The teachers themselves report fear of becoming visible as LGBT at their education centre.
- Not all education centres back teachers when they act against LGBT-phobic bullying or educate in respecting sexual-affective and gender identities diversity since the centres fail to condemn homophobia explicitly in the centre documents.
- Quite often the coordination of the tutorial action doesn’t take place because of the lack of an adequate institutional framework. Families are left aside and the treatment of affective-sexual diversity is not considered as a priority by all the didactic departments.
- Teachers report they lack the specific training and the material resources supporting their action against LGBT-phobic bullying and in education respecting sexual-affective diversity.
- To that respect, the work made by teachers is solely dependant on their interest and individual commitment to train and try to discuss sexual-affective and gender identities diversity in the subjects they teach, in the tutorials or at the Department of Orientation.
- Half of the students show doubts about whether their families would accept them if they were LGBT. Such figure has increased since our last study and we must consider it compared with a positive data: the action of teachers.
- Family support does not vary to a significant degree according to the gender of the students or their socioeconomic profile. From the first ESO degrees until the High School Diploma the open rejection reduces while the percentages of students perceiving intermediate situations increases. Let's stress the high percentage of those expecting rejection in the PCPI/FPB groups.
• Perception of LGBT-phobia within the family may lead the students to be more likely to commit LGBT-phobia acts.
• The rejection by the family to sexual-affective diversity implies that LGBT students assimilate and assume homophobia. They will be unable to respond when confronted to situations of school bullying motivated by the sexual-affective orientation or gender identity. They will even take part in the bullying in order to avoid becoming victims of bullying themselves.
Proposals for action

The best way to prevent LGBT-phobic violence is the education in moral values for democratic coexistence; that is, learning to coexist in respect of Human Rights which are actually inspired by values such as freedom, equal rights and equal chances and solidarity; values which eliminate intolerance and violence.

It is thus essential that the education community as a whole promotes among the student the development of attitudes and behaviour typical of an autonomous morale based upon tolerance; contributing to develop (pro-) social and civic attitudes and competences whose sources are respect (consideration), acceptance and valuation of diversity. This is the only way our students will become responsible citizens, fair, solidarity, participative and committed with the active transformation of their reality by means of interculturalism and social inclusion. These will be the tools for reaching a democratic coexistence based upon non-violence and peace.

Tolerance is reached through a careful process of emotional development (e.g. by promoting empathy) and cognitive development (e.g. by promoting cognitive process allowing critical thinking, social assessment ability and capacity to make choices). We present hereinafter a listing of proposals for action we deem essential in order to reach these goals.

It is essential to provide funding, material and human resources in order to ensure:

1) That all the people with positions with a social responsibility publicly and bluntly condemn the hate speech and the hate crimes based on intolerance towards sexual affective orientations and gender identities. These officials must receive the adequate training about affective-sexual affection and gender identities diversity and implement every measure they can in order to protect the liberties of the LGBT community. All people who use their public function or position or social responsibility to promote or cooperate in spreading hate speeches against LGBT’s or put their rights and freedoms at risk, by action or omission, must be dismissed immediately.

2) Campaigns and plans at national, regional and local level must be implemented in order to bring education of the respect of sexual-affective and gender identities diversity to all households in order to eliminate hate ideologies and LGBT-phobic prejudices from the family environment of the students.

3) School centres must become the main change generator about social attitudes towards sexual-affective and gender identities diversity for the citizens of the future as well as for the current education context. Some measures to reach this goal are:

14 Please refer to pages 58 to 63 of the study “Homofobia en las aulas 2013. ¿Educamos en la diversidad afectivo-sexual?” (Homophobia in classrooms 2013. Are we educating in affective-sexual diversity?) for a greater detail of such proposals.
• It must be ensured that the **State Education Inspectorate** controls and corrects specifically the levels of LGBT-phobia among the staff serving at the education centres; the Inspectorate must also be ready to intervene and solve any situation of LGBT-phobic bullying.

• It must be ensured that all the staff, teaching and well as non-teaching at education centres receives training on the respect of the sexual-affective and gender identities diversity with the assistance of specialists who perceive such diversity as an added value and not as a problem to solve.

• Care of sexual-affective and gender identities diversity, as well as prevention, detection and intervention against LGBT-phobic school bullying must be included in the university curricula of key professions as education, social work or psychology.

• Educational centres must be provided with material (bibliographic or other) aimed at training the teachers and educating the students about the sexual-affective and gender identities diversity. Such material must be adapted to the age of the students and the educational context.

• Until each and everyone of the teachers is not in a suitable professional background and has not received the adequate training to teach tolerance towards sexual-affective and genders identities diversity with a transversal approach within the subject he/she teaches, all the students must receive this training by means of an specific subject with specialised teachers.

• Educational centres must become gender neutral and ensure the total inclusion of the students; also those who do not fit in with the traditional gender roles.

• All education centres must make explicit in their documents (PEC, RRI, etc.) their rejection towards any intolerance display towards sexual-affective and gender identities diversity.

• All education centres must have protocols and plans on the prevention, detection, claim, intervention and penalization of behaviours limiting the rights and freedoms of LGBT students. Such protocols and plans must involve and enable the training, not only of teachers but also of students and families. It is essential not to wait until the presence of LGBT students or staff to start educating within the respect of diversity, as well as educate the students in the peaceful solution of conflicts while clearly defining the limits of insult.

• All the didactic departments must include specifically in their programs the care and education about the respect of the sexual-affective and gender identities diversity.

• The measures of care of diversity aimed at preventing the school failure must not lead to the exclusion and marginalisation of the students concerned.

• Measures must be implemented and improved promoting the inclusion of immigrant students and aimed at fighting racism, xenophobia and LGBT-phobia.

4) **The NGO's** developing programs of educational intervention in this area **must be provided with the necessary funding** allowing them the access of the staff and materials needed to develop their work.
Glossary

This glossary has a nested structure, so the global understanding of each concept is reached reading also the entries recommended between brackets at the end of each entry.

Aporophobia: any type of intolerant conception, attitude or behaviour against individuals with less economic resources (See entry: “Tolerance”).

Asexual: an affective orientation does not always entail a sexual orientation (and if both are found in the same individual, they must not be coincident; asexual is the individual who does not experience the need of sexual contacts. (See entry: Sexual-affective orientation).

Assigned sex/gender: (sometimes: biological sex): clinical distinction by which, at birth, the individuals of the human species are categorised as men or women according to their biological sexual features. This is a cisnormative criterium, based on the binary gender, which takes it for granted that a masculine anatomy goes with a masculine gender identity and a feminine anatomy with a feminine gender identity; but these do not necessarily coincide with the felt sex. Not to be confused with biological sex (See entries: “Binary gender”, “Cisnormativity”, “Transsexual”, “Felt sex” and “Biological sex”).

Biological sex: in the case of methanous with sexual reproduction, the ability to produce macrogametes (in the case of females), microgametes (machos) or both types of reproduction cells (hermaphrodites or monoic species; the human species being dioic, saying “hermaphrodite people” is a conceptual mistake). Not to be confused with assigned sex or sexual dimorphism (See entries: “Assigned sex” and “Sexual dimorphism”).

Biphobia: Any type of intolerant conception, attitude or behaviour against bisexuals. (See entries: “LGBT” and “LGBT-phobia”.)

Bisexuality: Individual whose affective and/or sexual attraction is oriented towards people with a gender different or similar to his. Not necessarily at the same time, in the same way or to the same degree. (See entry: Sexual-affective orientation).

Ciberharassment (sometimes: cyberbullying): school bullying which takes place through information and communication technologies. (See entry: “School bullying”).

Cisexual/Cisgender: individual meeting the gender binary roles criteria; particularly the pattern where the sex assigned coincides with the gender and sex felt. (See: “Gender binary roles”).

Cisnormativity: Ideological system imposing universal cissexuality. (See entries: “Cisexual/cisgender”, “transphobia”).

Come out of the closet: communicate publicly the own sexual orientation. Once or several times and with the people one deems suitable. (See entry: “To out somebody”).

Felt gender: ensemble of emotions, feelings, behaviours, anatomies, attitudes, lifestyles, ways of living, etc., related with the gender the person identifies with and defining his/her gender identity (the implications of the “gender label”). There are as many individuals as ways to feel the gender. Not to be confused with “gender expression”. The gender may not be felt, as in the case of people with an agender identity. (See entry: “Gender”).

Felt sense (sometimes: psychological sense or sexual identity): set of biological sexual features a person feels as his/her own. (See entry: “Transsexual”).

Gay: man whose sexual and/or affective attraction is orientated towards other men. (See entry: Sexual-affective orientation).

Gender binary roles (sometimes: “traditional gender roles”): feelings, emotions, attitudes, behaviours, anatomies, styles, ways of life or even alleged abilities socially associated to the men’s or the woman’s identity. (See entries “Binomial gender”).

Gender (binary) stereotypes: given ideas on gender identity and felt gender by a person. These ideas are based upon the fact that the gender reading we make of this person lead us to consider that he/she possesses some gender features or shows a gender expression which coincides (either totally or to some degree) with gender binary roles. (See entries: “LGBT-phobic stereotypes”, “Binomial gender”, “Gender reading” and “Binary gender roles”).

Gender expression (sometimes: “gender role” or “social sex”): ensemble of gender roles taken by a person. They do not necessarily coincide with the “Gender identity” or the “Felt Gender”. (See entries: “Gender” e “Gender identity”).

Gender identity (sometimes: “social sex”): label or “noun” which implies the recognition of the individual, the identification or self-identification in one or several ways to experience the gender. It may (not necessarily) entail a feeling of self-identification and belonging to a certain group of individuals who share that “felt gender”, totally or partially. It is not necessarily a part of the gender expression (particularly in environments with high degrees of transphobia). (See entries: “Gender”, “Felt gender” and “Transphobia”).
Gender reading: mental process, conscious or not, which tries to determine and assigns a possible gender identity to an individual according to his/her gender expression or based upon gender stereotypes (See entries: “Gender”, “Gender stereotypes”).

Gender roles: Attitudes, behaviours, anatomies, styles, ways of life related with the gender this people use to interact socially (See entries: “Gender” and “Gender expression”).

Gender: socio-cultural learnt construction depending on the historical moment, part of the collective idea and which may include emotions, feelings, behaviours, anatomies, attitudes, lifestyles, ways of living, etc., which are used to identify the individuals of a social group. Their forms of expression are varied. Not to be confused with the concepts: “binomial gender” or “sexual affective orientation” (See entries: “Gender identity”, “Binomial gender” and “Sexual-affective orientation”).

Hate crimes: Any crime or offence made against people, social groups or assets if the selection of the victim, premises or target of such action has been motivated by prejudices or social hate because of the condition of the victim, his/her connections, his/her belonging or relation with a precise social group, be it defined by its origin (national, ethnic or racial), its language, skin colour, religion, gender, age, mental or physical disability, sexual orientation, homelessness, disease, physical looks or any other factor related with hate, phobia or rejection of the difference or because the victim fails to fit in his/her particular preset conceptions. The Spanish penal code provides the elements to pursue and punish this kind of crimes (for instance, the article 22 on aggravating circumstances). (See entry: “Heterophobia”)

Heteronormativity (sometimes: heterosexism: ideological system imposing universal heterosexuality. (See entries: “Cisexual/Cisgender” and “Transphobia”).

Heteropatriarchy: heteronormative and sexist machist-biased social system. (See entries: “Heteronormativity” and “Sexism”).

Heterophobia: hate, phobia or irrational rejection of the difference, of what fails to fit in particular preset conceptions. Not to be used to refer to the rejection of the heteronormative system or to refer to rejection ideas or behaviours responding to the oppression exercised by such. (See entries: “Heteronormativity”, “Intolerance”).

Heterosexual: person whose affective and/or sexual attraction is orientated solely towards person of different sex/gender. (See entry: “Sexual-affective orientation”).

Homophobia: any type of conception, attitude or behaviour intolerant towards homosexual people. Sometimes used as a synonym of LGBT-phobia or to define the perception, attitude or behaviour intolerant towards gays. (See entries: “LGBT” and “LGBT-phobia”).

Homosexual: person whose affective and/or sexual attraction is orientated solely towards person of the same sex/gender. (See entries: “Sexual-affective orientation”, “Gay” and “lesbian”)

Internalised LGBT-phobia: any aversive conception, attitude or behaviour towards the own sexual-affective orientation. It is originated by living in a society stigmatizing LGBT individuals. (See entry: “LGBT”).

Intersexual: individual whose sexual features differ from the sexual dimorphism, which is a major feature of the human species. Not to be confounded with hermaphrodite. (See entry “Biological sex”).

Lesbian: woman whose sexual and/or affective attraction is orientated towards other women. (See entry: Sexual-affective orientation).

Lesbophobia: any type of intolerant approach, attitude or behaviour towards lesbians. (See entries: “LGBT” and “LGBT-phobia”).

LGB: acronym defining both the homosexual and bisexual sexual-affective orientations. Not to be confounded with LGBT. (See entries: “LGBT”, “Homosexual” and “Bisexual”).

LGBT (LGTB or LGBT*, sometimes: GLBT, LGTBI, LGTBIQ, LGBTIQ+ etc.): acronym defining lesbians, gays, bisexuals, trans* and intersexuals as a community victim of intolerance because the do not fit in with “normality”. Not to be confounded with LGB. (See entries: “LGBT-phobia”, “sexual-affective orientation”, “Trans**”, “Intersexual”, “Cisnormativity”, “Heteronormativity”).


LGBT-phobic prejudices: preconceptions on LGBT individuals accompanied by a negative emotional reaction and who end up in value judgements and intolerant attitudes towards such individuals and those fitting within such prejudices. (See entry: “LGBT-phobia”).

LGBT-phobic stereotypes: given ideas on LGBT people which simplify and regulate their reality. Not to confound with “LGBT-phobic prejudices”. (See entries: “LGBT”, “Binomial gender” and “LGBT-phobic prejudices”).

Sexism: any intolerant conception attitude or behaviour towards individuals not fitting within the masculine gender identity defined by the gender binary roles. (See entries: “Tolerance” and “binary gender”).

Pansexual: person experiencing affective and/or sexual attraction towards other people irrespective of the sex/gender (See entry: “Sexual-affective orientation”).

School bullying (sometimes called: bullying): recurrent and prolonged situation of abuse among students in which one or some of them are in a position of power against the victim(s), who lack the ability, resources or external help to face the conflict.

Sexual contacts: any physical expression of the affective and/or sexual orientation taking place with mutual consent. Some sexual practices which may take place in a sexual
relation are: kisses, caresses, embraces, coitus, etc. (See entry: "Sexual-affective orientation").

Sexual dimorphism: in diocious species, the morphological, physical or behavioural differences specific to a certain degree about the individuals of either biological sex. This concept, just like any other in Biology, does not exclude natural variations between the two extreme categories or are different or such. (See entries: "Biological sex"; "Intersexual").

Sexual-affective identity (sometimes: sexual-affective orientation): "label" or "noun" trying to describe in a simplistic way and through a generalisation process the sexual-affective orientation of an individual. It may (not necessarily) entail a feeling of self-identification and belonging to a certain group of individuals who share that "orientation", totally or partially. Not to confound with gender or sexual contact. Examples thereof: heterosexual, homosexual, bisexual (usually the use of such words belongs to a binarist approach of the gender). Another example of orientations is pansexual (in this case, the binary approach of gender does not apply) (See entries: "Gender", "LGBT", "Homosexual", "Heterosexual", "Bisexual", "Pansexual", "Asexual", "Come out of the closet" and "Sexual contact").

Sexual-affective orientation (sometimes: affective and/or sexual orientation): development of emotions, feelings, passions and/or erotic attraction towards certain features of (an)other individual(s) or the individual as a whole. It is not depending on the sex/gender of the person. Not to be confused with sexual-affective identity (although typically both terms are used equally), gender or sexual contact. It does not coincide necessarily with the orientation shown in public (particularly in highly LGBT-phobic environments). (See entries: "Sexual-affective identity", "Gender", "LGBT" and "Sexual contact").

Stigmatisation: extension of LGBT-phobic prejudices (and thence of intolerant behaviour) to the person trying to defend a victim of such prejudices. (See entry: "LGBT-phobic prejudices").

To out somebody: communicate publicly, with or without evidence, the sexual-affective orientation of somebody without his/her consentment. This is a violation of section 18 of the Spanish constitution which protects privacy.

Tolerance: respect (equalitarian consideration), acceptance and valoration of diversity.

Trans identities: all the gender identities going beyond the gender binarism and/or who do not match with the gender binary roles. E. g.: transsexual, transgender, bigender, intergender, etc. (See entries: "Gender" and "Transsexual").

Trans*: adjetivo referring to individuals with a trans* identity. (See entry: "Trans* identities").

Transphobia: any type of conception, attitude or intolerant behaviour towards trans* people. (See entries: "Trans*" and "Tolerance").

Transsexual (sometimes: Trans): transsexual is considered a trans* identity. Person who, out of a vital need, is submitted to a transsexualising process. Also used as synonym of Trans*. (See entries: "Transsexualisation process" and "Trans*").

Transsexualisation process: Set of psychological and medical/healthcare interventions aimed to accompany and direct the transition of a person from the assigned sex to the felt sex (See entries: "Assigned Sex/Gender" and "Felt sex").
References quoted


Constitución Española. (BOE núm. 311, 29 de diciembre de 1978).


Informe de la Alta Comisionada de las Naciones Unidas para los Derechos Humanos, “Leyes y prácticas discriminatorias y actos de violencia cometidos contra personas por su orientación sexual e identidad de género” (A/HRC/19/41).


Ley Orgánica 10/1995, de 23 de noviembre, del Código Penal (vigente hasta el 28 de octubre de 2015), de disposiciones generales sobre delitos. (BOE núm. 281 de 24 de Noviembre de 1995).

Ley Orgánica 2/2006, de 3 de mayo, de Educación (LOE). BOE, 4 de mayo de 2015, núm. 106.

Ley Orgánica 8/2013, de 9 de diciembre, para la mejora de la calidad educativa (LOMCE). BOE 10 de diciembre de 2013, núm. 295.


OSCE-ODIHR: Organización para la Seguridad y Cooperación en Europa-Oficina Para las Instituciones Democráticas y Derechos Humanos. (2014). Página web OSCE con resumen de reporte internacional de delitos de odio basados en la diversidad afectivo-sexual y de identidad de género & ODIHR’s 2014 Hate


Página web del servicio de endocrinología y nutrición del Hospital Ramón y Cajal [As of 22-11-2015] 114 http://www.madrid.org/cs/Satellite?c=Page&cid=1354397847175&pagename=HospitalRamonCajal%2FPage%2FHRYC_contenidoFinal


Principios de Yogyakarta. Principios sobre la aplicación de la legislación internacional de Derechos Humanos en relación con la orientación sexual e identidad de género. Available at: http://www.yogyakartaprinciples.org/ [Status as of: 8-12-2015].


Reed et al. (2009). Gender Variance in the UK: Prevalence, Incidence, Growth and Geographical Distribution. Ed. GIRES (Gender Identity Research and Education Society).


The increase of LGBT-phobic intolerance among the students of Secondary Education may be related with the increase, both at global and local levels, of the hate crimes and the hate speech towards sexual-affective and gender identities diversity. To this respect, the following table contains several news which were published while the sampling of this study was being carried out:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CONTENT</th>
<th>LINK</th>
<th>DATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><a href="http://www.elmundo.es/espana/2015/01/06/54aae990e2704eeb788b458b.html">http://www.elmundo.es/espana/2015/01/06/54aae990e2704eeb788b458b.html</a></td>
<td>08-01-2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><a href="http://www.elmundo.es/espana/2015/04/14/552d1fb268e3e8f1d8b4575.html">http://www.elmundo.es/espana/2015/04/14/552d1fb268e3e8f1d8b4575.html</a></td>
<td>14-04-2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><a href="http://www.eldiario.es/sociedad/homofobia-lgtb-discriminacion-neonazi_0_185832199.html">http://www.eldiario.es/sociedad/homofobia-lgtb-discriminacion-neonazi_0_185832199.html</a></td>
<td>14-10-2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><a href="http://www.elmundo.es/madrid/2014/12/14/548de61122601d79428b457e.html">http://www.elmundo.es/madrid/2014/12/14/548de61122601d79428b457e.html</a></td>
<td>14-12-2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LGBT-phobic statements made with total impunity by representatives of institutions belonging to the catholic hyerarchy.</td>
<td><a href="http://politica.elpais.com/politica/2015/03/13/actualidad/1426274215_231226.html">http://politica.elpais.com/politica/2015/03/13/actualidad/1426274215_231226.html</a></td>
<td>14-03-2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><a href="http://ccaa.elpais.com/ccaa/2014/10/03/catalunya/1412364693_284154.html">http://ccaa.elpais.com/ccaa/2014/10/03/catalunya/1412364693_284154.html</a></td>
<td>04-10-2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><a href="http://ccaa.elpais.com/ccaa/2013/04/10/madrid/1365597014_841869.html">http://ccaa.elpais.com/ccaa/2013/04/10/madrid/1365597014_841869.html</a></td>
<td>10-04-2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><a href="http://ccaa.elpais.com/ccaa/2012/10/22/madrid/1350929159_242511.html">http://ccaa.elpais.com/ccaa/2012/10/22/madrid/1350929159_242511.html</a></td>
<td>22-10-2012</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Annex II. Internalised LGTB-phobia among the students of this sample. Detail by sexual-affective orientation.

The choice of LGB students to leave-or not to leave- the closet depends upon a great deal of factors, internal as well as external, and personal reasons. The perception of discrimination within the educational environment, the perception of the lack of action by teachers, the lack of family support or the risk of becoming victim of physical or verbal aggression are some of the factors in the environment of the student which may have an impact on his/her fears to experience his/her own affective-sexual orientation in freedom. All of them, among with other social influences, as e.g. the stereotyped representation of the sexual-affective diversity in television programmes and in the collective imaginary (INJUVE, 201015), have an impact on the perception of the student of his/her own sexuality and therefore also on the self-assertion ability in a strongly heteronormative environment. Among the prejudices the students of our sample sample have assumed are:

“LGB people could be heterosexuals if they'd really try”

All prejudices are a little less accepted among LGB students than among heterosexual students. Nevertheless, it’s the LGB boys and those who do not define their sexual orientation who will reject more strongly their own sexuality and think they can change it if they try hard enough and then become heteronormative people.

“I dislike seeing two guys kissing”

LGB boys and those who do not define their orientation do not accept their own sexual-affective orientation; they have high levels of rejection towards the affective expression of their own sexuality.

“I dislike seeing two girls kissing”

Nevertheless among LGB girls we also find rejection of the own sexuality, particularly in the case of lesbian girls. Are those female students being victims of a sexism process of phallocentric auto-objectivation?

**“LGBT people must have the same rights as heterosexual people”**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Hetero.</th>
<th>LGB</th>
<th>Gay</th>
<th>Lesbian</th>
<th>Bisexual boy</th>
<th>Bisexual girl</th>
<th>DNK boy</th>
<th>DNK girl</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I totally agree</td>
<td>78,46%</td>
<td>87,56%</td>
<td>81,58%</td>
<td>81,58%</td>
<td>96,24%</td>
<td>96,24%</td>
<td>49,28%</td>
<td>58,39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I rather agree</td>
<td>12,13%</td>
<td>11,13%</td>
<td>7,89%</td>
<td>8,82%</td>
<td>20,23%</td>
<td>20,23%</td>
<td>19,57%</td>
<td>17,17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I somewhat agree</td>
<td>6,53%</td>
<td>6,53%</td>
<td>7,89%</td>
<td>6,82%</td>
<td>49,28%</td>
<td>49,28%</td>
<td>19,57%</td>
<td>17,17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I do not agree at all</td>
<td>3,85%</td>
<td>3,85%</td>
<td>3,85%</td>
<td>3,85%</td>
<td>49,28%</td>
<td>49,28%</td>
<td>19,57%</td>
<td>17,17%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Boys are once again those assuming LGBT-phobia to a higher degree, even denying their own rights. Rights acknowledge the dignity of people. So these students feel they are lacking in dignity.

**“LGB people can be good parents”**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Hetero.</th>
<th>LGB</th>
<th>Gay</th>
<th>Lesbian</th>
<th>Bisexual boy</th>
<th>Bisexual girl</th>
<th>DNK boy</th>
<th>DNK girl</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I totally agree</td>
<td>79,26%</td>
<td>90,69%</td>
<td>82,21%</td>
<td>82,21%</td>
<td>95,45%</td>
<td>95,45%</td>
<td>50,35%</td>
<td>70,41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I rather agree</td>
<td>12,13%</td>
<td>11,13%</td>
<td>7,89%</td>
<td>6,82%</td>
<td>19,15%</td>
<td>19,15%</td>
<td>19,15%</td>
<td>16,33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I somewhat agree</td>
<td>6,53%</td>
<td>6,53%</td>
<td>7,89%</td>
<td>6,82%</td>
<td>20,57%</td>
<td>20,57%</td>
<td>20,57%</td>
<td>16,33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I do not agree at all</td>
<td>3,85%</td>
<td>3,85%</td>
<td>3,85%</td>
<td>3,85%</td>
<td>9,93%</td>
<td>9,93%</td>
<td>9,93%</td>
<td>0,00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Once again, prejudice is more widespread among boys. However it is striking that bisexual girls believe more in their own ability to be good mothers. Maybe the possibility of building a heteronormative family model apparently reduces their levels of internalised-phobia?

**“All effeminate men/masculine women are homosexuals”**
The fear of overstepping the gender binarist canons is expressed through the assumption of the prejudice connecting effeminacy in men/masculinity in women and homosexuality; male LGB students show a higher degree of assumption of this prejudice than female LGB students (since the effeminacy of a man is more punishable in social terms than the masculinisation of a woman). Also the prejudice is higher among homosexual students than among bisexual ones (the generalised biphobia conceives bisexuality as an intermediate point between heterosexuality and homosexuality; thus the social concept of overstepping of gender binarist canons might not be such a major concern for bisexuals).
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