

SCHOOL VICTIMIZATION IN TRANSGENDER PEOPLE: A SYSTEMATIC REVIEW.

Background and justification of the subject of study:

School violence is defined as a conduct of physical and / or psychological persecution carried out by a student against another, whom he or she chooses as a victim of repeated attacks; this action, negative and intentional, places the victim in a position from which he can hardly escape by his own means; the continuity of these relationships causes the victims effects such as decreased self-esteem, anxiety states and even depressive symptoms, which hinders their integration into the school environment and normal development during their learning process (Jiménez-Barbero, Ruiz-Hernández, Llor-Esteban, & Waschler, 2016; Olweus, 1994, 1996).

According to statistical data, nine out of ten transgender teenagers are bullied at school (Greytak, Kosciw, & Diaz, 2009). Furthermore, almost half (46%) are absent from school one day a month because they feel unsafe (GLSEN, 2012). Moreover, 45% of transgender students dropped out due to bullying suffered by their peers and the transphobia developed by the institutions (UNESCO, 2012). In addition, they showed that academic performance was negatively affected by reaching low grades at the end of their studies, which negatively influenced their job expectations. (Toomey, McGuire, & Russell, 2012).

Transgender people are victims of a greater number of bullying cases than other students during the school period (Moran, Chen, & Tryon, 2018). In this sense, it has been pointed out that there are several factors that influence the victimization of transgender people during this stage (Walls et al., 2018). Evidence shows that

transgender teenagers are twice as likely to suffer truancy due to the consequences of victimization in school (Day, Perez-Brumer, & Russell, 2018). This fact hinders their training and limits their future professional development (Poteat, Mereish, DiGiovanni, & Koenig, 2011). Besides, it has been shown that the inclusion of transgender populations in the school curriculum is related to a greater perception of security by these (Toomey et al., 2012). In addition, the presence of another factor such as the support of peers, teachers and parents was related to a reduction in the negative consequences of victimization (Moran et al., 2018).

Moreover, the perception of a safe school climate has an important implication in the academic performance and psychosocial environment of transgender people (Gower, Forster, et al., 2018). The literature also highlights the need for schools to implement bullying prevention programs that address bullying based on prejudices towards transgender people (Jiménez Barbero, Ruiz Hernández, Llor Esteban, & Pérez García, 2012). Similarly, it is required to provide support to transgender youth, through the creation of support groups aimed at them, trained teachers and inclusion of content about this topic in school planning (Clark, 2017). In addition, a school climate that accepts a wider range of gender expressions for all students should be encouraged (Gower, Forster, et al., 2018). This initiative will not only favor the acceptance of these students, but also it will help to develop their social skills and enhance their personal growth (Gower, Rider, et al., 2018).

In the light of the above, I consider it of importance to investigate the different factors that influence victimization of transgender people during the school stage in order to facilitate the development of strategies that guarantee the inclusion of

transgender people in the school, offering thus a greater amount of resources that allow them to grow and develop fully in the different areas of the person.

Objective.

Examine the factors that influence the victimization of transgender people during the school stage.

Study selection criteria.

The studies were included in the review if they met the following criteria: (a) their objective should be to study bullying in transgender people; (b) the age group of the study population will cover from the beginning of the school stage until the end of the same, (a predetermined age is not set due to the variation of the ages established in the educational systems of the different countries) ; (c) the studies could present a quantitative design (observational, experimental or quasi-experimental), qualitative or mixed.

The exclusion criteria were established: (a) articles that did not raise among their objectives the study of victimization in transgender people; (b) that the study population is outside the school stage established in the inclusion criteria; (c) secondary studies (narrative or systematic reviews).

Search strategy and sources of information for the identification of studies.

A systematic search will be carried out in the following electronic databases: Pubmed / Medline, PsycINFO, Cochrane, Lilacs and Web of Science. The main descriptors used were: Transgender OR transex * OR gender incongruence AND school violence OR bullying OR school harassment OR victimization OR transphobia. The

search will be carried out by two independent researchers who will prepare lists of potentially eligible articles. These listings will be subsequently agreed, resolving disagreements through the intervention of a third reviewer.

Risk of bias assessment.

The selected studies will be subsequently subjected to risk analysis of bias, which will be carried out by two independent reviewers. The instruments used by these reviewers will be the critical evaluation and reading tools proposed by the Critical Appraisal Skills Program for qualitative studies (Cano Arana, González Gil, & Cabello López, 2010), as well as the STROBE initiative statement for observational studies (Von Elm et al., 2007) and the CONSORT statement for experimental and quasi-experimental studies (Grant, 2018). The cut-off point for the eligibility of the studies will be established based on the quality of the selected studies. Finally, reliability is calculated using an intraclass correlation analysis.

Data extraction.

The studies finally included in the systematic review will be coded in an Excel database by the first author. The coding will be reviewed by the second author, and the doubts, if they exist, will be resolved through the discussion between the two authors. Subsequently, summary tables will be created in which the data of each selected study will be recorded according to the following categories: date and country of study, research objective, size and age of the sample used, study design, monitoring, main outcome measures, significant results and conclusions.

Analysis and synthesis of scientific evidence.

For quantitative studies it is intended to perform a quantitative synthesis of the results (meta-analysis). In the event that it was not possible due to the high heterogeneity in the outcome measures, a narrative synthesis will be carried out. In the case of qualitative studies, the indications of (Williams, Smith, & Papathomas, 2014) will be taken into account. The categories obtained in the different studies will be grouped into common themes from which the narrative synthesis of the results will be developed.

Declaration of conflict of interest.

The authors declare that there is not conflict of interest.

Sources of funding.

There have not been sources of financing.

Bibliography.

Cano Arana, A., González Gil, T., & Cabello López, J. . (2010). Plantilla para ayudarte a entender un estudio cualitativo. *Guías CASPe de Lectura Crítica de La Literatura Médica, 3*, 3-8.

Clark. (2017). Transgender Students ' School Perceptions and Experiences, (17).

Collell, J., & Escudé, C. (2006). El acoso escolar: un enfoque psicopatológico. *Anuario de Psicología Clínica y de La Salud, 2*, 9–14. <https://doi.org/10.1037//1093-4510.4.2.107>

Day, J. K., Perez-Brumer, A., & Russell, S. T. (2018). Safe Schools? Transgender

Youth's School Experiences and Perceptions of School Climate. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, 47(8), 1731–1742. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10964-018-0866-x>

GLSEN. (2012). Assessing Transgender Status in Surveys of Adolescents, 1–4.

Gower, A. L., Forster, M., Gloppen, K., Johnson, A. Z., Eisenberg, M. E., Connell, J. E., & Borowsky, I. W. (2018). School Practices to Foster LGBT-Supportive Climate: Associations with Adolescent Bullying Involvement. *Prevention Science*, 19(6), 813–821. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11121-017-0847-4>

Gower, A. L., Rider, G. N., Coleman, E., Brown, C., McMorris, B. J., & Eisenberg, M. E. (2018). Perceived Gender Presentation Among Transgender and Gender Diverse Youth: Approaches to Analysis and Associations with Bullying Victimization and Emotional Distress. *LGBT Health*, 5(5), 312–319. <https://doi.org/10.1089/lgbt.2017.0176>

Grant. (2018). The CONSORT-SPI 2018 extension: a new guideline for reporting social and psychological intervention trials. *Addiction*, 1–5. <https://doi.org/10.1111/add.14411>

Greytak, E. A., Kosciw, J. G., & Diaz, E. M. (2009). Harsh Realities: The experiences of transgender youth in our nation's school. *Network*, 67.

Jiménez Barbero, J. A., Ruiz Hernández, J. A., Llor Esteban, B., & Pérez García, M. (2012). Effectiveness of antibullying school programmes: A systematic review by evidence levels. *Children and Youth Services Review*, 34(9), 1646–1658. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chillyouth.2012.04.025>

Moran, T. E., Chen, C. Y. C., & Tryon, G. S. (2018). Bully victimization, depression, and the role of protective factors among college LGBTQ students. *Journal of Community Psychology*, 46(7), 871–884. <https://doi.org/10.1002/jcop.21978>

Olweus, D. (1994). Bullying at School: Basic Facts and Effects of a School Based Intervention Program. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry*, 35(7), 1171–1190. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1469-7610.1994.tb01229.x>

Olweus, D. (1996). Bullying at school. Knowledge base and an effective intervention program. *Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences*, 794, 265–276. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1749-6632.1996.tb32527.x>

Poteat, V. P., Mereish, E. H., DiGiovanni, C. D., & Koenig, B. W. (2011). The effects of general and homophobic victimization on adolescents' psychosocial and educational concerns: The importance of intersecting identities and parent support. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 58(4), 597–609. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0025095>

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

UNESCO. (2012). *Education Sector Responses to Homophobic Bullying*.

Von Elm, E., Altman, D. G., Egger, M., Pocock, S. J., Gøtzsche, P. C., & Vandenbroucke, J. P. (2007). The Strengthening the Reporting of Observational Studies in Epidemiology (STROBE) statement: Guidelines for reporting observational studies. *PLoS Medicine*, 4(10), 1623–1627. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pmed.0040296>

Walls, N. E., Atteberry-Ash, B., Kattari, S. K., Peitzmeier, S., Kattari, L., & Langenderfer-Magruder, L. (2018). Gender Identity, Sexual Orientation, Mental Health, and Bullying as Predictors of Partner Violence in a Representative Sample of Youth. *Journal of Adolescent Health*, 64(1), 86–92.

Williams, T. L., Smith, B., & Papathomas, A. (2014). The barriers, benefits and facilitators of leisure time physical activity among people with spinal cord injury: a meta-synthesis of qualitative findings, 0–28.

Table 1. Quality assessment of included studies.

Study	Review score 1 / Total scale score	Review score 2 / Total scale score	Final value after consensus of the reviewers and / or consultation with third reviewer
(Graybill & Proctor, 2016)	11/22	12/22	11/22
(Edwards-Leeper, Leibowitz, & Sangganjanavanich, 2016)	11/22	16/22	11/22
(Moran, Chen, & Tryon, 2018)	22/25	21/25	22/25
(Walls et al., 2018)	21/25	20/25	21/25
(Reisner, Geryak, Parsons, & Ybarra, 2016)	22/25	19/25	22/25
(White, Moeller, Ivcevic, Brackett, & Stern, 2018)	21/22	18/22	21/22
(Formby, 2015)	8/10	7/10	8/10
(Day, Perez-Brumer, & Russell, 2018)	21/22	18/22	21/22
(T Hatchel, Espelage., & Huang., 2018)	20/22	17/22	20/22
(Zeluf et al., 2018)	21/22	19/22	21/22
(Poteat, Mereish, DiGiovanni, & Koenig, 2011)	20/25	21/25	20/25
(Edwards & Sylaska, 2013)	18/22	18/22	18/22
(Villaplana, 2018)	0/10	8/10	0/10
(Tyler Hatchel & Marx, 2018)	20/22	17/22	20/22
(GLSEN, 2012)	13/25	21/25	13/25
(M. E. Eisenberg, McMorris, Gower, & Chatterjee, 2016)	22/25	21/25	22/25
(Gülgöz, Gomez, DeMeules, & Olson, 2018)	20/22	20/22	20/22
(Wiederhold, 2014)	0/10	3/10	0/10
(Myers, Swearer, Martin, & Palacios, 2017)	20/22	20/22	20/22
(Dank, Lachman., Zweig., & Yahner., 2014)	18/22	15/22	18/22
(Kosciw, Greytak, & Diaz, 2009)	20/22	20/22	20/22
(Birkett, Newcomb, & Mustanski, 2015)	19/22	20/22	19/22
(Hoxmeier & Madliem, 2018)	19/22	18/22	19/22
(Jones, 2017)	18/22	18/22	18/22
(Wernick, Kulick, & Inglehart, 2013)	19/22	17/22	19/22
(Deming, Soule, Poulsen, & Walker, 2013)	0/10	6/10	0/10
(Ayuntamiento de Arganda del Rey, 2017)	7/10	6/10	7/10
(Toomey, McGuire, & Russell, 2012)	20/22	20/22	20/22
(Kulick, Wernick, Woodford, & Renn, 2017)	19/22	19/22	19/22
(Willging, Green, & Ramos, 2016)	23/25 4/10	20/25 8/10	23/25 4/10
(Bidell, 2014)	0/10	7/10	0/10
(Russell, Ryan, Toomey, Diaz, & Sanchez, 2011)	19/22	18/22	19/22
(Jauk, 2013)			
(Goodrich & Luke, 2009)	7/10	7/10	7/10
(Bragg, Renold, Ringrose, & Jackson, 2018)	16/22	17/22	16/22
(Robinson & Espelage, 2013)	10/10	6/10	10/10
(Wallen, Veenstra, Kreukels, & Cohen-Kettenis, 2010)	19/22	18/22	19/22
(Gower, Rider, et al., 2018)	19/22	19/22	19/22
(Granero Andújar, Manzano León, Andújar, & León, 2018)	20/22	18/22	20/22
(M. Eisenberg et al., 2017)	7/10	8/10	7/10
(Huebner, Thoma, & Neilands, 2016) (American Psychological Association, 2015)	21/25	20/25	21/25
(Gower, Forster, et al., 2018)	20/22	16/22	20/22
(Gower, Forster, et al., 2018)	0/10	7/10	0/10
(Mitchell, Ybarra, & Korchmaros, 2014)	19/22	15/22	19/22
(McConnell, Birkett, & Mustanski, 2017)	22/25	21/25	22/25
(Kolbert et al., 2015)	20/22	17/22	20/22
(McConnell, Birkett, Mustanski, Andrews, & Puckett, 2016)	21/22	16/22	21/22
(Clark et al., 2014)	22/25	20/25	22/25
(Lyle, Blosnich, & Kamen, 2016)	19/25		22/25
(Clark, 2017)	21/25	20/25	21/25
(Langenderfer-magruder, Walls, Whitfield, Brown, & Barrett, 2016)	10/10	9/10	10/10
	8/10	8/10	8/10