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**Purpose**

We examine associations between (i) family support during the school-age period, and school‐age bullying (short-term associations), and (ii) family support during the school-age period and workplace bullying (long-term associations) for Gay, Lesbian and Bisexual (LGB) adults in Britain.

**Methodology**

We employ retrospective questions regarding family support for LGB children and school-age bullying and questions regarding workplace bullying in the respondents’ present jobs. A 2016 data set was utilized which was created by attending events during the UK LGBT History Month.

**Findings**

The empirical investigation demonstrates that supportive family environments towards LGB children reduce both school-age and workplace bullying.

**Implications**

Given the increasing number of people self-identifying as LGB, the significant percentages of school and workplace bullying incidents and the corresponding negative effects on people’s lives, it is important to examine the benefits of family support with regards to reducing school and workplace victimization. This study also reports that family support could have an enduring influence on the experiences of LGB children and adults.

**Originality**

No known research has considered the possible developmental benefits of family support on reducing future workplace bullying for LGB children. In addition, this might be the first study which simultaneously examines family support towards LGB children, school-age and workplace bullying.
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**1. Introduction**

Sexual orientation minorities in the UK seem to experience adverse societal challenges in their families, schools and workplaces (Office for National Statistics, 2018). A 2018 national representative study found that only 56% of respondents scored themselves as comfortable being LGB (lesbian, gay, bisexual) in the UK, scoring their life satisfaction on average 6.48 out of 10, compared to 7.66 for the general UK population (Office for National Statistics, 2018). The study reported that 70% of respondents avoid being open about their sexual orientation for fear of an adverse reaction from others, predominantly in the workplace. In addition, the study found that 19% of respondents said that they had received verbal harassment, insults or other hurtful comments in education due to their sexual orientation. An even higher percentage of respondents (23%) reported that they had experienced a negative or mixed reaction from others in the workplace due to their sexual orientation. Moreover, the study noted the long-term negative effect of bullying on respondents’ well-being indicators. By observing the assigned patterns in the aforementioned study (Office for National Statistics, 2018), we investigate which factors might moderate bullying incidents against sexual orientation minorities.

In the present study, using a 2016 data set we address two questions about the association between family support and bullying against sexual orientation minority people in Britain: (1) Can family support reduce school-age bullying? and (2) Can family support, during the school-age period, reduce future workplace bullying? Although the first question has received some attention in the literature (Hall, 2018; Katz-Wise et al., 2016; Rosario, 2015; Ryan et al., 2010), the second question has not been examined.

We examine whether enduring relationships exist between supportive families towards LGB children and future workplace victimization. Given the crucial role of parents in securing their children’s progression, it is surprising that so little attention has been paid to the relationship between family support and workplace victimization due to a minority sexual orientation. In addition, the lack of literature on the aforementioned issue is unanticipated given the increased number of people who are self-identifying as LGB, the high level of victimization due to one’s minority sexual orientation and the corresponding adverse implications on physical and emotional health, human capital, and workplace outcomes (Drydakis, 2018; Hafeez et al., 2017; Kidd et al., 2016; Drydakis, 2014).

The outcomes of this study will suggest that associations between family support and lower school bullying and workplace-bullying exist for LGB people. Our study will also argue that supportive family environments could be associated with lower victimization in the workplace, implying that the family’s attitude towards an LGB child can have long lasting effects. The next section provides a literature review and the study’s hypotheses. In Section 3, we provide the data gathering process and descriptive statistics. In Section 4, the regression outcomes are presented. Finally, Section 5 offers a discussion and limitations followed by conclusions.

**2. Literature review and hypotheses**

Studies evaluate that six out of ten children have witnessed bullying incidents daily and one in three students in middle and high school experienced adverse mental health symptoms due to bullying (National Educational Association, 2012).The typical victim of bullying is one who is, among other traits, noticeably rejected and isolated by their peers (Cook et al., 2010).

A 2015 review study of school-age bullying, regardless of one’s sexual orientation, found that victims between the age of 6 and 17 are more likely to develop anxiety disorders and depression disorder, psychotic experiences, increased risk of self-harm and poor well-being (Wolke and Lereya, 2015). Studies have also found that the adverse effects of frequent bullying are just as detrimental 40 years later (Takizawa et al., 2014; Lund et al., 2008). For instance, compared to people who had never been bullied, those exposed to school-age bullying were at a significantly increased risk of having been diagnosed with depression between the ages of 31 and 51 (Lund et al., 2009). Being a victim of school-age bullying is associated with internalising problems, recovering slowly from illnesses and economic adaptation, experiencing more trouble making or keeping friends, and having a lower likelihood of living with a partner in young adulthood and middle adulthood (Wolke and Lereya, 2015). It has also been estimated that school-age bullying is associated with lower human capital, including a lower probability of holding a higher education degree and lower wages (Drydakis, 2014).

Review studies have provided potential channels by which school-bullying affects later life outcomes (Wolke and Lereya, 2015). Victimization is found to reduce physiological responses to stress, boost genetic vulnerability and ageing, and increase the risk of developing adverse mental health symptoms problems (Wolke and Lereya, 2015). It is suggested that victims of bullying might be vulnerable targets for bullies due to their sub-assertive behaviours and characteristics of vulnerability (Reijntjes et al., 2010; Newman et al., 2005; Meyers and Meyers, 2003).

In relation to sexual orientation, international and UK studies have specified that between 44% and 96% of sexual orientation minority students experience bullying incidents (Köllen, 2016; Guasp et al., 2012; Kosciw et al., 2008). Review studies have also identified high rates of LGB stigma, which is correlated with instances of inequality, biased treatment, bullying, victimization, violence and murder (Köllen, 2016; Drydakis, 2014; 2017a; b). Further studies have evaluated that, due to societal bias and exposure to discrimination, sexual orientation minority children experience higher levels of adverse mental health problems, anxiety, depression, and suicide attempts relative to population averages[[1]](#footnote-1) (Hafeez, 2017; Kidd et al., 2016; Lick et al., 2013; British Psychological Society, 2012). These adverse conditions for LGB people are found to persist over a long period of time and negatively affect their progression and well-being (Lick et al., 2013; British Psychological Society, 2012). Drydakis (2018) suggested that school-age and workplace bullying might share some common underlying principles: sexual orientation minority groups attract societal biases and face adverse human capital and workplace outcomes. Studies confirm that LGB employees experience significant workplace bullying (Hoel et al., 2014; Drydakis, 2014; Ellison and Gustone, 2009).

According to a 2010 meta-analysis study utilizing 153 studies, a positive family environment can minimize bullying incidents (Cook et al., 2010). The study highlighted the important role family plays in the development and maintenance of bullying (Cook et al., 2010). Similarly, a review of 70 studies evaluated that high parental involvement and support, good family communication and supervision, as well as warm and affectionate relationships were most likely to protect children and adolescents against peer victimization (Lereya et al., 2013). A longitudinal study evaluated that warm parenting plays an important role in protecting children against ongoing victimization and depression (Healy and Sanders, 2018a), while a nationally representative sample study found that family factors, such as maternal warmth, sibling warmth and a positive atmosphere at home, are associated with resilience to bullying victimization (Bowes et al., 2010). On the other hand, negative parenting behaviour is related to an increase in the risk of becoming a bullying victim at school (Lereya et al., 2013). Abuse, neglect and maladaptive parenting were the best predictors of victimization (Lereya et al., 2013).

Adverse mental health issues in adolescence are perceived to be a vital concern for social planners as these are linked to suicide, which is found to be the third leading cause of death in youth aged 10 to 24 (Centers for Disease Control, 2015). Supportive family environments have been found to reduce depressive symptoms and increase emotional regulation and healthy development from childhood to adolescence (Bridgett et al., 2015; Auerbach et al., 2011). For instance, a 2017 meta-analytic review study of more than 340 studies suggested that support from family, school and peers is a protective factor during child and adolescent development (Rueger et al., 2017). Social support models have also shown support can bring positive mental health outcomes and enhance self-worth (Cohen, 2004), while support is found to be positively correlated with well-being and negatively correlated with depression incidents (Rueger et al., 2017). In addition, family support in childhood is associated with character traits in adulthood affecting the way adults deal with stress and label themselves as targets of bullying (Løkke Vie et al., 2010; Mikulincer and Shaver, 2007). Indeed, self-labelling as a victim plays an important role in the workplace victimizing process, and repeated exposure to adverse experiences at work might lead the target to define and/or label themselves as an easy victim of bullying (Løkke Vie et al., 2010).

In relation to LGB children, family acceptance and support in adolescence have been found to predict a greater level of self-esteem and health status, lower depression, substance abuse and suicidal ideation (Hall, 2018; Katz-Wise et al., 2016; Ryan et al., 2010). A study found that LGB children who have received family support can approach stressful situations in an adaptive manner, enabling them to develop and implement coping strategies to reduce the stressor (Rosario, 2015). However, representative samples of youth find that relative to heterosexual peers sexual orientation minorities report lower levels of parental closeness and elevated rates of parental abuse and homelessness (Pearson and Wilkinson, 2013; Waller and Sanchez, 2011). Regularly, homophobia and deviations from expectations may lead parents to be less supportive of their children or even reject them (Ryan et al., 2009). High levels of family rejection affect children’s ability to accept their own minority sexual orientation (Bregman et al., 2013). Associations between parental rejecting behaviours during adolescence and more internalized homophobia, depression, attempted suicide, use of illegal drugs, and sexual health risk by LGB young adults have been observed (Hall, 2018; Katz-Wise et al., 2016; D’Augelli, 2010; Ryan et al., 2009). In addition, low family support is consistently recognized as a risk factor for LGB victimization (Perren and Hornung, 2015).

By considering the aforementioned patterns and working in a synthesizing way, we have established the following hypotheses:

*Hypothesis 1: Supportive family environments towards LGB children might reduce school-age bullying.*

*Hypothesis 2: Supportive family environments towards LGB children might reduce future workplace bullying.*

In relation to *Hypothesis 1*, if an LGB child has felt accepted and comfortable with their sexuality through their family attitudes and received effective aid during hard times, due to societal homophobia, we might expect a positive relationship between supportive family environments and reduced school victimization. In relation to *Hypothesis 2*, if for LGB adults the burden of limited or no support from families and the potential corresponding internalized shame of rejection, combined with the enduring negative effects of potential school-age bullying, have made them easy targets for victimization, we might expect more frequent workplace bullying incidents. We suggest that supportive family environments might enable LGB children to meet developmental demands, thus enabling them to cope with homophobic peers in workplaces.

**3. Method and descriptive statistics**

We employ retrospective questions regarding family support[[2]](#footnote-2) due to a child’s minority sexual orientation and school-age bullying[[3]](#footnote-3), as well as questions regarding workplace bullying[[4]](#footnote-4) in the respondents’ present job (Hamburger et al., 2011; Nielsen and Einarsen, 2012). The data gathering process took place in 2016 in London, Cambridge and Oxford during the LGBT History Month. The data gathering and variables’ coding are described in Drydakis (2018), where relationships between school-age bullying, workplace bullying and job satisfaction were presented. In Drydakis’ (2018) study no evaluation on family support during the school-age period was offered and no relevant data was utilized.

In this study, the sample is restricted to those whose family was aware of their minority sexual orientation[[5]](#footnote-5). Given this restriction, the valid sample consists of 168 observations for gay/bisexual men and 103 observations for lesbian/bisexual women[[6]](#footnote-6). In **Table 1**, Panel I, we present the descriptive statistics for gay/bisexual men, while Panel II offers the descriptive statistics for lesbian/bisexual women. In Panel I, we observe that 86.9% are gay men and 13.1% are bisexual men: the mean age is 37.9 years; 59.5% hold a higher-education degree; 70.2% are white-collar employees; 22.6% are pink-collar employees; and 6.5% are blue-collar employees. In Panel II, we observe that 82.5% are lesbians and 17.5% are bisexual women: the mean age is 35.2 years; 54.3% hold a higher-education degree; and 59.2% are white-collar employees, 34.9% are pink-collar employees and 5.8% are blue-collar employees.

In Table 1, we offer the mean values for the family support, school-age bullying, and workplace bullying indicators for both sexes. The statistics suggest that for both gay/bisexual men and lesbian/bisexual women family support is at very low levels and that school-age bullying levels are higher in comparison to workplace bullying. In addition, in all cases, gay/bisexual men have experienced higher school-age and workplace bullying levels than lesbian/bisexual women. Simultaneously, the level of family support has been lower for gay/bisexual men than for lesbian/bisexual women.

Moreover, in Panel I, it is observed that for gay/bisexual men the mean value for family and support is ‘never’ or ‘rarely’, or 0.64; for school-age bullying it lies between ‘sometimes’ and ‘frequently bullied’, or 2.35; and for workplace bullying it lies between ‘rarely’ and ‘sometimes bullied’, or 1.88. In Panel II, we observe that for lesbian/bisexual women the mean value for family support lies between ‘rarely’ and ‘sometimes’, or 1.29; for school-age bullying lies between ‘rarely’ and ‘sometimes bullied’, or 1.79; and for workplace bullying it lies between ‘rarely’ and ‘sometimes bullied’, or 1.25.

**[Table 1]**

To provide more insights into the aforementioned patterns, the proportions of the key variables of interest are presented in **Table 2**. In Panel I, for gay/bisexual men, the most frequent response for family support is ‘never’ (54.1%); for school-age bullying it is ‘frequently bullied’ (39.2%); and for workplace bullying it is ‘sometimes bullied’ (36.3%). In Panel II, we observe that for lesbian/bisexual women the most frequent response for family support is ‘never’ (49.5%); for school-age bullying it is ‘frequently bullied’ (33.9%); and for workplace bullying it is ‘rarely bullied’ (30%). The statistics suggest that lesbian/bisexual women are more likely to get support from their family than gay/bisexual men. Furthermore, lesbian/bisexual women are less likely to experience frequent and constant school-age and workplace bullying than gay/bisexual men.

**[Table 2]**

Moreover, in **Tables 3** and **4**, we provide the correlation matrixes which are used to examine whether family support is associated with school-age bullying and workplace bullying. According to **Table 3**, for gay/bisexual men there is a negative correlation between family support, school-age bullying (r=-0.678, p<0.01) and workplace bullying (r=-0.550, p<0.01). There is also a positive correlation between school-age bullying and workplace bullying (r=0.866, p<0.01). **Table 4** provides comparable patterns for lesbian/bisexual women.

**[Table 3] - [Table 4]**

**4. Results**

*4.1 Gay/bisexual men*

In Table 5, the estimations for gay/bisexual men are presented. Model I presents the ordered-probit school-age bullying estimations, which suggest a negative association between family support and school-age bullying (b= -1.152, p < 0.01). We accept Hypothesis 1 for gay/bisexual men. The marginal effect suggests that family support is associated with a 31% decrease in frequent school-age bullying (z=5.35, p<0.01).

In Model II, we present the ordered-probit workplace bullying estimations. A negative association between family support and workplace bullying can be observed (b= -0.563, p < 0.01). Hence, we accept Hypothesis 2 for gay/bisexual men. The marginal effect suggests that family support is associated with a 12.5% decrease in frequent workplace bullying (z=4.08, p<0.01).

*4.2 Lesbian/bisexual women*

In Table 6, the estimations for lesbian/bisexual women are presented. In Model I we present the ordered-probit school-age bullying estimations. There is a negative association between family support and school-age bullying (b= -1.268, p < 0.01). Given this outcome, we accept Hypothesis 1 for lesbian/bisexual women. The marginal effect suggests that family support is associated with a 25.6% decrease in frequent school-age bullying (z=4.90, p<0.01).

In Model II, we present the ordered-probit workplace bullying estimations. A negative association between family support and workplace bullying can be observed (b= -0.705, p < 0.01). So, we accept Hypotheses 2 for lesbian/bisexual women. The marginal effect suggests that family support is associated with a 4.6% decrease in frequent workplace bullying (z=2.54, p<0.01).

*4.3 Total sample: Gay/bisexual men and lesbian/bisexual women*

In Table 7, we pool data for men (gay and bisexuals) and for women (lesbians and bisexuals). In Models I and II, it is evident that we have obtained qualitative comparable estimates as in Tables 5 and 6. So, we can accept both Hypotheses 1 and 2. In Models I and II, it is observed that men experience higher levels of school-age and workplace bullying compared to women (b=0.405, p<0.05, and b=0.442, p<0.05, respectively). The marginal effects suggest that men face 13.3% (z=2.15, p<0.05) higher levels of frequent school-age bullying, and 7.2% (z=1.78, p<0.05) higher levels of frequent workplace-age bullying in comparison to women.

In addition, in Model I, the interaction effect between family support and men suggests that family support for gay/bisexual men provides them with a lower level of school-age bullying compared to lesbian/bisexual women (b= -0.334, p < 0.05). The marginal effect indicates that the effect of family support in reducing frequent school-age bullying is 10.9% higher for gay/bisexual men than for lesbian/bisexual women (z=2.38, p < 0.05). In Model II, the relevant interaction effect is not statistically significant.

**5. Discussion and conclusions**

In this study, by utilizing British LGB data in 2016, we empirically tested two hypotheses. We examined whether supportive family environments towards LGB children can reduce school-age bullying (Hypothesis 1) and workplace bullying (Hypothesis 2). With retrospective data on both family support during the school-age period and school-age bullying, Hypothesis 1 was accepted. In addition, employing retrospective data on family support during the school-age period and data on workplace bullying in the present job meant that Hypothesis 2 was also accepted.

This study is the first attempt, to examine whether family support during the school-age period can have long-term positive effects on LGB people’s future workplace experiences, namely workplace victimization. Moreover, by utilizing the same data set, this study simultaneously assessed whether family support moderates both school- and workplace-bullying. Given the increased number of people identifying as LGB in modern societies and the adverse effect of homophobia, it is important to consider the factors which reduce bullying in both school- and workplace- settings. This study concluded that warm family environments towards LGB children, which enabled them to feel accepted and comfortable with their sexuality and having family member(s) stand by them during challenging times due to their sexuality might positively affect short-term (reduced school-age bullying) and long-term (reduced workplace bullying) experiences.

For Hypothesis 1, the driving mechanisms of the associations might be straightforward. If an LGB child has received effective aid whenever needed and their parents were (pro)active in preventing or/and addressing adverse consequences due to homophobia, we might expect a reduction in school bullying. For Hypotheses 2, we suggest that an accepted and welcoming environment for a minority sexual orientation child might ensure they do not internalize the adverse effect of homophobic incidents, such as feelings of inferiority, shame and pessimism. As we have reviewed, bullying is found to be associated with internalizing disorders such as depression and anxiety in both children and adolescents (Hawker and Boulton, 2000). However, in the literature, supportive families are found to enable LGB children to meet developmental demands which are important in dealing with homophobic demonstrations. Healy and Sanders (2018b) argued that warm parenting reduces a child’s vulnerability to bullying and can protect them against the emotional consequences of bullying.

If an LGB child has received support from their parents which has positively impacted on their self-esteem and self-worth, this pattern might have influence how adult LGB people prevent, avoid and/or deal with victimization. Parents who have supported their children during difficult times might have taught them the appropriate attitudes and approaches to address homophobia as well as its adverse effects. LGB people with higher self-esteem and pride might not allow being humiliated. Family support in childhood seems to be correlated with character traits in adulthood and is regularly found to have positive implications in terms of helping cope with stressful incidents (Lund et al., 2008; Mikulincer and Shaver, 2007). LGB people who have received support from their families might be able to cope with bullying incidents and will be less likely to internalize the magnitude of bullying and its corresponding negative effects. They might also downsize the victimization incident itself by effectively addressing it.

If we work with the Stress-Buffering model, it seems clear that emotional support can have positive effects on the psychological states of people who experience societal challenges (Cohen and Wills, 1985). In the same vein, the Main Effect model evaluates that support can boost one’s identity and self-worth and enhance feeling of controls (Cohen, 1988). If for LGB children family support results in building their sense of identity, self-esteem and control, we might suggest that all these psychological states during the school-age period might positively impact on psychological traits in adulthood. Family acceptance seems to be crucial to ensure that LGB children develop a healthy sense of self while family rejection of LGB children can negatively affect their identity and well-being (Katz-Wise et al., 2016; Rosario, 2015). Those LGB children who have experienced a lower degree of rejection and loneliness from their families, or no such feelings at all, might be better equipped to cope in a heteronormative workplace environment compared to those who have experienced a higher degree of rejection.

Hypothesis 2 might also hold if LGB people work in supportive environments that enable them to avoid bullying incidents in their job. LGB people with a strong sense of self might have established a culture of diversity and inclusivity in the workplace that does not allow, by prevention, any incident of harassment due to sexual orientation. Moreover, it might be the case that these people apply for jobs where a supportive LGBT network exists. If LGB people have been raised in supportive families, they might want to work in accepting workplace environments and this pattern might reduce victimization incidents. In addition, we suggest that individuals exhibiting confident and open behaviours in the workplace due to better psychological well-being following supporting family environments and disclosure of their sexual orientation will be a protective factor against the likelihood of workplace bullying (Kosciw et al., 2010; Ryan et al., 2010).

 We should highlight that the outcomes of this study do not call for generalizations. The sample is rather small, and new research projects should attempt to employ a larger population. In this study, we collected information from LGB events. Sample selection might be an issue. The unique characteristics of the participants in these events might not provide us with unbiased patterns. Efforts to approach LGB people in a more representative way are recommended.

The nature of the family support and bullying questions used in this survey should have driven the results. One might decide to create family support and bullying indexes consisting of a plethora of items in order to construct better informed scales. Moreover, although this study has strongly suggested that bullying might entail adverse mental health symptoms, the reverse may be true; thus, causal inferences are not recommended. The direction of the effects should be properly assessed. Qualitative oriented research might be helpful in clarifying the direction of the effects.

Based on the outcomes of this study, one might be surprised by the fact that although family member(s) were aware of their children’s sexuality only 50% of the LGB children had received some relevant support. As explained by Drydakis (2018), we have to recognize the demographics of the sample. The mean age of the participants was approximately 37 years, meaning that they were in school, approximately, in the 1985-1997 period. We expect that family acceptance and support towards LGB children to be much lower in past generations than today. Similarly, we expect that school-age bullying in past generations was more commonplace than in present periods.

In this study, we did not differentiate between those employees who were open about their sexual orientation in work and those who were not. New research may wish to explore whether openness at work or suspicion of one’s minority sexual orientation moderate our study’s relationships. In addition, we suggest that not only might information regarding one’s sexual orientation affect workplace evaluations, but also other characteristics such as masculinity and femininity (Drydakis et al., 2018). In the regression stage, we did not control for masculine and feminine traits. Thus, workplace bullying might be driven by gender identity traits and not only by a minority sexual orientation status. In this study, we could not estimate the actual magnitude of the effect. Comparable arguments hold for school-age bullying since we did not control whether LGB children were open about their sexuality in school.

The outcomes of the study suggested that family support can have a greater positive effect in reducing school-age bullying for gay/bisexual men than for lesbian/bisexual women. Further research is required in order to evaluate why gender moderates the relationship. One should focus on the actual characteristics of bullying experienced by gay/bisexual men and lesbian/bisexual women while approaching the assigned pattern. We do believe that qualitative oriented research is required for an in-depth understanding of the underlying mechanisms that drove the patterns ascertained in this study. Furthermore, whether supportive family environments during a person’s adult life affect future workplace bullying has not been explored in this study and we suggest that welcoming environments, regardless of a person’s age, can positively impact on workplace conditions. Additional work might be useful in exploring, as a protective factor, whether and how family support influences present and future victimization. This could be utilized to inform prevention policies against school-age and workplace bullying. Further, how school supportive settings and peer interactions affected the study’s research questions has not been examined but is of interest. We expect that the inter-correlation between family, school and peer environments has a notable impact on school and workplace experiences.
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|  |
| --- |
| **Table 1. Descriptive statistics** |
|  | Panel IGay/bisexual men | Panel IILesbians/bisexual women |
| Age  | 37.97 (0.786) | 35.27 (0.744) |
| Gay men or lesbians^  | 86.91 (0.026) | 82.52 (0.037) |
| Higher education  | 59.52 (0.037) | 54.36 (0.049) |
| Working experience  | 16.26 (0.786) | 14.22 (0.863) |
| White-collar employees  | 70.23 (0.035) | 59.22 (0.048) |
| Blue-collar employees  | 6.54 (0.019) | 5.82 (0.023) |
| Pink-collar employees  | 22.61 (0.032) | 34.95 (0.047) |
| School-age bullying | 2.35 (0.092) | 1.79 (0.116) |
| Workplace-bullying | 1.88 (0.088) | 1.25 (0.101) |
| Family support  | 0.648 (0.069) | 1.291 (0.145)  |
| Observations | 168 | 103 |
| *Notes: Standard deviations are in parentheses. (^) Bisexuals otherwise.* |

|  |
| --- |
| **Table 2. Proportions; Family support, school-age bullying and workplace bullying** |
|  | Panel IGay/bisexual men | Panel IILesbians/bisexual women |
| Family support: |  |  |
| -Always | 1.19 | 9.70 |
| -Very often | 5.95 | 19.41 |
| -Sometimes | 3.57 | 10.67 |
| -Rarely | 35.11 | 10.67 |
| -Never | 54.16 | 49.51 |
|  |  |  |
| School-age bullying: |  |  |
| -Never bullied | 8.92 | 18.44 |
| -Rarely bullied  | 17.26 | 23.30 |
| -Sometimes bullied  | 19.04 | 21.35 |
| -Frequently bullied  | 39.28 | 33.98 |
| -Constantly bullied  | 15.47 | 2.91 |
| Workplace bullying: |  |  |
| -Never bullied  | 15.47 | 29.12 |
| -Rarely bullied  | 18.45 | 30.09 |
| -Sometimes bullied  | 36.30 | 27.18 |
| -Frequently bullied  | 22.02 | 13.59 |
| -Constantly bullied  | 7.73 | 0 |
| Observations | 168 | 103 |

|  |
| --- |
| **Table 3. Correlation matrix; Gay/bisexual men** |
|  | Family support | School-age bullying | Workplace bullying |
| Family support | 1 |  |  |
| School-age bullying | -0.678 (0.000)\* | 1 |  |
| Workplace bullying | -0.550 (0.000)\* | 0.866 (0.000)\* | 1 |
| *Notes: N=168. P-values are in parentheses. (\*) Significant at the 1 % level.*  |

|  |
| --- |
| **Table 4. Correlation matrix; Lesbians/bisexual women** |
|  | Family support | School-age bullying | Workplace bullying |
| Family support | 1 |  |  |
| School-age bullying | -0.862 (0.000)\* | 1 |  |
| Workplace bullying | -0.694 (0.000)\* | 0.769 (0.000)\* | 1 |
| *Notes: N=103. P-values are in parentheses. (\*) Significant at the 1 % level.*  |

|  |
| --- |
| **Table 5:** **Ordered probit models; Gay/bisexual men**  |
|  |
|  | Model ISchool-age bullying | Model IIWorkplace bullying |
| Family support | -1.152(0.123)\* | -0.563(0.000)\* |
| Gay# | 0.014(0.253) | 0.317(0.260) |
| Age | - | 0.073(0.029)\*\* |
| Higher education | - | -0.182(0.220) |
| Working experience | - | 0.029(0.030) |
| Occupations controls | - | yes |
| Cities controls | yes | yes |
| Events controls | yes | yes |
| LR x2  | 117.773 | 157.812 |
| Prob> x2 | 0.000 | 0.000 |
| Pseudo R2 | 0.235 | 0.313 |
| Log likelihood | -191.536 | -173.007 |
| Observations | 168 | 168 |
| *Notes: (#) Bisexuals otherwise. Standard errors are in parentheses. (\*) Significant at the 1 % level. (\*\*) Significant at the 5 % level.*  |

|  |
| --- |
| **Table 6: Ordered probit models; Lesbian/bisexual women**  |
|  |
|  | Model ISchool-age bullying | Model IIWorkplace bullying |
| Family support | -1.268(0.150)\* | -0.705(0.111)\* |
| Lesbians# | 0.173(0.314) | 0.168(0.325) |
| Age | - | -0.109(0.077) |
| Higher education | - | 0.549(0.538) |
| Working experience | - | 0.161(0.077)\* |
| Occupations controls | - | yes |
| Cities controls | yes | yes |
| Events controls | yes | yes |
| LR x2  | 126.587 | 90.132 |
| Prob> x2 | 0.000 | 0.000 |
| Pseudo R2 | 0.423 | 0.325 |
| Log likelihood | -86.134 | -93.575 |
| Observations | 103 | 103 |
| *Notes: (#)Bisexuals otherwise. Standard errors are in parentheses. (\*) Significant at the 1 % level.*  |

|  |
| --- |
| **Table 7: Order Probit models; Gay/bisexual men and lesbian/bisexual women**  |
|  |
|  | Model ISchool-age bullying | Model IIWorkplace bullying |
| Family support | -0.940(0.095)\* | -0.552(0.091)\* |
| Gay or lesbians# | 0.065(0.192) | 0.231(0.197) |
| Men | 0.405(0.184)\*\* | 0.442(0.188)\*\* |
| Men x family support | -0.334(0.137)\*\* | -0.060(0.138) |
| Age | - | 0.052(0.024)\*\* |
| Higher education | - | -0.021(0.194) |
| Working experience | - | 0.037(0.026) |
| Occupations controls | - | yes |
| Cities controls | yes | yes |
| Events controls | yes | yes |
| LR x2  | 236.792 | 249.881 |
| Prob> x2 | 0.000 | 0.000 |
| Pseudo R2 | 0.289 | 0.309 |
| Log likelihood | -290.275 | -278.573 |
| Observations | 271 | 271 |
| *Notes: (#)Bisexuals otherwise. Standard errors are in parentheses. (\*) Significant at the 1 % level. (\*\*) Significant at the 5 % level.* |

1. In this study, we did not focus on the gender identity literature. Workplace studies on biased treatments due to trans statuses can inform interested readers (Drydakis, 2017a; b; 2016). [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. The question asked: ‘Did your family provide you with a supportive environment due to your minority sexual orientation during your school-age period (up to 18 years old). By the term supportive environment, we mean a warm family setting that enabled you to feel accepted and comfortable with your sexuality and you had family member(s) to stand by you during challenging times due to your sexuality’. The options for this question were: Always, very often, sometimes, rarely, or never. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. The question asked: ‘Think back to your school days, up to 18 years old. You may have been bullied by others due to your minority sexual orientation (i.e. for being gay, lesbian, bisexual or other sexual orientation minority) in some way, such as verbally (e.g. name calling), physically (e.g. hitting) or socially (e.g. spreading rumours, social rejection, extortion, and isolation). Please, choose which best describes your own experience at workplace’. The options for this question were: Never bullied, rarely bullied, sometimes bullied, frequently bullied, or constantly bullied. [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. The question asked: ‘You may have been bullied in your present job by others due to your minority sexual orientation (i.e. for being gay, lesbian, bisexual or other sexual orientation minority) in some way, such as unfair treatment, ridiculing, shouting and verbal abuse, ostracism, denying training or promotion opportunities, and spreading malicious rumours. Please, choose which best describes your own experience at workplace’. The options for this question were: Never bullied, rarely bullied, sometimes bullied, frequently bullied, or constantly bullied. [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. The question asked: ‘Were your parents or other member(s) in your household aware of your minority sexual orientation during your school-age period (up to 18 years of age)?’. The options for this question were: Yes or no. [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. Disclosure of sexual orientation to family members is suggested to be common among sexual orientation minority youth (Rosario et al., 2009). [↑](#footnote-ref-6)