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INTRODUCTION

This chapter investigates bullying involvement at home (sibling bullying) and at school in a representative sample of children within families. Sibling bullying was found to be widespread and more frequent than bullying by peers in school. Gender differences were small for sibling bullying and contrary to previous evidence, not found for school bullying. Family and sibling type had some but only a small impact on sibling or school bullying. While the prevalence of sibling bullying was high across adolescence, school bullying reduced from 10-15 years of age. Contrary to some previous reports, not only physical but also relational bullying reduced during adolescence in school. Involvement in bullying at home between siblings and victimisation at school was related to increased unhappiness and more behaviour problems. We found a dose-response relationship with children who were bullied both at home and at school had the strongest association with behaviour problems (up to 14 times increased) and were the least happy compared to those not victimised in either context.

PREVIOUS RESEARCH ON BULLYING

The intensive research on bullying over the last three decades can be traced to 1982 when three young boys killed themselves in short succession in Norway, each leaving notes that they had been whipping boys, bullied by their peers (Stassen Berger, 2007). Many more suicides attributed to bullying have occurred worldwide since then (Kaminski & Fang, 2009). Apart from suicide, being a victim of bullying increases the risk of a range of adverse outcomes including increased physical health problems (Gini & Pozzoli, 2009; Wolke et al., 2000), more behaviour and emotional problems (Wolke & Sapouna, 2008); a higher risk for psychotic symptoms (Schreier et al., 2009) and poorer school performance (Woods & Wolke, 2004). Bullying and victimisation is a serious public health problem.

Bullying victimisation refers to children being exposed repeatedly and over time, to negative actions on the part of one or more other children who are or perceived to be stronger (Oliveus, 1993). It is a systematic abuse of power (Smith & Sharp, 1994). Bullying can be physical or direct including verbal abuse, hitting, kicking, destroying others’ belongings or blackmail. In contrast, relational bullying refers to deliberate social exclusion of children such as ignoring, excluding them from games or parties, spreading gossip or humiliation (Wolke et al., 2000). Direct bullying is more frequent at younger ages and decreases with age. It has been suggested that relational bullying increases in adolescence. Those subjected to both direct and relational bullying on a regular basis appear to be at the highest risk for adverse outcomes (Crick, Ostrov & Werner, 2006; Wolke et al., 2000).

Bullying is one way to gain social status and a powerful dominant position in the peer or sibling group. Individuals who are dominant have better access to material and social resources (the most wanted toy, best role in a game, sexual attention) (Salmivalli, 2010). Not all bullies are the same (Haynie et al., 2001). There is a small group of so-called ‘pure bullies’ (prevalence: 2-5%). These bully others but are not victims themselves. Their approach is labelled ‘cool cognition’ due to their lack of empathy for others (Sutton, Smith & Swettenham, 1999). Other bullies are called ‘Bully-victims’ because they are victimised themselves and at other times bully others (prevalence 5-10%) (Wolke et al., 2000). Bully-victims have been reported to be most at risk for behaviour problems and low self-esteem (Sourander et al., 2007). Any child can become a victim (estimated as between 12-25%), but those who remain victims are often more anxious, submissive, withdrawn or physically weak, easily show a reaction (e.g. run away, start crying, scream for help), have poor social understanding (Woods, Wolke, Novicki & Hall, 2009) and no or few friends who can stand up for them (Wolke, Woods & Samara, 2009).

By middle childhood, children spend as much, if not more, time interacting with siblings than with parents (Kim, McHale, Crouter & Osgood, 2007). In many families aggression between siblings is frequent and a source of great concern to parents (Dunn & Herrera, 1997). Duncan (1999a) reported that 30% of children with siblings were frequently bullied by their siblings with some 8% reporting that they were scared of being hurt badly by their sibling. Around 40% of children also admitted to bullying their brothers or sisters. Children may learn particular behaviours in relationships with their parents and siblings, and these behaviours then generalise to their interactions with peers and friends (MacDonald & Parke, 1984). Indeed, those bullied by siblings have been reported to be more likely to be involved in bullying at school (Duncan, 1999a; Wolke & Samara, 2004). Thus children who are bully-victims at school and involved in bullying at home may have the highest levels of psychological pathology. It is surprising that sibling bullying has been relatively ignored in the literature, perhaps because it is so common. Overall, the adverse effects of bullying involvement appear to be more likely or
stronger if children experience several types of bullying (i.e., relational and physical), it occurs in different contexts, (i.e. at home and in school), or they are both bullies and victims.

This is the first study to investigate sibling and peer bullying in a representative national household sample. The analysis focuses on family factors related to sibling and school bullying and investigates whether those involved in both sibling and school bullying are at the highest risk for adverse behavioural outcomes.

SAMPLE AND MEASURES

The Understanding Society Youth Questionnaire was completed by 2,163 adolescents aged 10 – 15 years in the four UK countries (participants from England: 83.7%; Wales: 4.9%; Scotland: 8.8% and Northern Ireland: 2.6%). The questionnaire is self-completion and answered by the young person in confidence. Of the 2,163 adolescents, 1,872 (87%) had siblings but 43 had missing information on the sibling questions and seven had missing information on the school bullying questions. Altogether 2,114 adolescents could be included in the analysis of combined school and sibling bullying. Those who had no siblings were included in the analysis and coded to reflect no sibling bullying. The distribution by age was fairly even with approximately 350 adolescents in each age year (Table 1). Fifty-seven percent lived with both biological parents, 29% with one biological parent, 13% with a step parent and 2% were living with no biological parent (Table 1). Of those with siblings, 10% were half siblings and 3% step siblings. Of those with siblings, 51% had one sibling, 33% two, 12% three and 4% four or more siblings. Of the respondents with siblings, 40% were the eldest, 38% the youngest sibling with 23% a middle child or co-twin (Table 1). The highest academic qualification held by either parent or the main carer and household income distribution (income quintiles based on the total sample of those aged 16 years and more) are shown in Table 2.

BULLYING MEASURES

Bullying over the last 6 months was assessed with previously used and well validated questions.

Sibling Bullying
Firstly, the participants were asked about victimisation during the last six months: ‘How often do any of your brothers or sisters do any of the following to you at home?’ The response categories and frequency of responses are shown in Table 3. Secondly, they were asked about bullying perpetration against their siblings: ‘How often do you do any of the following to your brothers or sisters at home?’ Those adolescents who had experienced or perpetrated one or more of these behaviours quite a lot (more than 4 times in the last 6 months) or a lot (a few times every week) were considered victims or bullying perpetrators (Wolke & Samara, 2004). Four groups were constructed: neutral: neither or rarely bully or victim, victim: quite a lot/a lot victimised but no bullying perpetration; bully-victim: both quite a lot/a lot victims and bully; bully: quite a lot/a lot perpetrator but not a victim.

School Bullying
The participants were asked if they had been physically bullied: ‘How often do you get physically bullied at school, for example getting pushed around, hit or threatened or having belongings stolen?’ or relationally bullied: ‘How often do you get bullied in other ways at school such as getting called names, getting left out of games, or having nasty
stories spread about you on purpose?’ (Sapouna et al., 2010). Similarly they were asked whether they had been perpetrators of physical or relational bullying (Table 3). Those adolescents who had experienced or perpetrated one or more of these types of bullying quite a lot (more than 4 times in the last 6 months) or a lot (a few times every week) were considered victims or bullying perpetrators (Wolke et al., 2000). Pupils were classified as whether they were not victims, victims of physical or relational bullying only, or both physical and relational victims.

BEHAVIOUR PROBLEMS AND HAPPINESS

Behaviour Problems
Adolescents also completed the Strengths and Difficulties Questionnaire (SDQ) self-completion version (Goodman, 2001) (www.sdqinfo.org). The SDQ is a well-validated tool that asks questions about five domains of behaviour, namely: conduct problems, hyperactivity, emotional symptoms, peer problems and pro-social behaviour (Goodman, 2001). One item of the conduct scale asks about ‘fighting a lot’ and one item of the peer problems scale asks if ‘other children pick on me or bully me’. We excluded these two items as they refer to potential bullying or victimisation and may inflate correlations between bullying measures and SDQ. Scores from the other conduct problem items, hyperactivity, emotional symptoms and other peer problem items were summed to construct a total difficulties score. Abnormal Total Difficulties (clinical range) were determined as scores greater than the 90th percentile (Goodman, Meltzer & Bailey, 2003) of all Understanding Society adolescents with SDQ data at age 10-15 in the Total Difficulties Scale.

Unhappiness
Participants were also asked a series of questions about their happiness: ‘The next few questions are about how you feel about different aspects of your life. The faces express various types of feelings. Below each face is a number where ‘1’ is completely happy and ‘7’ is not at all happy. Please tick the box which comes closest to expressing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Unweighted N</th>
<th>Weighted %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Highest academic qualification1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree</td>
<td>544</td>
<td>25.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other higher</td>
<td>324</td>
<td>15.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A levels</td>
<td>398</td>
<td>18.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GCSEs</td>
<td>608</td>
<td>28.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other qualification</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No qualifications</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>8.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Household income quintile (gross, monthly)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 (&lt;£1102)</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 (£1102-£1870)</td>
<td>358</td>
<td>17.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 (£1871-£2778)</td>
<td>454</td>
<td>21.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 (£2779-£3998)</td>
<td>516</td>
<td>24.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 (£&gt;3998)</td>
<td>592</td>
<td>27.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1Highest academic qualification takes the education of the most highly educated parent in families with two parents, the education of the parent in one-parent families, and the education of the adult who reports to be responsible for the child, in families with no natural parents.

2Unweighted row percentages.

Table 3 Frequency of bullying at home and at school

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bullying/victimisation frequency</th>
<th>%2 Never</th>
<th>% Not much</th>
<th>% Quite a lot</th>
<th>% A lot</th>
<th>% Missing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sibling victimisation (N=1,872)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hit, kick, or push you</td>
<td>34.7</td>
<td>31.0</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>17.3</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Take your belongings</td>
<td>49.6</td>
<td>28.0</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Call you nasty names</td>
<td>37.0</td>
<td>29.7</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>17.7</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Make fun of you</td>
<td>41.0</td>
<td>29.1</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sibling bullying (N=1,872)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hit, kick, or push them</td>
<td>37.7</td>
<td>36.1</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Take their belongings</td>
<td>57.1</td>
<td>27.2</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Call them nasty names</td>
<td>40.4</td>
<td>32.8</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Make fun of them</td>
<td>42.7</td>
<td>32.2</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School victimisation (N=2,163)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical victimisation</td>
<td>79.0</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relational victimisation</td>
<td>67.3</td>
<td>21.7</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School bullying perpetrator (N=2,163)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical bullying</td>
<td>93.3</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relational bullying</td>
<td>89.8</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1Highest academic qualification takes the education of the most highly educated parent in families with two parents, the education of the parent in one-parent families, and the education of the adult who reports to be responsible for the child, in families with no natural parents.
2Unweighted row percentages.
how you feel about each of the following things: A: Your school work?, B: Your appearance?, C: Your family?, D: Your friends?, E: The school you go to?, F: Which best describes how you feel about your life as a whole?’. These scores were reverse coded and combined into an overall happiness scale (alpha 0.73) (Chan & Koo, 2010). Those with scores of less than the 10th percentile of all Understanding Society adolescents were considered unhappy.

PREVALENCE OF BULLYING

SIBLING BULLYING

More than half of all siblings were involved in bullying in one form or the other (54%). The second largest group was victims (16%) and few were pure bullies (4.5%). Details of the responses to the specific questions are shown in Table 3. There were few differences in sibling bullying involvement as victim or bully in England, Scotland and Northern Ireland (Table 4). However, fewer children were involved in sibling bullying overall in Wales (40%). Table 4 shows that individual characteristics were associated with bullying involvement. Boys were more often pure bullies or bully–victims while girls were slightly more likely to be pure victims. Type and prevalence of sibling bullying differed slightly by age during adolescence, i.e. from early to later adolescence. Fewer of those aged 13 and 14 were pure victims but similar percentages of bully victims were found at each age. There was no significant association with family type. However, children in step parent households tended to be slightly more often victims. No relationship between sibling type and sibling bullying was found.

This first report of sibling bullying in a representative sample in the UK indicates that sibling bullying is found in half of all UK households with adolescents, a rate higher than has been reported in the USA, Israel or Italy previously using similar measures (Duncan, 1999b; Wolke & Samara, 2004; Menesini, Camodeca & Noventini, 2010). Sibling bullying is

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Individual characteristics</th>
<th>Pure bully</th>
<th>Bully-victim</th>
<th>Pure victim</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Country*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>England</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>34.7</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>45.3</td>
<td>1,417</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wales</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>21.4</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td>59.5</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scotland</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>27.9</td>
<td>18.6</td>
<td>46.4</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern Ireland</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>43.1</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>40.4</td>
<td>188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>36.0</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>43.4</td>
<td>914</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>32.8</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>47.7</td>
<td>915</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 years</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>34.6</td>
<td>18.1</td>
<td>42.1</td>
<td>309</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 years</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>34.6</td>
<td>19.3</td>
<td>43.1</td>
<td>295</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 years</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>32.1</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>49.2</td>
<td>305</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 years</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>34.4</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>47.9</td>
<td>334</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 years</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>36.4</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>46.5</td>
<td>297</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 years</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>34.3</td>
<td>17.3</td>
<td>44.3</td>
<td>289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family type</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 natural parents</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>32.7</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>47.1</td>
<td>1,121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 natural parent</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>38.3</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>42.6</td>
<td>462</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 natural and 1 step parent</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>36.0</td>
<td>19.7</td>
<td>41.7</td>
<td>228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No natural parents</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>72.2</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sibling type</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Only natural siblings</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>34.3</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>45.6</td>
<td>1,576</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step siblings</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>28.0</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Half siblings</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>39.0</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>40.7</td>
<td>182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>71.4</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05  **p < .01
frequent and a third of all adolescents both bully their siblings and are the victims of bullying at the hand of their siblings.

**SCHOOL BULLYING**

Overall, 12% of adolescents reported being victims of bullying at school, 1.2% physical victims only; 7.1% relational victims only and 3.8% were both relational and physical victims. Only 22 adolescents (1%) reported frequent bullying, thus analysis of bullies or bully-victims was not possible. No gender differences or differences according to the four UK countries in victimisation were found (Table 5). All types of victimisation reduced with age with older adolescents less likely to become victims of either physical or relational victimisation (Table 5). Family type had a weak association with victimisation: children from step families were slightly more often physical and relational victims than children from other types of families (Table 5), a finding also recently reported in another UK sample (Green, Collingwood, & Ross, 2010).

The prevalence of victimisation and the reduction with age found here is remarkably similar to the first such survey of bullying in the UK in 1993 (Whitney & Smith, 1993). While a recent report by the Department for Education using data from the Longitudinal Study of Young People in England (LSYPE) also reported a decrease of victimisation with age in adolescence, the prevalence reported was much higher (Green et al., 2010). Higher prevalence was found because the LSYPE asked about whether bullying behaviour had ‘ever’ occurred in the last 12 months, a very lenient definition not taking into account the repetitive nature required for defining aggressive acts as bullying. In contrast, very few children admitted to bullying others, a finding replicated in other recent cohorts in the UK (Schreier et al., 2009). It may indicate that efforts to combat bullying in school (Samara & Smith, 2008) have resulted in adolescents being less willing to admit to being perpetrators of bullying in school. Alternatively, asking directly about experiences of bullying rather than individual behaviours (such as in the sibling questions) may have led to less reporting of bullying as it is less socially desirable.

**VICTIMS AT HOME AND AT SCHOOL**

Of the 913 victims at home, 135 (14.8%) were also victims at school. In contrast, of the 1,201 children not victimised at home, 112 (9.3%) were victims at school. Being victimised at home significantly increased the odds of also being victimised in school. A more detailed look at the type of victim at home revealed that only sibling bully-victims had increased odds compared to neutrals of being also victimised at school but not the pure sibling victims or pure sibling bullies.

The finding that bully-victims at home are at the highest risk for involvement in bullying in school found here replicates previously reported findings in Israel and the USA (Wolke & Samara, 2004; Duncan, 1999b).
VICTIMISATION AND BEHAVIOUR PROBLEMS

Involvement in sibling bullying was related to increased Difficulties scores in the SDQ (see Figure 1). Sibling bully-victims had the highest Total Difficulties scores, followed by bullies and victims. Those not involved in sibling bullying had the lowest Total Difficulties scores. Similarly, those bullied at school, in particular, those victimised using both physical and relational means had highly increased Total Difficulties scores in the SDQ. Considering both family and school settings, while those bullied in both settings had the highest score, those bullied in a single setting had more difficulties than those not bullied (Figure 1).

While mean differences indicate a general shift of scores, the SDQ abnormal clinical scores have been used to identify young people who are at increased risk for child psychiatric disorders likely to require treatment (Goodman et al., 2003). The impact of sibling and school bullying on SDQ total scores in the clinical range are shown in Figure 2. Involvement in all types of sibling bullying increased the risk of abnormal SDQ total scores. However, once adjusted for age, sex, family type, parents’ highest qualification, family income and type of victimisation experienced in school, being a pure sibling bully or pure sibling victim did not remain a significant predictor of SDQ scores in the clinical range (Figure 2). In contrast, even after adjustment, being a sibling bully-victim increased the odds three times of having behaviour problems.

Being bullied at school was associated with highly increased odds of abnormal SDQ scores, in particular if victimisation was physical and relational. The strong association remained after adjustment for social variables and sibling victimisation (Figure 2). The highest risk of behavioural scores in the clinical range was found for children who were bullied both at school by their peers and at home by their siblings and the odds were increased 14 times even when adjusted for other family variables (Figure 3). Odds ratio is a measure of the strength of association. A value of 1.0 shows no association, while positive associations have odds ratios above 1.0 and negative associations are below 1.0.

VICTIMISATION AND HAPPINESS

Adolescents who were bullied by their siblings and in school by their peers were 10-times more often unhappy than those not victimised either at home or in school (Figure 4). Those who were either victimised in just one setting, that is either at home or at school also had double the odds of being unhappy.

The findings here in a representative sample support those previously reported in an Israeli sample (Wolke & Samara, 2004), that those involved in both sibling and school bullying as victims or bully-victims are at the highest risk for behaviour problems. Adolescents bullied in both contexts have more behaviour problems and are much more often unhappy youngsters. Previously trans-context effects from home to peer relationships and well-being have been reported for highly positive sibling relationships (Gass, Jenkins, & Dunn, 2007). We found that if the sibling relationship is conflict laden it negatively affects peer relationships and behaviour adjustment. It appears that for those victimised at home and at school there is little escape from bullying and its consequences. Sibling relationships are a training ground with implications for well-being of
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Figure 3 Relationship between bullying by siblings AND/OR at school and clinical SDQ scores

Neither Reference cat.
Sibling OR School Adjusted OR: 2.7 (1.8, 4.1)
Sibling AND School Adjusted OR: 14.1** (8.4, 23.5)

Figure 4 Relationship between bullying by siblings AND/OR at school and unhappiness

Neither Reference cat.
Sibling OR School Adjusted OR: 2.2 (1.5, 3.1)
Sibling AND School Adjusted OR: 10.5 (6.6, 16.7)

the individual. Overall, bullying is one of the major safety
concerns for parents as also reported by the recent Staying
Safe Survey, commissioned by the then Department of
Children, Schools and Families (2009) that interviewed
young people aged 12 to 17, and parents/carers. Bullying
was the second highest concern expressed about children’s
safety by parents (61%), and also by children (though only by
35%). The current findings add that bullying also takes place
at home and interventions should include the family and
parenting skills of dealing with repeated conflicts between
siblings (Wolke & Samara, 2004). Strengthening families
and parenting skills and increasing sibling support is likely
to reduce bullying in school and increase well-being (Bowes,
Maughan, Caspi, Moffitt & Arseneault, 2010).

FUTURE RESEARCH

The current analysis documents the strong association
of involvement in bullying and reduced well-being and
increased likelihood of behaviour problems. However, cross-
sectional analysis does not allow for conclusions regarding
causality: Are children with behaviour problems more often
bullied or does bullying lead to behaviour problems and
less well-being? Repeated measures of sibling and school
bullying as well as well-being and behaviour problems in
future waves (Wave 3, Wave 5) of Understanding Society
will help disentangle whether bullying uniquely contributes
to less well-being. Furthermore, the impact on academic
aspirations and economic success needs to be monitored
in the long term. Linkage to other data including school
examination results and health data would provide
objective measures of outcomes that do not rely on self-
report. Inclusion of measures of other members of the
household and the economic situation of the family will
help to investigate what family factors are related to sibling
and peer bullying. Finally, the inclusion of biomarkers for
the young people as they reach adulthood may help to
investigate how social relationships affect physical health,
e.g. obesity (Griffiths, Wolke, Page, Horwood & Team, 2006)
or how genes may moderate the impact of bullying on
mental health outcomes (Sugden et al., 2010).

Sample Size

The Understanding Society Youth Questionnaire was
completed by 2,163 adolescents aged 10 – 15 years in
the four UK countries: in England there were 1,672 young
people, 97 in Wales, 176 in Scotland, and 211 in Northern
Ireland. Of the 2,163 adolescents, 1,872 (87%) had siblings
and after excluding those with missing information
2,114 children, including those with no siblings, could be
included in the analysis of combined school and sibling
bullying. The distribution of the sample by age was fairly
even with approximately 390 adolescents in each age year.
The data are weighted to take account of design effects in
the sample.

Findings

More than half of all siblings (54%) are involved in
bullying as either the bully or the victim or both. At school,
12% of young people reported being involved in bullying
Bully-victims at home are most likely to also be involved
in bullying at school. Strengthening parenting skills and
increasing sibling support is likely to reduce bullying and
increase well-being.

After taking account of individual and family
characteristics, there is a strong association between
involvement in bullying and reduced well-being.
Adolescents who are bullied by their siblings and at
school are ten times more likely to be unhappy with their
life than those not victimised in either setting.
Being bullied at school is associated with increased
behaviour problems. After adjusting for individual
and family characteristics, being a sibling bully-victim
increased the odds three times of having behaviour
problems. The risk of behavioural scores in the clinical
range for young people bullied both at home and at school
was 14 times as great as those who were not bullied at all.
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