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• Large breadth of research has focused on general populations of primary school children with regard prevalence of victimisation and associated correlates
  • specific focus on children from areas of lower affluency has been negligible.

• Menacker, Weldon, and Hurwitz (1990) - reported higher levels of exposure to violence among children from less affluent areas
  • It might be argued that such general exposure might be exacerbated by school victimisation.
Children from low affluent areas

- Tippett and Wolke (2014)
  - children from lower socio-economic status (SES) regions are at greater risk for childhood victimisation.

- Jansen, Veenstra, Ormel, Verhulst, and Reijneveld (2011)
  - children of lower socioeconomic status had greater likelihood of involvement in victimisation problems as the aggressor, the victim, or both, compared to children of higher SES.

Aim

- Baseline paper: Hyland, Hyland, and Comiskey (2017) has highlighted the experiences of primary school children from lower affluent areas in Ireland with regard to victimisation, depression and health-related quality of life (KIDSCREEN).

- To date, cross-national comparisons have focused primarily on general primary school children, with negligible specific focus on children from lower affluent areas.

- Aim: examine baseline data from less affluent regions of Ireland to similar regions in England.
Sample

- ROI: 217 10-12-year-old schoolchildren participated in the Healthy Schools 2013 iteration of the survey (see Hyland et al. (2017) for more details on the recruitment process).
  - Seven DEIS-Band 1 schools in Dublin
  - As part of a larger project, the internationally funded ‘Healthy Schools’ Initiative (Comiskey et al., 2012) with Children Development Initiative


Measures

- Direct question on victimisation
- ROI: Q27a from the The HRBQ-Short version
  - “Have you been bullied at or near school in the school in the last year”
  - Yes/No/Don’t know

- England: Q46 on the HBSC
  - ‘How often have you been bullied at school in the past couple of months?’
  - ‘I have not been bullied at school in the past couple of months, it has happened once or twice, two or three times a month, about once a week, and several time a week
  - Answers were dichotomised to yes and no, where all those that indicated they were bullied being grouped together
Measures

• Victimisation: behaviour based questions:

  • ROI: “Have any of the following happened to you in this school year?”
    • Ten different types including an other option e.g. Been teased/made fun of, Bullied through mobile phone, Had belongings taken/broken, Been threatened for no reason
    • Never, Sometimes, Always

  • England: How often have you been bullied at school in the following ways?
    • Ten different types e.g. messages/online, spread embarrassing information, teased/mean names
    • Never, Sometimes, Always

• Health related quality of life

  • ROI: KIDSCREEN 27-item
  • Five subscales -Physical well-being, Psychological well-being, Autonomy and Parent relations, Social Support and Peer Relations and School environment

  • England: KIDSCREEN 10-item
  • One total score to indicate health related quality of life
Results

School Victimisation – direct question
• ROI: ‘Have you been bullied at or near school in the last year?’
  • Yes (victim) = 31.6% (N = 59)
  • No (non-victim) = 68.4% (N = 128)

• England: How often have you been bullied at school in the past couple of months?’
  • Yes (victim) = 37% (N = 67)
  • Sometimes basis 30.1% (N= 55) [once or twice 23.2% (N=42), two or three times a month = 7.2% (N = 13)]
  • Frequent basis 6.6% (N = 12) [once a week = 3.3% (N = 6), several times a week = 3.3% (N = 6)]
  • No (non-victim) = 63% (N = 114)

School victimisation – associated behaviours

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ireland: Have any of the following happened to you in this school year?</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Always</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Been teased/made fun of</td>
<td>61.5% (N = 123)</td>
<td>32.5% (N=65)</td>
<td>6% (N = 12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Called nasty names</td>
<td>57.9% (N = 117)</td>
<td>34.7% (N = 70)</td>
<td>7.4% (N = 15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bullied through mobile phone</td>
<td>93.5% (N = 118)</td>
<td>6% (N = 12)</td>
<td>.5% (N = 1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bullied through email/internet</td>
<td>92.5% (N = 186)</td>
<td>6.5% (N = 13)</td>
<td>1% (N = 2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pushed/hit for no reason</td>
<td>69.3% (N = 140)</td>
<td>25.7% (N = 52)</td>
<td>5% (N = 10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Had belongings taken/broken</td>
<td>82.7% (N = 167)</td>
<td>15.8% (N = 32)</td>
<td>1.5% (N = 3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Been threatened for no reason</td>
<td>77.4% (N = 154)</td>
<td>18.1% (N = 36)</td>
<td>4.5% (N = 9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Been asked for money</td>
<td>88.6% (N = 179)</td>
<td>9.4% (N = 19)</td>
<td>2% (N = 4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Been ganged up on</td>
<td>80.7% (N = 163)</td>
<td>15.3% (N = 31)</td>
<td>4% (N = 8)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
School victimisation – associated behaviours

England: How often have you been bullied at school in the following ways?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Always</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Messages/online</td>
<td>94.8% (N = 165)</td>
<td>4.6% (N=8)</td>
<td>.6% (N = 1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Images</td>
<td>97.1% (N = 169)</td>
<td>2.3% (N = 4)</td>
<td>.6% (N = 1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teased/mean names</td>
<td>65.7% (N = 115)</td>
<td>31.4% (N = 55)</td>
<td>2.9% (N = 5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Left out/ignored</td>
<td>74.1% (N = 129)</td>
<td>23% (N = 40)</td>
<td>2.8% (N = 5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hit/kicked/pushed</td>
<td>84.5% (N = 147)</td>
<td>12.7% (N = 22)</td>
<td>2.9% (N = 5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lies/rumours</td>
<td>76.0% (N = 133)</td>
<td>20.5% (N = 36)</td>
<td>3.4% (N = 6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weight</td>
<td>85.6% (N = 149)</td>
<td>12% (N = 21)</td>
<td>2.2% (N = 4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spread embarrassing info</td>
<td>86.9% (N = 152)</td>
<td>9.1% (N = 16)</td>
<td>4% (N = 7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illness/disability</td>
<td>93.7% (N = 163)</td>
<td>4% (N = 7)</td>
<td>2.2% (N = 4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity</td>
<td>87.5% (N = 154)</td>
<td>10.8% (N = 19)</td>
<td>1.7% (N = 3)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Victimisation and health related quality life

- Victim and non-victim groups compared within each country for trends
- ROI:
  - One way MANOVA - statistically significant difference on the combined five dimensions of the KIDSCREEN between victims and non-victims (F(5, 181) = 8.40, p < .001, effect size = .19).
  - Following a Bonferroni adjustment to .01, there were significant differences across each of the individual dimension, with victims reporting greater impairment on all dimensions in comparisons to their non-victim peers. These differences displayed in the graph
Victimisation and health related quality life

- **England:**
  - Independent samples t-test - significant differences on the total KIDSCREEN between victims and non-victims ($t (169) = 5.52$, $p < .001$, CI [95%] 4.58, 9.69),
  
  - Victims ($M = 45.58$, $SD = 8.25$) reporting greater impairment in health related quality of life in comparison to their non-victim peers ($M = 52.72$, $SD = 8.14$).
Victimisation and trends for sex and age

• Gender:
  • A chi-square test reported no significant age differences for victimology for either Ireland ($X^2 (1) = .19, p = .660$) or England ($X^2 (1) = .02, p = .877$).

• Age
  • No age differences were reported for Ireland ($X^2 (2) = 3.10, p = .212$) or England ($X^2 (1) = 1.24, p = .265$).

Discussion

• Highlights similar rate of victimisation across both countries.
• Victims experience significantly great impairment to health related quality of life in comparison to non-victims
• Similar experiences for children of low-affluent areas across England and Ireland, despite different geographical areas
• Need to consider the needs of these already potentially at-risk children when designing anti-bullying polices and intervention and prevention programmes in order to buffer the psychological impact of victimisation
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