



FOCUS ON: BULLYING 2020

Peter K Smith
Goldsmiths, University of London



**NATIONAL
CHILDREN'S
BUREAU**
Part of the family

This edition of **Focus on: Bullying** summarises publications, especially journal articles, on bullying in the UK (or involving UK participants) published during 2020. Following the similar [Focus on: Bullying reports for 2017, 2018, and 2019](#), it is restricted to research relevant to children and young people, including students in higher or further education, and to studies which had bullying as a primary or substantial focus. I have endeavoured to cover major contributions using search engines and databases, but inevitably a few may have been missed.



CONTENT

●	Context: Government	4
●	Prevalence	4
●	Perceptions of victimisation	6
●	Risk factors – family and school	6
●	Correlates of involvement	7
●	At risk groups – mental health and disability	8
●	At risk groups – sexual minorities	9
●	Self-exclusion from school	10
●	Interventions	10
●	Intervention programs	13
●	International action	15
●	Reports and Books	15
●	Concluding comments	16
●	References	17

CONTEXT: GOVERNMENT

All Government guidance is listed under [1]. The Department for Education guidance for England remains unchanged, as does advice from the Welsh Government and the Scottish Government. This is also true for the Northern Ireland Assembly, although there it is planned to introduce new legislation on bullying from September 2021.



Of the **21%** who did not report it [experiencing bullying], common reasons were being embarrassed, called a 'snitch', and scared of it getting worse.

PREVALENCE

The Annual Bullying Survey 2020 by Ditch the Label [2] surveyed young people aged 12–18 years (mostly 12–16), across the UK (mostly England and Scotland), between September 2019 and March 2020. Although a total of 23,433 young people completed the survey, after 'the data was cleansed to remove incomplete and low quality responses', the sample was reduced to 13,387, which does make it less representative. A key question was 'In the past 12-months and based on your own definition, what have been your experiences of bullying?'. On this basis, 25% said that they had been bullied, 26% had witnessed bullying, and 3% said they had bullied others. For those bullied, the most frequent type reported was social exclusion (89%); this was closely followed by verbal bullying (86%) and then spreading rumours (54%), intimidation (35%) and cyberbullying (27%). When asked why they thought they got bullied, the most common reason given was 'attitudes towards my appearance' (47%), followed by 'attitudes towards my interests or hobbies' (30%). When those bullied were asked how it impacted them, the most common responses were anxious (44%), felt depressed (36%), and had suicidal

thoughts (33%). Of those bullied, 79% told someone (usually a family member, teacher, or friend). Of the 21% who did not report it, common reasons were being embarrassed, called a 'snitch', and scared of it getting worse. There are many quotations from respondents.

Compared to the 2019 survey, there was a small increase in being bullied (from 22 to 25%) and bullying others (from 2 to 3%) but a small decrease in witnessing bullying (from 27 to 26%). Social exclusion became the most frequent type reported. There was some increase in those who reported the bullying to someone (from 72 to 79%).

The full findings from the 2017/2018 Health Behaviour of School-aged Children (HBSC) survey, in which a standard definition of being bullied is given, were released in 2020 [3]. It provides prevalence rates for being bullied and bullying others, at ages 11,13 and 15 years, by gender, for 45 countries including England, Wales and Scotland. Sample size is a minimum of 1,500 per age group in each country. Taking the criterion of it happening at least twice in the past couple

of months, all 3 countries tend to come in the mid-to-high country range for rates of being bullied, but in the mid-to-low country rates for rates of bullying others. Over all ages and both genders, rates of being bullied were 14.2% in England, 13.7% in Wales, and 13.5% in Scotland. Rates of bullying others were 4.2% in England, 3.8% in Wales, and 2.5% in Scotland. For England, rates of both being bullied, and bullying others, have increased notably since the previous survey in 2013/14, especially for 13 year olds (being bullied) and for girls (bullying others).

This survey also has data on being cyberbullied or cyberbullying others, reporting prevalence for a more lenient criterion of at least once in the past couple of months. Over all ages and both genders, rates of being cyberbullied were 17.3% in England, 16.5% in Wales, and 15.0% in Scotland. Rates of cyberbullying others were 10.0% in England, 9.3% in Wales, and 7.7% in Scotland. Whereas for offline bullying there was not much gender difference, for cyberbullying girls were more often the targets in all 3 countries, especially at 13 years. Boys however were usually more involved in cyberbullying others, especially at 15 years.

Ditch the Label and HBSC used very different methodologies, but it is concerning that both show the position worsening somewhat. This does not appear to be a long-term trend globally; analysis of HBSC data [4] found that for traditional victimisation, trends (from 2002 to 2014) have been downward for 21 countries, rather stable for 10 countries, and increasing in six (including Scotland and Wales over this longer time period).

Youthworks Consulting reported findings from their 2019 survey of children's digital lives [5], from 14,944 young people in England and Scotland, mainly 11–15 years. They found that 22% reported having been cyberbullied (no time reference period was given). This rate has been fairly steady over 4 surveys since 2015. However, of those cyberbullied, 35% had told no-one, which was higher than in previous surveys. More positively, if they did tell someone, it stopped for 68% (stayed the same for 23%, got worse for 9%). The COVID-19 pandemic has affected the mental health of young people, and more specifically the prevalence and types of victimisation, through much of 2020 following the shutdown in March of that year [6, 7]. In particular there have been reports of less offline victimisation with pupils off school, but more online victimisation and racial victimisation., especially of children of Asian heritage [8, 9].

Over all ages and both genders, rates of being bullied were **14.2%** in England, **13.7%** in Wales, and **13.5%** in Scotland.

Of those cyberbullied, **35%** had told no-one, which was higher than in previous surveys. More positively, if they did tell someone, it stopped for **68%**.



PERCEPTIONS OF VICTIMISATION

The surveys cited in the previous section, like most surveys, rely on self-report data. It is useful to remember that each respondent must interpret what is meant by a term such as bullying or victimisation, and this is not straightforward. A group of studies explored this further. A report based on 7 focus group discussions with 28 students aged 11 to 15 years considered associations between humour, banter and bullying [10]. Students were aware of the ambiguity in banter – it could be friendly or offensive, and viewpoints might vary – and misinterpretation might be more likely online than face-to-face. Similar work with university students [11] was based on two studies, and the second especially – 4 focus groups with 21 students - showed the complexity with which what might be banter was interpreted with regard to intent. Data in another study was gathered from 10 focus groups with 63 teachers [12], on how they perceived cyberbullying as influenced by publicity and severity. Visual acts of cyberbullying were perceived as more severe than written forms. Level of publicity (private, semi-public, public) was seen to affect young people's bystander intentions, with public incidents of cyberbullying instigating both more positive and negative bystander intervention.



RISK FACTORS – FAMILY AND SCHOOL

Two quite different studies reported findings from the Avon Longitudinal Study of Parents and Children (ALSPAC). One continued a focus on the issue of sibling bullying [13; see also Focus 2019]. It reported findings from 16,987 participants. Primary caregivers reported on precursors at 7 years or earlier, and children self-reported on sibling bullying at 11 years. The strongest predictors of sibling bullying involvement were family-level characteristics such as birth order,

ethnicity, and number of siblings; next were child-level individual differences such as emotional dysregulation, and sex. Parenting characteristics (e.g. primary caregiver self-esteem and harsh parenting) predicted sibling bullying, but to a lesser extent.

Examination of school factors has usually focussed on issues related to school climate. Although school toilets are known to be one venue where bullying may occur, this has

been little studied. However, the quality of school toileting environments was available from 3,962 female ALSPAC participants at age 13, assessed as: toilets are dirty or in a bad condition, don't have any privacy, don't have toilet paper, don't have soap, don't have hand dryers or towels, child is likely to be bullied at toilets, there is always a queue at toilets [14]. Lower Urinary Tract Symptoms (such as incontinence, bedwetting), correlated with the school toilet environment measure, and most strongly with the item 'likely to be bullied at toilets'. Although causal effects need to be substantiated, the authors point to the need to ensure good toileting environments in schools.

CORRELATES OF INVOLVEMENT

The negative consequences of being involved in bullying are now well-established. Further evidence comes from a study of 2,218 students aged 11-19 years from 4 London secondary schools [15]. This assessed both traditional and cyber perpetration and victimisation, and post-traumatic stress (PTS) symptoms. As is commonly found, there was a significant overlap between traditional bullying and cyberbullying. Both cyber and traditional victimisation significantly predicted intrusion of thoughts and memories, and avoidance.

A significant proportion of those who were cybervictims, cyberbullies or cyberbully-victims presented clinically significant PTS symptoms. Cybervictims (both cyber-only and cyberbully-victims) suffered more intrusion and avoidance than cyberbullies. However, cyberbullies still suffered more PTS symptoms than the non-involved.



Lower Urinary Tract Symptoms (such as incontinence, bedwetting), correlated with the school toilet environment measure, and most strongly with the item 'likely to be bullied at toilets'.

AT RISK GROUPS – MENTAL HEALTH AND DISABILITY

Young people with mental health difficulties may not only be at greater risk of being targeted, but bullying can exacerbate their mental health needs. This was explored in a qualitative semi-structured interview study with 14 adolescents aged 14-16, who were asked about their school experiences, 16 parents, and 9 teachers, recruited via CAMHS in England [16]. Almost all the adolescents and parents raised bullying as an issue. It was seen as a serious stressor, reinforcing a cycle of victimisation which they could nevertheless find difficult to talk about. Bullying was less often mentioned by teachers, and adolescents and parents felt that school staff should be more attuned to subtle signs of bullying and that multi-agency links could be strengthened.

The attitudes and behaviour of peers is known to be important– for example, whether some peers will help defend a target of bullying. Two studies used vignettes of bullying scenarios to examine such aspects. One [17] focussed on autism. Survey data were collected at the beginning and end of the school year from 775 children aged 11–12 years, from six schools: three with specialist centres for autism and three without. Participants read four vignettes (one each on verbal bullying, and social exclusion; for both a neurotypical and an autistic child), then completed measures of their judgments and intended responses; they also completed an attitudes to autism scale, as well as amount of personal contact with people they knew were autistic. It was found that pupils who increased their personal contact with people on the autistic spectrum over the school year, showed more positive attitudes towards them. Differences between centre and non-centre schools were non-significant on many measures, but children from centre schools showed a greater increase in prosocial emotions

towards targets of bullying; children from non-centre schools showed a decrease in prosocial emotions for verbal bullying, but not in response to social exclusion of an autistic child.

A study of 248 university students in England used vignettes to assess likely bystander reactions to a cyberbullying scenario [18]. The target was described in terms of symptoms characteristic of anxiety, depression, schizophrenia, Asperger's; or control. Bystander reactions were typically less helpful to targets with mental and developmental disorders, and especially for schizophrenic victims (given less support) and depressive victims (more often ignored).

A systematic review was reported of the social inclusion experiences of children with and without disabilities, as viewed from their own perspective, with a focus on how typically developing peers did or did not promote social inclusion [19]. It covered 45 studies published between 2006 and 2018, 9 of these being from the UK. The studies reported varying degrees to which children with disabilities felt accepted by their peers. They generally reported feeling different, being aware of their difference, and having to work hard to keep up with their peers. They often reported feeling lonely, being an outsider, not feeling at ease with peers, and encountering social exclusion and bullying. The authors conclude that more needs to be done to reduce barriers to inclusion both inside and outside educational settings for children with disabilities.

More needs to be done to reduce barriers to inclusion both inside and outside educational settings for children with disabilities.

AT RISK GROUPS – SEXUAL MINORITIES

Young people with a sexual minority (non-heterosexual) orientation, and trans pupils, are known to be at greater risk of being targets of bullying. Four publications were relevant to this theme.

A questionnaire survey of adolescents in 6 European countries, including eastern England, asked students about their sexual orientation, as well as suicidal ideation and other variables including being bullied [20]. Of 1,958 students whose data was analysed, 214 reported sexual minority orientation. These students also reported greater levels of suicidal ideation, and higher levels of bullying victimisation; although no specific connection between these two was established.

A qualitative study focussed on interviews with teachers delivering LGBTQ-inclusive education in four English primary schools serving faith communities [21]. Targeting of LGBTQ pupils is often called 'homophobic, biphobic and transphobic' or 'HBT' bullying, although the author suggests that this can be pathologising, and argues for a broader challenge to the usual focus on heteronormativity. LGBTQ-inclusive education could be seen as a controversial issue in these schools, and teachers capitalised on a broader degree of consensus in the community about human rights and the unacceptability of bullying, and took the issue of HBT bullying as a governmental and legally approved way of

Students who reported sexual minority orientation reported greater levels of bullying victimisation.

getting into the delivery of LGBTQ-inclusive education. Making use of Anti-Bullying Week was one example of this. Despite anxieties, many teachers were encouraged by the responses of children and communities.

Another qualitative study analysed interview data from 23 parents of trans and gender-diverse children (who express themselves in a way that is not traditionally associated with their assigned sex at birth). These parents were supportive of their children, and described their experiences of working with schools and the school culture in relation to gender roles, identities, and expressions [22]. On the whole, interactions with school staff were seen as very positive. However, bullying was a major concern, often related to gender policing by peers (enforcing normative gender expressions for example in appearance, clothing and activities). It was concluded that it was through supportive and informed parental involvement that the schools became reactive in supporting trans and gender-diverse children.

'Everyone Knows Me as the Weird Kid' is a performance text created from collaborative narrative interviews between the first author of a journal article [23] and a 15-year-old participant named Max who identifies as bisexual and genderfluid. The performance explores how Max negotiated a range of challenges—including homophobia, transphobia, bullying, and harassment—on a day-to-day basis. It offers evocative insights into life as a young person with an intersecting identity across school, community, online, and family contexts. The representation of Max's experiences as a performance text offers a resource that can be performed in educational settings not only to young people but also by young people, to help others respond to sexual and gender-related bullying and discrimination in their own lives.



SELF-EXCLUSION FROM SCHOOL

Some young people and their parents choose to self-exclude from school; they may be educated at home, or seek alternative provision such as a Red Balloon Learner Centre. Reasons for this were ascertained from a survey uploaded to all internet listed home educating groups in England and posted on 'Mumsnet'. A report [24] presents findings from 132 online surveys and 12 follow-up interviews focusing on those parents who had removed children from compulsory, mainstream education.



Anxiety due to bullying was shaped by issues around friendship dynamics, lack of support, and institutional factors in schools. This led to gradual withdrawal from school, and eventually self-exclusion.

Inadequate responses to bullying was one major reason. Thirty-two respondents had removed their child/children, of whom sixteen had additional needs, from school because of peer bullying, and eight respondents cited staff bullying.

A study using participatory approaches with young people themselves [25], gives a more final account of a working paper report [32 in Focus 2019] on reasons for experiences of self-exclusion from school due to bullying. Fifteen adolescents from Red Balloon Learner Centres helped design the approach, and organise focus groups on the topic. The findings suggested that anxiety due to bullying was shaped by issues around friendship dynamics, lack of support, and institutional factors in schools. This led to gradual withdrawal from school, and eventually self-exclusion. In another article [26] the same authors reflect on the participatory research process itself, the practicalities and ethical issues, and the benefits of involving young people in this way in future studies.

INTERVENTIONS

Interventions to reduce bullying can take place at many levels, from institutional to individual. A number of publications are relevant to this theme, in varied ways.

An Erasmus+ project used participatory approaches with young people aged 14-16-year olds living in areas of socio-economic disadvantage in five European countries, including England and Northern Ireland [website report mentioned as 34 in Focus 2019]. A further article on this project [27] describes the process of using the quality circle approach (working together to solve a problem in small, peer-led groups) to harness pupils in designing resources to tackle cyberbullying. The researchers worked with 237 European teenagers across 10 schools to create innovative anti-cyberbullying

resources for teachers, parents/ carers, peers and social media providers. Each quality circle group was tasked with creating a resource for one of the target audience groups. The final resources comprise a rich variety of different formats including videos, comic strips, a board game, leaflets, posters, and newsletters. The pupil feedback highlighted, for most but not all participants, an increased knowledge of cyberbullying and e-safety skills, as well as enhanced problem-solving skills, levels of confidence, and group work skills. Several operational challenges are discussed, including the importance of school-level support, planning, staffing, and finding an appropriate balance between facilitator support and pupil agency.

It is a legal requirement for schools to have their anti-bullying strategy set out in an anti-bullying policy or behaviour policy, but the situation in universities is less clear. One study examined the quality of what policies were available [28]. Using the Good University Guide website and FOI requests, 62 anti-bullying and harassment policies were obtained between 2016 and 2019. These were coded for quality and coverage using a 64 item scale. On average 66% of items were scored. The lowest scoring items (<20% of policies) were those mentioning material bullying (e.g. damaging property); stating that 'being under the influence' does not excuse inappropriate behaviour; and including a clear flow chart of what to do in a bullying situation. The authors suggest that all universities should create and implement an anti-bullying policy, and that students could be involved in the development of interventions or policies, as co-created initiatives may be more influential. The need for college and university policies is highlighted by responses to bullying allegations at an Edinburgh vet school [29].



In the school context, the transition from primary to secondary school can be a time of stress and of increased risk of bullying. A literature review and three preliminary research studies are described as leading to the development of an emotional centred-intervention, called Talking about School Transition (TaST) [30]. This aims to help children to position the transition as a progression as opposed to a loss, build children's coping skills and resilience, and understand the importance of social support, how this may change at secondary school, and how to access it. While teacher led, in later sessions the children would engage in the cross-aged teaching (CATZ) approach, where older students teach and pass on their knowledge to younger students. The evaluation of this intervention is ongoing and will be reported later.

The attitudes and behaviours of peers are crucial factors in the likelihood of bullying happening and the impact on targets. Virtual learning environments, and games, have been used to try and influence knowledge about and attitudes towards bullying (for example in the KiVa project, see [37]). Using an anti-bullying game School of Empathy, the effect of different game experiences on

both cognitive outcomes (knowledge) and socioemotional outcomes (compassion) was examined in a cross-national study [31]. Each player had the opportunity to play three different roles consecutively: the victim, the bystander, and the bully. All the players progressed through the game in the same order. Firstly, they experienced the victim role and learnt behaviours for protecting themselves. Then, in the bystander role, they recognised bullying situations and learnt appropriate helping behaviours. Finally, in the bully role, they experienced the negative consequences of bullying behaviours and positive consequences of prosocial behaviours. Students aged 12 to 14 years took part from 10 European schools (one in the United Kingdom). Compared to control conditions, and examining differential effects of particular players' experiences, the findings suggested that the amount of challenge experienced during the bullying prevention game affected students' subsequent knowledge about appropriate behaviour in bullying situations; while the extent of immersion in the game was important for enhancing compassion for the victim.

The Diana Award's Anti-Bullying Ambassador Programme (ABAP) trains and supports students to be Anti-Bullying Ambassadors,

empowering them to become Upstanders rather than Bystanders when they encounter bullying behaviour at their school and online, and to advocate for Online Safety. A report [32] evaluated the impact of the ABAP, using quantitative data from participating schools before training, directly after training and three months after training; and qualitative data from focus groups and surveys with five case study schools in England. Students, Ambassadors and staff gained knowledge and awareness of bullying behaviour at their school and online, and more skills to tackle bullying behaviour. The Ambassadors themselves became more confident, made new friends, and gained leadership skills. Factors such as adherence to the whole-school and peer-led approach, and cooperation between teachers and Ambassadors, influenced the effectiveness of the programme at different schools. It was important that Ambassadors are motivated and ready for the responsibility of the role; girls were more likely to be Ambassadors than boys and were more effective as Ambassadors.

Another approach to peer support, via cybermentoring, was developed in the UK by BeatBullying. A rollout of this scheme to six European countries involved train-the-trainer workshops for partners and life mentors, followed by training sessions for pupil cybermentors aged 11–16 years. Although BeatBullying went into liquidation in November 2014, the project was largely completed. A report from the UK [33] evaluated the training of the life mentors and mentors, via a questionnaire survey; and discussed findings about the implementation of the scheme and its potential at a cross-

The amount of challenge experienced during the bullying prevention game affected students subsequent knowledge about appropriate behaviour in bullying situations.



national level, via partner interviews during and at the end of the project. The training was highly rated in all respects, in all six countries involved. The overall consensus was that there was a positive impact for the schools and professionals involved; some challenges encountered are discussed. The BeatBullying Europe project, despite being unfinished, was argued to be promising, with a similar approach deserving further support and evaluation in the future.

Therapeutic work by professionals can clearly have a role when working with children severely bullied within the school environment. The potential of person-centred therapy was investigated in a study with four young women who had left school due to bullying in high school, and had received person-centred counselling

for this [34]. Structured interviews suggested that the bullying had been a multifaceted experience, and a lack of emotional support in the school environment added to the trauma that the victims experienced from it. The bullying the participants experienced during school led to mental health problems in adulthood, especially anxiety. Participants found the person-centred approach to be useful, especially just to be able to talk about their experiences and express their emotions. However, some wished they had had more practical help and techniques to help them cope with their bullying experiences; the author concluded that other therapeutic approaches such as cognitive behavioural therapy may be more beneficial to someone experiencing bullying.



Thematic content analysis identified three social mechanisms that were important for reducing bullying: building student commitment to the school community; building healthy relationships by modelling and teaching pro-social skills; and de-escalating bullying and aggression and enabling re-integration within the school community.

INTERVENTION PROGRAMS

Some packages or programs use a number of components to provide a more comprehensive range of intervention strategies at various levels. In the UK, the Learning Together program [see 30 and 31 in Focus 2018] comprised three components: a school action group to encourage pupil participation; a social and emotional skills curriculum; and staff training in restorative practices. In order to explore how intervention resources were taken up and used by local actors, how participants described the intervention mechanisms that then ensued, and how these might have generated beneficial outcomes, a study used qualitative analysis of 45 interviews and 21 focus groups across three case-study schools [35]. Thematic content analysis identified three social mechanisms that were important for reducing bullying: building student commitment to the school community; building healthy relationships by modelling and teaching pro-social skills; and de-escalating bullying and aggression and enabling re-integration within the school community (broadly corresponding to the three components of the intervention).

In England, the ABA All Together Programme aims to reduce the incidence and impact of bullying (including cyberbullying) of children and young people, particularly those who have SEN/D, by training leaders across schools and the wider children's workforce in a model of bullying prevention based on a whole school approach and the social model of disability. Participating schools can access an online Hub, which provides resources training materials and evaluation tools. An interim evaluation between March 2019 and March 2020 [36] used data from an online Pupil Bullying and Wellbeing Questionnaire. Over time victimisation and bullying reduced for all pupils, but more so for those pupils who identified as SEN/D. Primary schools showing the most improvement. Pupil Wellbeing remained static over time overall, but with a significant improvement reported by pupils with SEN/D, who felt safer at school. The programme also provided training through face-to-face workshops or online, for all who worked with children and young people; this was designed to improve knowledge and skills and develop a better understanding of preventing and responding to bullying. All participants reported significantly improved and sustained confidence as a result of the training, and felt able to utilise what they had learnt to make changes in forming and developing their anti-bullying work and anti-bullying policies.

The KiVa anti-bullying program has been used with considerable success in Finland, and some other countries, and is being tried out in Wales [see 37 in Focus 2019]. A report [37] evaluated the implementation fidelity and effectiveness of KiVa, in a randomized controlled trial in which 22 primary schools were allocated to intervention or a waitlist control. Implementation fidelity was measured using teacher-completed online records and independent researcher observations. Lesson adherence was good but lesson length was lower than the recommended amount, and there was considerable variability in the implementation of whole school elements. Outcome analyses with 11 intervention schools (1,578 children) and 10 control schools (1,636 children) found that although child-reported victimisation, and bullying perpetration, were less in intervention schools, the findings were not statistically significant. Nor were significant effects found for teacher-reported child behaviour and emotional well-being, or school absenteeism. Thus, the trial found insufficient evidence to conclude that KiVa had an effect on the main outcomes. Possible reasons were lack of implementation fidelity, variable administration of the annual student online survey, and the possibility that control schools more frequently used relevant programs not in KiVa, such as PSE curriculum. The authors argued that a larger trial of KiVa in the UK is warranted, with attention to these issues.

Over time victimisation and bullying reduced for all pupils, but more so for those pupils who identified as SEN/D.

INTERNATIONAL ACTION

UNESCO has been producing reports and resources to help schools and societies tackle violence in school, and bullying, for several years. 2020 saw the inauguration of what will be an annual International Day against Violence and Bullying at School including Cyberbullying, on 5 November; together with a leaflet Together Against Bullying in School to mark the occasion [38].

REPORTS AND BOOKS

A review of racist and faith targeted bullying was provided in a report [39] which found 21 relevant studies between 1993 and 2020. Overall, BAME groups and religious minorities were not bullied more than others; but there were exceptions, notably Gypsy, Roma and Traveller children and mixed-race children. The BAME acronym was felt to be unhelpful in this context. The report noted the lack of recent research (including post-Brexit), and of research on cyberbullying and on some minorities such as Jewish, Eastern European and East Asian children and young people.

Peer support can take many forms, and despite some well-documented successes, also has some pitfalls to avoid. An overview

of work internationally as well as in the UK is provided in [40]. It covers Befriending, Circle of friends, Peer mediation, Peer counselling, Peer mentoring, and Upstanding schemes. The social and historical context of peer support is summarised, and the benefits and disadvantages of peer support are discussed.

Another book scrutinises the act of bullying from a range of perspectives; it explores how societies create their own bullies as well as what some of the key components of child development tell us about why some children choose to bully others. A review of the book [41] describes it as 'an engaging, accessible text that highlights the need to look beyond a simple within-child view of bullying behaviour towards a more holistic perspective'. The reviewer praises the way the book deals with the contentious issue of labelling, but would have liked a deeper exploration of online bullying.



CONCLUDING COMMENTS

Publications on school bullying continue to appear at a rapid rate, internationally and in the UK. Two reports on prevalence do concur in suggesting some increase in bullying rates, at least in England [2, 3]. These findings are, on the whole, pre-COVID-19 and the impact of that is beginning to be felt [6, 7, 8, 9]. Self-report prevalence rates will be affected by what is interpreted as being bullying [10, 11]. Use continues to be made of longitudinal data bases available in the UK [13, 14]. Several studies have focussed on young people particularly at risk of being targeted, including those with mental and developmental disorders

[16, 17, 18, 19]; and those with sexual minority orientation or identity [20, 21, 22, 23]. Three studies focus on self-exclusion from school, often due to bullying [24, 25, 26]. Studies on interventions cover a range of topics, from college policies [28] to assisting school transition [30], virtual learning games [31], individual therapy [34], and several on peer support [32, 33, 39]; as well as three reports on intervention packages [35, 36, 37]. As last year, use of more participatory approaches involving young people themselves is advocated in several studies [23, 25, 26, 27, 28].

For more information, tools and resources about bullying, visit: <https://anti-bullyingalliance.org.uk/tools-information/all-about-bullying>



Take part in our free whole-school anti-bullying programme [HERE](#)



Learn more about bullying with our free CPD anti-bullying online training <https://anti-bullyingalliance.org.uk/tools-information/free-cpd-online-training>



REFERENCES

1. DfE (2018). Keeping children safe in education: statutory guidance for schools and colleges. London: DfE. https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/741314/Keeping_Children_Safe_in_Education_3_September_2018_14.09.18.pdf
DfE (2018). Approaches to preventing and tackling bullying: case studies. DFE-RR751. London: DfE. www.gov.uk/government/publications
Respect for All: national approach to anti-bullying – gov.scot www.gov.scot
<https://www.gov.scot/publications/respect-national-approach-anti-bullying-scotlands-children-young-people/>
Welsh Government/Llywodraeth Cymru (2019). School Bullying. <https://gov.wales/school-bullying>
Weir announces new legislation to address bullying in schools (NI Department of Education)
<https://www.education-ni.gov.uk/news/weir-announces-new-legislation-address-bullying-schools>
<https://www.education-ni.gov.uk/articles/dealing-bullying>
2. Ditch the Label (2020). The Annual Bullying Survey 2020. <https://www.ditchthelabel.org/wp-content/uploads/2020/11/The-Annual-Bullying-Survey-2020-2.pdf>
3. Inchley, J., Currie, D., Budisavljevic, S., Torsheim, T., Jåstad, A., Cosma, A., Kelly, C., Arnasson, A.M. & Samdal, O. (eds.) (2020). Spotlight on adolescent health and well-being: Findings from the 2017/2018 Health Behaviour in School-aged Children (HBSC) survey in Europe and Canada. International report Volume 2: Key data. Copenhagen: WHO Regional Office for Europe.
<https://www.euro.who.int/en/publications/abstracts/spotlight-on-adolescent-health-and-well-being-findings-from-the-20172018-health-behaviour-in-school-aged-children-hbsc-survey-in-europe-and-canada-international-report-volume-2-key-data>
4. Cosma, A., Walsh, S.D., Chester, K.L., Callaghan, M., Molcho, M., Craig, W. & Pickett, W. (2020). Bullying victimization: time trends and the overlap between traditional and cyberbullying across countries in Europe and North America. International Journal of Public Health, 65:75–85. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00038-019-01320-2>
5. Katz, A. & El Asam, A. (2020). In their own words: The digital lives of schoolchildren. Internet Matters. <https://www.internetmatters.org/about-us/in-their-own-words-2019-cybersurvey-research-report/>
6. Cowie, H. & Myers, C-A. (2020). The impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on the mental health and well-being of children and young people. Children & Society, <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/pdf/10.1111/chso.12430>
7. YoungMinds (2020). Impact of COVID-19 on children's and young people's mental health: Results of survey with parents and carers. YoungMinds. <https://youngminds.org.uk/>
8. Barnardo's (2020). Briefing for MPs and Peers: Children's Mental Health and COVID-19. <https://www.barnardos.org.uk/sites/default/files/uploads/parliamentary-briefing-childrens-mental-health-covid19.pdf>
9. Diana Award survey (2020). <https://diana-award.org.uk/news/the-diana-award-and-nationwide-to-put-an-end-to-bullying/>
<https://www.theguardian.com/education/2020/sep/22/one-third-of-children-in-uk-have-heard-racist-comments-at-school>
10. Steer, O.L., Betts, L.R., Baguley, T., & Binder, J.F. (2020). "I feel like everyone does it"- adolescents' perceptions and awareness of the association between humour, banter, and cyberbullying. Computers in Human Behavior, 108, 106297. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2020.106297>
11. Buglass, S.L., Abell, L., Betts, L.R., Hill, R. & Saunders, J. (2020). Banter versus Bullying: a university student perspective. International Journal of Bullying Prevention, <https://doi.org/10.1007/s42380-020-00085-0>
12. Macaulay, P.J.R., Betts, L.R., Stiller, J. & Kellezi, B. (2020). 'The more public it is, the more severe it is': teachers' perceptions on the roles of publicity and severity in cyberbullying. Research Papers in Education. <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/02671522.2020.1767183?journalCode=rrred20>
13. Toseeb, U., McChesney, G., Dantchev, S. & Wolke, D. (2020). Precursors of sibling bullying in middle childhood: Evidence from a UK-based longitudinal cohort study. Child Abuse & Neglect, 108, 104633. <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/32745800/>



14. Shoham, D.A., Wang, Z., Lindberg, S. + 15 more authors (2020). School toileting environment, bullying, and lower urinary tract symptoms in a population of adolescent and young adult girls: Preventing lower urinary tract symptoms consortium analysis of Avon Longitudinal Study of Parents and Children. *Pediatric Urology*, 151, 86–93. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.urology.2020.06.060>
15. Mateu, A., Pascual-Sánchez, A., Martínez-Hervas, M., et al. (2020). Cyberbullying and post-traumatic stress symptoms in UK adolescents. *Archives of Disease in Childhood*, 105, 951–956. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1136/archdischild-2019-318716>
16. Hart, T. & O'Reilly, M. (2020). Perspectives on what schools and mental health services can do about bullying of adolescents with severe emotional health conditions. *Pastoral Care in Education*. <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/02643944.2020.1827280?journalCode=rped20>
17. Cook, A., Ogden, J. & Winstone, N. (2020). The effect of school exposure and personal contact on attitudes towards bullying and autism in schools: A cohort study with a control group. *Autism*, 24(8), 2178–2189. <https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/1362361320937088>
18. Görzig, A., Bedrosova, M. & Machackova, H. (2020). Do stereotypes of mental and developmental disorders predict bystander intentions in cyberbullying? An application of the Stereotype Content Model. *International Journal of Developmental Science*, 13 (3–4), 83–95. <https://content.iospress.com/articles/international-journal-of-developmental-science/dev190270>
19. Woodgate, R.L., Gonzalez, M., Demczuk, L., Snow, W.M., Barriage, S. & Kirk, S. (2020). How do peers promote social inclusion of children with disabilities? A mixed-methods systematic review. *Disability and Rehabilitation*, 42(18), 2553–2579. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09638288.2018.1561955>
20. Gambadauro, P., Carli, V., Wasserman, D., Balazs, J., Sarchiapone, M., & Hadlaczky, G. (2020). Serious and persistent suicidality among European sexual minority youth. *PLoS ONE* 15(10): e0240840. <https://journals.plos.org/plosone/article?id=10.1371/journal.pone.0240840>
21. Carlile, A. (2020) Teacher experiences of LGBTQ+ inclusive education in primary schools serving faith communities in England, UK. *Pedagogy, Culture & Society*, 28:4, 625–644. <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/14681366.2019.1681496?journalCode=rpcs20>
22. Davy, Z. & Cordoba, S. (2020) School cultures and trans and gender-diverse children: Parents' perspectives. *Journal of GLBT Family Studies*, 16:4, 349–367. <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/1550428X.2019.1647810>
23. Carless, D., Douglas, K., Milnes, K. & Turner-Moore, T. (2020). "Everyone Knows Me as the Weird Kid": Being Bisexual, Genderfluid, and Fifteen. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 26(7), 840–848. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1077800419846525>
24. Mitchell, E. (2021). Why English parents choose home education – a study. *Education 3–13*, 49:5, 545–557. <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/03004279.2020.1742185?journalCode=rett20>
25. Dadswell, A. & O'Brien, N. (2020). Working with adolescents to understand bullying and self-exclusion from school. *International Journal of Developmental Science*, 14, 63–73. <https://content.iospress.com/articles/international-journal-of-developmental-science/dev200288>
26. O'Brien, N. & Dadswell, A. (2020). Reflections on a participatory research project exploring bullying and school self-exclusion: power dynamics, practicalities and partnership working. *Pastoral Care in Education*, 38:3, 208–229. <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/02643944.2020.1788126?journalCode=rped20>
27. Hamilton, J., Purdy, N., Willems, R.A., Smith, P.K., Culbert, C., Brighi, A., Fiedler, N., Guarini, A., Maneli, C., Menin, D., Scheitauer, H. & Völlink, T. (2020). Using the Quality Circle approach to empower disadvantaged youth in addressing cyberbullying: An exploration across five European countries. *Pastoral Care in Education*, 38, 254–272. <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/02643944.2020.1788127?journalCode=rped20>
28. Harrison, E.D., Fox, C.L. & Hulme, J.A. (2020). Student anti-bullying and harassment policies at UK universities. *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management*, 42:5, 547–562. <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/1360080X.2020.1767353?journalCode=cjhe20>
29. Anonymous (2020). Responses to bullying allegations at Edinburgh vet school. *Vet Record*, 31 October/7 November, p.362. <https://bvajournals.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1136/vr.m4157>
30. Bagnall, C.L. (2020) Talking about School Transition (TaST): an emotional centred intervention to support children over primary-secondary school transition. *Pastoral Care in Education*, 38:2, 116–137. <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/02643944.2020.1713870?journalCode=rped20>
31. Zubković, B.R., Kolić-Vehovec, S., Smojver-Ažić, S., Dorčić, T.M. & Pahljina-Reinić, R. (2020). The role of experience during playing bullying prevention serious game: effects on knowledge and compassion. *Behaviour & Information Technology*. <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/0144929X.2020.1813332>
32. Van Rens, T., Rolfe, H., & Nubir, B. (2020). A Peer's Perspective: The Impact of a Peer-To-Peer Approach to Bullying Behaviour at School and Online. London: Demos. <https://diana-award.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2020/11/A-Peers-Perspective-Sep-2020-Summary-report-1.pdf>
33. Smith, P.K., Thompson, F, Jessel, J., Kožuchová, A., Ferreira, I., Idriceanu, G. Menesini, E., Miklosz, M. & de Villanueva, M. (2020). Training, implementation, and potential of a cybermentoring scheme in six EU countries. *Journal of Psychologists and Counsellors in Schools*, 30, 58–72. <https://doi.org/10.1017/jgc.2019.11>

34. Jones, C. (2020). Is person-centred counselling effective when assisting young people who have experienced bullying in schools? *Counselling and Psychotherapy Research*, 20, 657–665. <https://doi.org/10.1002/capr.12312>
35. Warren, E., Melendez-Torres, G. J., Viner, R. & Bonell, C. (2020). Using qualitative research to explore intervention mechanisms: findings from the trial of the Learning Together whole-school health intervention. *Trials*, 21, 774. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s13063-020-04688-2>
36. Reducing bullying in school: a summary of findings from the independent evaluation of the All Together Programme – Phase Two (2020). https://anti-bullyingalliance.org.uk/sites/default/files/uploads/attachments/All_Together_Report_2020%20FINAL_0.pdf - https://anti-bullyingalliance.org.uk/sites/default/files/uploads/attachments/All%20Together%20Phase%20II%20Evaluation%202020_0_0.pdf
37. Axford, N., Bjornstad, G., Clarkson, S., Ukoumunne, O.C., Wrigley, Z., Matthews, J., Berry, V. & Hutchings, J. (2020). The effectiveness of the KiVa Bullying Prevention Program in Wales, UK: Results from a pragmatic cluster randomized controlled trial. *Prevention Science*, 21, 615–626. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11121-020-01103-9>
38. UNESCO (2020). International day against violence and bullying at school including cyberbullying. <https://en.unesco.org/commemorations/dayagainstschoolviolenceandbullying/2020>
39. Eilenberg, J. and the Anti-Bullying Alliance (2020). Racist and Faith targeted Bullying in the UK: a review of existing literature 2020. <https://anti-bullyingalliance.org.uk/sites/default/files/uploads/attachments/Racist%20and%20Faith%20Targeted%20Bullying%20a%20review%20of%20the%20current%20literature%20-%202020%20FINAL%20REBRAND.pdf>
40. Cowie, H. (2020). Peer support in school. Sixth Monograph in Resilience and Health by the Centre for Resilience and Socio-Emotional Health, University of Malta. ISBN: 978-9918-9510-1-7 (electronic) ISBN: 978-9918-9510-0-0 (paperback). <https://www.um.edu.mt/library/oar/bitstream/123456789/62474/4/Helen%20Cowie%20Peer%20Support%20in%20School%20final%20Online.pdf>
41. Lissack, K. (2020). The bully in the greenhouse – exploring why children bully others and what schools can do about it. *Educational Psychology in Practice*, 36:4, 458–459. <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/02667363.2020.1804655?journalCode=cepp20>