#### SPECIAL SECTION ON SUBSTANCE USE: QUANTITATIVE RESEARCH



# Bullying victimization and illicit drug use among students in Grades 7 to 12 in Manitoba, Canada: a cross-sectional analysis

Sarah Turner<sup>1</sup> • Tamara Taillieu<sup>2</sup> • Janique Fortier<sup>1</sup> • Samantha Salmon<sup>1</sup> • Kristene Cheung<sup>3</sup> • Tracie O. Afifi<sup>1</sup>

Received: 30 June 2017 / Accepted: 2 November 2017 / Published online: 22 February 2018  ${\rm (}{\rm C}{\rm )}$  The Canadian Public Health Association 2018

## Abstract

**Objectives** There is inconsistent evidence examining the relationship between bullying victimization and illicit drug use, with most studies only examining the association between bullying victimization and marijuana use. The current study aims to (1) determine the relationship between bullying victimization and six types of illicit drug use among boys and girls in grades 7 to 12 and (2) examine gender and grade differences in the relationships between bullying victimization and drug use.

**Methods** Data were drawn from the Manitoba Youth Health Survey (N = 64,174) collected in the 2012–2013 school year among students in grades 7 to 12 from Manitoba, Canada. Logistic regression models were used to analyze the relationships between nine different types of bullying victimization and marijuana, cocaine, methamphetamines, ecstasy, hallucinogens, and prescription/over-the-counter drugs used to get high. All analyses were stratified by gender and grade.

**Results** Bullying victimization was associated with increased odds of all types of drug use among boys and girls in grades 7 to 12. A dose-response relationship was noted with more frequent bullying victimization corresponding to greater odds of drug use. Grade and gender differences were found for some drug use types.

**Conclusions** There are strong relationships between bullying victimization and illicit drug use among boys and girls in grades 7 to 12, indicating that reductions in bullying victimization may result in reductions in illicit drug use. Grade and gender differences may signify the need for early and gender-specific bullying prevention and intervention strategies.

## Résumé

**Objectifs** Les études qui examinent le lien entre être victime d'intimidation et l'utilisation de drogues illicites varient et la plupart examinent seulement le lien à l'utilisation de la marijuana. Cette étude vise à : 1) déterminer la relation entre être victime d'intimidation et l'utilisation de six types de drogues illicites chez les élèves de la  $7^{e}$  à la  $12^{e}$  année et 2) examiner les différences entre sexe et niveaux scolaires.

**Méthodes** Les données provenaient de l'Enquête sur la santé des jeunes au Manitoba en 2012–2013 (N = 64,174). Des modèles de régression logistique, stratifiés selon le sexe et niveaux scolaires, ont été adoptés pour analyser les liens entre neuf types d'intimidation et la marijuana, la cocaïne, les méthamphétamines, l'ecstasy, les hallucinogènes, et les médicaments sur ordonnance ou sans ordonnance.

**Résultats** Être victime d'intimidation était associé à une augmentation des risques d'utilisation de chaque type de drogues parmi les deux sexes et chaque niveau scolaire. La probabilité d'utilisation de drogues augmentait avec la fréquence accrue d'intimidation. Des différences de niveaux scolaires et de sexe ont été observées pour l'utilisation de certains types de drogues. **Conclusions** Il existe de fortes relations entre être victime d'intimidation et l'utilisation de drogues illicites chez les garçons et les filles de la 7<sup>e</sup> à la 12<sup>e</sup> année. Ceci suggère que la réduction d'intimidation pourrait être associée à une réduction d'utilisation de drogues illicites. Les différences de niveaux scolaires et de sexe suggèrent le besoin de stratégies de prévention et d'intervention précoces et adaptées selon le sexe.

Tracie O. Afifi tracie.afifi@umanitoba.ca

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> Applied Health Sciences Program, University of Manitoba, 202 Active Living Centre, Winnipeg, MB, Canada

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Department of Community Health Sciences, University of Manitoba, S113-750 Bannatyne Avenue, Winnipeg, MB R3E 0W5, Canada

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup> Department of Psychology, University of Manitoba, 190 Dysart Road, Winnipeg R3T 2N2, MB, Canada

Keywords Adolescent · Bullying · Victimization · Drug users

Mots-clés Adolescent · Intimidation · Victimisation · Toxicomane

# Introduction

Bullying victimization is one of the most common forms of victimization in childhood and adolescence (Radford et al. 2013) and is often defined as experiencing any unwanted aggressive behaviour by an individual or a group of individuals with more social power that is intended to harm and is repeated over time (Nansel et al. 2001; Freeman et al. 2011). Bullying victimization can result in both immediate and long-term consequences such as the following: increased risk of developing mental disorders and suicidal behaviours (Takizawa et al. 2014; Arseneault 2017; Skapinakis et al. 2011; Moore et al. 2017); poor educational achievement (Wang et al. 2014; Wolke and Lereya 2015); difficulty maintaining stable employment (Wolke et al. 2013); increased risk of falling below the poverty line (Wolke et al. 2013); and increased risk-taking behaviours such as smoking, alcohol use, and illicit drug use (Moore et al. 2017; Wolke et al. 2013; Niemelä et al. 2011; Tharp-Taylor et al. 2009; Radliff et al. 2012). A recent systematic review and meta-analysis quantified the magnitude of risk associated with bullying victimization and determined a 1.60 increased odds of poor mental health, 2.21 increased odds of depression, 1.77 increased odds of anxiety, 1.77 increased odds of suicidal ideation, and 2.13 increased odds of suicide attempts when bullying victimization were experienced (Moore et al. 2017). Importantly, bullying victimization was also associated with a 1.41 increased odds of illicit drug use (Moore et al. 2017).

The definition of bullying victimization, pioneered by Olweus in 1993, includes three components: (1) aggressive behaviour, (2) power imbalance, and (3) repetition over time (Olweus 1993). Since the 1990s, researchers have adapted and modified this definition, resulting in the inability of consistent assessment or comparison of prevalence between populations or over time (Modecki et al. 2014; Griffin and Gross 2004). Discrepancies in how bullying victimization is defined and measured have been documented, highlighting differences in the assessment time frame and number of experiences measured (Vivolo-Kantor et al. 2014). Several studies have assessed past 12-month reports of physical aggression, verbal aggression, and cyber-victimization and determined that between 4.0% and 44.6% of youth experienced victimization (Kann et al. 2014; DeVoe and Murphy 2011; Carlyle and Steinman 2007; Haynie et al. 2001; Hemphill et al. 2015; Schneider et al. 2012). In Canada, the national prevalence of adolescents experiencing bullying victimization, including physical, relational, verbal, indirect, sexual harassment, racial,

religious, and/or electronic victimization once or twice in the past 2 months, was approximately 60.0% for both boys and girls combined (Freeman et al. 2011). It is possible that differences in how bullying victimization was assessed, including the number of experiences that were asked about, the time frame for occurrence, and the frequency of occurrence account for some of the discrepancy between these findings. It is also important to note that demographic differences in the prevalence of bullying victimization exist, with boys often reporting a higher frequency of bullying than girls, and differences in the prevalence of bullying victimization across grades (Nansel et al. 2001; Freeman et al. 2011; Radliff et al. 2012; Carlyle and Steinman 2007; Berthold and Hoover 2000; Carbone-Lopez et al. 2010). Therefore, bullying victimization should be assessed separately for boys and girls and for different grades, but ideally with comparable assessment tools.

Adolescence and youth are also peak times for exposure and experimentation with illicit drugs (Canadian Centre on Substance Abuse 2007; Boak et al. 2014). In 2015, approximately 20.6% of Canadians aged 15 to 19 years old used marijuana in the past year, while 5.0% used other illicit drugs (i.e., hallucinogens, cocaine, ecstasy, methamphetamines, and heroin) (Health Canada 2015). These estimates are higher than the reported prevalence estimates for Canadians age 25 years or older, which are 9.9% for marijuana and 1.5% for any other illicit drug use. Representative Canadian statistics do not exist for the prevalence of illicit drug use for youth below the age of 15. However, the 2004 Health Behaviour in School-Aged Children survey showed an increase in illicit drug use from grade 9 to grade 10 (Boyce 2004) and in the USA, the 2016 National Survey on Adolescent Drug Use showed that illicit drug use increases from grade 8 to grade 12 (Johnston et al. 2017). Previous literature has also identified that boys are more likely to use illicit drugs than girls (Health Canada 2015; Boyce 2004; Johnston et al. 2017).

There is a growing literature on the relationship between bullying involvement and illicit drug use (Wolke and Lereya 2015; Wolke et al. 2013; Niemelä et al. 2011; Tharp-Taylor et al. 2009; Radliff et al. 2012; Luk et al. 2010; Kaltiala-Heino et al. 2000; Sigurdson et al. 2014; Bender and Losel 2011; Bouffard and Koeppel 2017; Valdebenito et al. 2015). However, these studies have indicated inconsistent findings, with some studies noting significant relationships between bullying victimization and illicit drug use (Tharp-Taylor et al. 2009; Luk et al. 2010; Sigurdson et al. 2014; Valdebenito et al. 2015; Goebert et al. 2011), while others find little or no effect (Wolke and Lereya 2015; Wolke et al. 2013; Niemelä et al. 2011; Radliff et al. 2012; Kaltiala-Heino et al. 2000; Bender and Losel 2011; Bouffard and Koeppel 2017). Furthermore, many studies are limited by only assessing marijuana use and using a population of either middle school or high school youths (Tharp-Taylor et al. 2009; Berthold and Hoover 2000; Carbone-Lopez et al. 2010; Luk et al. 2010; Goebert et al. 2011). How bullying victimization is related to specific drug types and if these relationships vary according to grade or gender is currently unknown. We also do not know if a dose-response relationship exists with frequency of bullying victimization corresponding with increased drug use. One previous study examined the relationship between bullying victimization and drug use among students in middle school (grades 6 to 8) and high school (grades 9 to 12) and found similar trends among the two grade groupings; however, the authors did not test for statistical differences (Radliff et al. 2012). A different study indicated significant gender differences in the relationships between bullying victimization and substance use (Carbone-Lopez et al. 2010), although substance use was measured using an aggregate variable consisting of alcohol, tobacco, marijuana, and inhalant use. Some studies have noted a dose-response relationship with increasing bullying victimization corresponding with poorer outcomes (Evans et al. 2014; Kelleher et al. 2013) but not in relation to drug use. Examining the relationships between the frequency of different bullying victimization types and drug use types between younger and older grades and among boys and girls is important for understanding possible grade- and gender-related differences, which can provide evidence for grade- and gender-specific intervention and prevention strategies.

The current study extends the existing literature with population-based data that assesses the frequency of nine different bullying victimization types and six different drug use types separately among boys and girls in grades 7 to 9 and grades 10 to 12 in Manitoba, Canada. The objectives of this study were to (1) determine the relationships between the frequency of nine different types of bullying victimization and six different drug use types among boys and girls in grades 7 to 9 and grades 10 to 12 and (2) examine grade and gender differences in the relationships between bullying victimization and drug use. We hypothesized that bullying victimization would be related to all drug use types, with increasing frequency of victimization corresponding with increased drug use. We also hypothesized that there would be grade and gender differences in the relationships between bullying victimization and drug use.

## Methods

## Data and sample

The data used for this study were from the Youth Health Survey (YHS; N = 64,174, response rate 67%; 49% female and 51% male), collected during the 2012–2013 school year in Manitoba,

Canada. Partners in Planning for Healthy Living (PPHL), a network of government and non-government bodies and Manitoba Regional Health Authorities, partnered to facilitate and support the administration of this survey in all schools in Manitoba (Partners in Planning for Healthy Living 2013). A self-administered, paper-and-pencil questionnaire was offered to all schools with students in grades 7 to 12 across the province including public, independent, Colony, Francophone, and First Nations schools, making it a population-based design. Participation was voluntary, and students could stop participating at any time. Passive parental consent (i.e., parent/guardian is given the option to withdraw their child, but if they do not, consent is implied) or active parental consent (i.e., parent/guardian must sign a consent form and return it to the school to allow their child to participate) was obtained depending on the consent process chosen by the school division. Ethical approval to conduct the current study was granted from the University of Manitoba Health Research Ethics Board. Further details of the YHS data collection process and survey content can be found elsewhere (Partners in Planning for Healthy Living 2013).

#### **Primary measurements**

#### **Bullying victimization**

Bullying victimization was measured using the following items: "How many times in the past year (12 months) has anyone done any of the following to you: 1) physically threatened or injured you, 2) threatened or injured you with a weapon such as a gun, knife or club, 3) bullied, taunted or ridiculed you, 4) said something bad about your race or culture, 5) said something bad about your sexual orientation, 6) said something bad about your body shape, size or appearance, 7) asked for personal information over the internet, 8) made you feel unsafe when you were in contact with them over the internet, and 9) bullied or picked on you through the internet." Response options included the following: never, one to five times, six or more times, and everyday (internal consistency as measured by Cronbach's  $\alpha = 0.77$ ). To calculate gender by drug type and grade by drug type interaction terms, a dichotomous variable was also created that categorized respondents who indicated they experienced any of these one time or more in the past year as experiencing any bullying victimization, and those who reported never for all victimization items as not experiencing any bullying victimization.

## Drug use

Respondents were asked about their use of six different types of drugs in the past month including: marijuana, cocaine, methamphetamines, ecstasy, LSD or other hallucinogens, and prescription or over-the-counter (OTC) drugs used to get high. Response options included the following: 0 times, 1-2 times, 3-9 times, and 10 or more times. A dichotomous

variable for each drug was computed to categorize respondents who used the drug one time or more in the past month compared to never.

#### Stratification variables

The analysis was stratified by two grade groupings and gender. All analyses are presented separately for boys and girls in grades 7 to 9 and 10 to 12.

## Covariates

Two measures of mental and emotional health were included as covariates in the analyses. First, mental health functioning and emotional well-being were measured using the 14-item Mental Health Continuum Short Form (MHC-SF) developed by Corey Keyes (Keyes 2002; Keyes et al. 2008; Westerhof and Keyes 2010). The MHC-SF measure constructs such as happiness and satisfaction with life, sense of belonging to a community, presence of trusting relationships with others, and believing that life has a meaning or direction. Based on the MHC-SF responses, a developed algorithm classifies respondents as having either (a) flourishing, (b) moderate, or (c) languishing mental health. Second, the presence of sadness/ hopelessness was measured using the question: "during the past 12 months, did you ever feel so sad or hopeless that you stopped doing some usual activities for a while?" Respondents could answer either yes or no.

#### Statistical analysis

Descriptive statistics of the sample were computed using crosstabs. The frequencies of bullying victimization by each drug type were calculated separately for boys and girls and for grades 7 to 9 and 10 to 12. Logistic regression models were conducted to determine the relationships between the frequency of bullying victimization and drug use, stratified by gender and grade categories and adjusting for mental and emotional well-being and feeling of sadness/hopelessness. Gender by drug type and grade by drug type interaction terms were calculated to test moderation effects in the relationship between any bullying victimization and drug use.

## Results

Table 1 describes the sample. Table 2 provides the prevalence of past-year bullying victimization among boys and girls in grades 7 to 12. Marijuana was the most commonly used drug among boys and girls and in both grade groupings.

Table 3 (boys in grades 7 to 9), Table 4 (boys in grades 10 to 12), Table 5 (girls in grades 7 to 9), and Table 6 (girls in grades 10 to 12) present the associations between frequency of past-

 Table 1
 Demographic characteristics of the sample

Characteristic	Total sample % ( <i>n</i> )	Any bullying victimization % (n)	No bullying victimization % (n)
Sex			
Female	49.4 (29510)	53.2 (20006)	43.0 (9504)
Male	50.6 (30188)	46.8 (17588)	57.0 (12600)
School grade			
Grade 7	17.4 (10408)	15.2 (5696)	21.3 (4712)
Grade 8	17.7 (10592)	17.4 (6530)	18.4 (4062)
Grade 9	18.2 (10855)	18.7 (7033)	17.3 (3822)
Grade 10	16.6 (9885)	17.7 (6642)	14.7 (3243)
Grade 11	15.6 (9312)	16.3 (6119)	14.4 (3193)
Grade 12	14.5 (8646)	14.8 (5574)	13.9 (3072)
Age			
11 or younger	0.5 (272)	0.4 (157)	0.5 (115)
12	15.6 (9293)	13.5 (5065)	19.1 (4228)
13	17.6 (10502)	17.2 (6468)	18.3 (4034)
14	17.7 (10548)	18.1 (6794)	17.0 (3754)
15	16.3 (9691)	17.3 (6488)	14.5 (3203)
16	15.5 (9216)	16.1 (6050)	14.3 (3166)
17	13.3 (7934)	13.7 (5138)	12.7 (2796)
18 or older	3.6 (2168)	3.7 (1385)	3.5 (783)
Positive mental h	ealth		
Languishing	5.7 (3348)	7.5 (2785)	2.6 (563)
Moderate	36.1 (21398)	41.9 (15629)	26.3 (5769)
Flourishing	58.2 (34489)	50.7 (18922)	71.1 (15567)
Feeling of sadnes	s/hopelessness		
Yes	43.3 (25457)	55.0 (20328)	23.7 (5129)
No	56.6 (33151)	45.0 (16613)	76.3 (16538)

Denominators for each variable vary due to missing data

year bullying victimization and past-month drug use. For boys and girls in all grade levels, experiencing any bullying victimization type everyday was significantly associated with increased odds of drug use, after adjusting for mental and emotional wellbeing and feelings of sadness/hopelessness. For many bullying victimization types, experiences that occurred one to five times a year and six or more times a year were also significantly associated with drug use. For boys and girls in all grade levels, the largest effect sizes were seen for the relationship between being threatened or injured with a weapon, and drug use, with methamphetamine use having the largest effect size (AOR for methamphetamine use range from 42.76 to 243.00). Large effect sizes were also noted for boys in grades 7 to 9 and 10 to 12 for some internet-related victimization experiences. Strong dose-response relationships were noted for both boys and girls in grades 7 to 9 and 10 to 12 with increased frequency of bullying victimization corresponding to increased drug use.

Grade interaction terms between any bullying victimization and each drug type indicated that the relationship between **Table 2** Prevalence of past-<br/>month drug use and bullying<br/>victimization among boys and<br/>girls in grades 7 to 9 and 10 to 12<br/>in Manitoba

Bullying victimization and	Boys		Girls	
past-month drug use	Grade 7–9 ( <i>n</i> = 17,872) % ( <i>n</i> )	Grade 10–12 ( <i>n</i> = 15,040) % ( <i>n</i> )	Grade 7–9 ( <i>n</i> = 16,768) % ( <i>n</i> )	Grade 10–12 ( <i>n</i> = 14,494) % ( <i>n</i> )
Any bullying victimization				
Never	43.9 (7100)	39.3 (5500)	35.1 (5496)	28.9 (4008)
1 time or more	56.2 (9090)	60.7 (8498)	64.9 (10169)	71.1 (9837)
Marijuana				
Never	93.0 (15491)	77.8 (11141)	92.3 (14749)	82.0 (11530)
1 time or more	7.1 (1175)	22.2 (3174)	7.7 (1229)	18.0 (2535)
Cocaine/crack				
Never	98.9 (16402)	96.1 (13636)	99.3 (15821)	98.0 (13762)
1 time or more	1.1 (186)	3.9 (555)	0.7 (115)	2.0 (275)
Methamphetamines				
Never	99.0 (16366)	97.3 (13781)	99.5 (15839)	99.4 (13926)
1 time or more	1.0 (168)	2.7 (385)	0.5 (73)	0.6 (82)
Ecstasy				
Never	98.9 (16344)	96.2 (13627)	99.3 (15788)	98.3 (13757)
1 time or more	1.2 (190)	3.8 (538)	0.8 (119)	1.7 (242)
LSD or hallucinogens				
Never	98.8 (16266)	96.1 (13578)	99.3 (15735)	98.5 (13737)
1 time or more	1.2 (202)	4.0 (559)	0.7 (111)	1.5 (206)
Prescription or OTC drugs				
Never	97.7 (15728)	94.6 (13133)	96.7 (14971)	95.0 (12982)
1 time or more	2.3 (368)	5.4 (756)	3.3 (509)	5.0 (684)
Any drug use				
Never	91.2 (14629)	75.3 (10540)	90.0 (13871)	78.7 (10759)
1 time or more	8.8 (1406)	24.7 (3457)	10.0 (1547)	21.3 (2910)

Denominators for each variable vary due to missing data

bullying victimization and drug use was significantly stronger for boys in grade 7 to 9 compared to boys in grades 10 to 12 for all drug types except for prescription or OTC drugs. For girls, grade interaction terms indicated that the relationship between any bullying victimization and marijuana use and any drug use was significantly stronger for girls in grades 7 to 9 compared to girls in grades 10 to 12.

Gender interaction terms indicated that in grades 7 to 9, the relationship between any bullying victimization and using marijuana, and any drug use was stronger for girls compared to boys. In grades 10 to 12, significant interaction effects between any bullying victimization and drug use were found for marijuana, ecstasy, prescription drug use, and any drug use, with the relationships stronger for girls compared to boys.

# Discussion

This study has several important findings: (1) all past-year bullying victimization experiences were associated with increased odds of all past-month drug use types including marijuana, cocaine, methamphetamines, ecstasy, LSD or other hallucinogens, and prescription or OTC drugs among boys and girls in grades 7 to 12; (2) across gender and grades and dose-response relationships were noted with increased frequency of bullying victimization corresponding to increased odds of drug use; (3) the relationships between any past-year bullying victimization and several drug use types were stronger in grades 7 to 9 than in grades 10 to 12; however, differences exist between boys and girls; and (4) the relationship between any past-year bullying victimization and some specific drug use types was stronger for girls compared to boys in grades 7 to 9 and 10 to 12.

The majority of previous studies on the relationship between bullying victimization and drug use has limited measures of drug use types, often only examining marijuana use (Tharp-Taylor et al. 2009; Radliff et al. 2012; Luk et al. 2010; Goebert et al. 2011) or multiple types of illicit drug use grouped together (Wolke et al. 2013; Niemelä et al. 2011; Kaltiala-Heino et al. 2000; Sigurdson et al. 2014; Bender and Losel 2011). The robust relationships found for nine different bullying

Table 3 A	ssociation	between past-year l	villying vi	ictimization and past-n	nonth drug	g use among boys in g	trades 7 to	9 in Manitoba				
Bullying experience	Marijuan	T	Cocaine		Methamp	ohetamines	Ecstasy		LSD		Prescripti	on or OTC drugs
type	% (n)	AOR (95% CI)	% (n)	AOR (95% CI)	% (n)	AOR (95% CI)	% (n)	AOR (95% CI)	% (n)	AOR (95% CI)	% (n)	AOR (95% CI)
1. Physically th	reatened or it	ijured you	(12) 0 20		76.4 (66)		18.4.660	00			16.01.001	00 -
1-5 times	33.8 (374)	1.00 1.94 (1.68, 2.24)	28.0 (47)	1.00 2.25 (1.52, 3.33)	25.8 (39)	1.00 2.09 (1.36, 3.21)	27.9 (48)	1.00 2.13 (1.44, 3.15)	(c/) c.ec (12) 27.4 (51)	1.00 2.10 (1.44, 3.05)	40.2 (100) 29.2 (101)	1.00 1.86 (1.43, 2.42)
6+ times	8.6 (95)	2.23 (1.75, 2.85)	10.1 (17)	3.58 (2.03, 6.29)	8.6 (13)	3.16 (1.68, 5.95)	11.1 (19)	3.63 (2.11, 6.23)	11.3 (21)	3.70 (2.20, 6.20)	12.1 (42)	3.51 (2.43, 5.06)
Every day	5.0 (55)	6.41 (4.46, 9.23)	25.0 (42)	40.77 (25.31, 65.68)	29.1 (44)	50.92 (31.42, 82.55)	22.7 (39)	32.35 (19.93, 52.52)	22.0 (41)	32.19 (20.06, 51.66)	12.4 (43)	16.55 (10.87, 25.22)
2. Threatened c	r injured you	with a weapon such as	a gun, knife	e, or club	10 10 10	1 00	(20) 0 31	1 00	(00) 2 67	00	(300,003	1 00
Never 1_5 times	71 5 (735)	1.00 5 51 (4 62 6 50)	(0/) 8.04 21 7 (36)	1.00 6.67 (4.34 10.24)	45.0 (04) 22 3 (33)	1.00 7 08 (4 47 11 21)	(11) 0.64	1.00 731 (4 84 11 02)	45.7 (8U) 25.7 (47)	7.87 (5.29.(11.70)	08.2 (250) 15.9 (55)	1.00 3 19 (2 32 4 40)
6+ times	3.8 (42)	8.21 (5.44, 12.37)	8.4 (14)	20.65 (10.83, 39.37)	(01) (01) (01)	15.79 (7.46, 33.43)	6.4 (11)	14.22 (6.98, 28.96)	8.2 (15)	20.04 (10.70, 37.54)	3.8 (13)	6.11 (3.32, 11.25)
Everyday	4.6 (50)	35.48 (20.13,62.51)	24.1 (40)	178.12 (101.29, 313.23)	28.2 (42)	243.00 (136.30, 433.24)	24.0 (41)	180.54 (102.16, 319.03)	22.4 (41)	188.89 (105.76, 337.34)	12.1 (42)	69.21 (39.81, 120.33)
3. Bullied, taun	ted, or ridicul	led you										
Never	61.0 (664)	1.00	45.7 (74)	1.00	43.8 (64)	1.00	45.5 (76)	1.00	47.0 (85)	1.00	45.0 (154)	1.00
1–5 times 64 times	24.6 (268) 7 0 (86)	0.94 (0.81, 1.10)	17.9 (29) 0 3 (15)	0.93 (0.60, 1.45) 1 14 (0.63 2 0.6)	17.1 (25) 6 0 (10)	0.97 (0.60, 1.57)	18.6 (31)	$0.97 \ (0.63, 1.50)$ 1 24 $(0.71, 2.18)$	19.3 (35) 8 2 (15)	$1.00\ (0.66, 1.50)$ 0 97 $(0.54\ 1.74)$	25.4 (87) 13 5 (46)	1.33 (1.01, 1.76) 1 84 (1 20 2 62)
Evervdav	(00) $(.7)$ $(.71)$	1.75 (1.30, 2.35)	(CI) C.C 27.2 (44)	10.01 (6.39, 15.68)	32.2 (47)	1.01 (0.21, 2.01) 13.70 (8.65, 21.70)	25.8 (43)	9.09(5.79, 14.26)	0.11) C.0 25.4 (46)	8.79 (5.69, 13.58)	16.1 (55)	6.71 (4.65, 9.68)
4. Said somethi	ng bad about	your race or culture										
Never	64.0 (692)	1.00	46.0 (75)	1.00	43.8 (64)	1.00	49.4 (84)	1.00	45.9 (83)	1.00	56.9 (197)	1.00
1-5 times	20.4 (220)	1.63 (1.38, 1.93)	13.5 (22)	1.48 (0.90, 2.42)	13.7 (20)	1.54(0.90, 2.62)	12.4 (21)	1.25 (0.76, 2.05)	16.0 (29)	1.81 (1.17, 2.81)	19.4 (67)	1.75 (1.31, 2.34)
6+ times	7.9 (85)	2.07 (1.61, 2.67)	8.0 (13)	2.81 (1.53, 5.17)	7.5 (11)	2.92 (1.51, 5.64)	8.2 (14)	2.63 (1.47, 4.74)	7.7 (14)	2.71 (1.51, 4.88)	7.2 (25)	2.07 (1.34, 3.20)
Everyday	7.8 (84)	5.96 (4.43, 8.02)	32.5 (53)	29.64(19.50, 45.03)	34.9 (51)	35.06 (22.70, 54.17)	30.0 (51)	24.05 (15.82, 36.54)	30.4 (55)	27.51 (18.23, 41.53)	16.5 (57)	12.83 (8.97, 18.35)
D. Data Sollicut	1112 Dau aDOUI	your sexual orientation	or genuer 1	1.00	(LTA) 13	1 00	25 0 (05)	1 00	57 5 (104)	100	1360 2 0361	1 00
1-5 times	(0.40) 6.77	1.93 (1.58, 2.36)	(16) 7.66	2.18 (1.28, 3.72)	(+/) 0.16	2.77 (1.61, 4.76)	(26) 6.00	1.78 (1.02, 3,11)	(+01) C./C (23)	2.27 (1.40, 3.69)	(CC2) / 00 (12.0 (41)	1.88 (1.31, 2.68)
6+ times	4.0 (43)	1.73 (1.23, 2.44)	6.7 (11)	3.76 (1.90, 7.44)	4.1 (6)	2.81 (1.19, 6.63)	8.2 (14)	4.51 (2.45, 8.31)	5.0 (9)	2.42 (1.15, 5.11)	6.1 (21)	2.77 (1.68, 4.55)
Everyday	5.2 (56)	5.80 (4.02, 8.37)	27.3 (45)	40.10 (25.50, 63.07)	31.0 (45)	50.30 (31.52, 80.26)	25.9 (44)	34.76 (22.05, 54.80)	24.9 (45)	31.63 (20.19, 49.56)	13.2 (45)	16.09 (10.65, 24.28)
6. Said somethi	ing bad about	your body shape, size,	or appearan	ce								
Never	60.2 (653)	1.00	44.5 (73)	1.00	42.5 (62)	1.00	46.7 (78)	1.00	43.7 (79)	1.00	49.9 (171)	1.00
1–5 times	23.6 (256)	1.30 (1.11, 1.53)	18.9 (31)	1.39 (0.90, 2.15)	17.8 (26)	1.33 (0.82, 2.17)	19.8 (33)	1.30 (0.84, 2.00)	21.6 (39)	1.61 (1.07, 2.41)	27.4 (94)	1.77 (1.35, 2.31)
6+ times Evenuday	8.3 (90) 7 9 (86)	1.25 (0.98, 1.59) 3 06 /7 33 4 03)	10.4 (17) 26 2 (43)	2.04 (1.16, 3.57) 12 22 77 88 18 07)	8.9 (13) 30 8 (45)	1.87 (0.99, 3.54) 16 02 (10 22 - 25 12)	9.0 (15) 24 6 (41)	1.53 (0.85, 2.77) 9 71 (6 24 15 11)	10.5 (19) 24 3 (44)	2.06 (1.21, 3.52) 10 96 /7 11 16 80)	9.6 (33) 13 1 (45)	1.75(1.19, 2.60) 5 47 (3 73 8 01)
7. Asked for pe	rsonal inform	ation over the internet	e.g., addres	s, phone number, or last na	me)	10.04 (10.44, 40.14)	(11) 0.12	/11.01 (0.47, 10.11)	(LL) C.L.7	10:00 (1111) 00:00)	(CL) 1.CT	(10:0 (0:0) (1:0
Never	70.0 (760)	1.00	43.6 (72)	1.00	40.5 (60)	1.00	45.3 (77)	1.00	47.5 (87)	1.00	60.6 (209)	1.00
1–5 times	17.7 (193)	2.13 (1.79, 2.54)	19.4 (32)	3.58 (2.32, 5.52)	18.2 (27)	3.53 (2.19, 5.70)	20.0 (34)	3.26 (2.12, 5.00)	19.1 (35)	3.00 (1.98, 4.56)	18.8 (65)	2.46 (1.84, 3.30)
6+ times	7.4 (80)	4.25 (3.24, 5.57)	10.3 (17)	8.63 (4.95, 15.04) 111 45 657 52 182 682	10.1 (15)	9.34 (5.16, 16.91) 144 80 (87 06, 241 12)	10.0 (17)	7.73 (4.45, 13.44)	8.7 (16)	6.41 (3.66, 11.22)	8.1 (28) 17 5 (42)	4.57 (2.98, 7.01)
Every day 8 Made von fe	(0C) 1.C el uncafe whe	15.75 (10.22, 24.25) on vou were in contact	20./(44) with them or	111.43 (0/.02, 103.00) ver the internet	(0+) 1.1c	(61.147,00,00,241.13	24.7 (42)	80.12 (22.02, 142.94)	(0.42	(10.101 ,01.00) 80.76	(c+) c.7I	(46.60, 16.02) 18.10
Never	83.2 (905)	1.00	54.0 (88)	1.00	49.3 (72)	1.00	55.3 (94)	1.00	57.9 (106)	1.00	74.6 (259)	1.00
1-5 times	9.4 (102)	2.03 (1.61, 2.56)	12.9 (21)	3.96 (2.36, 6.63)	14.4 (21)	5.47 (3.25, 9.20)	14.1 (24)	3.97 (2.42, 6.51)	14.8 (27)	4.04 (2.54, 6.43)	9.8 (34)	2.12 (1.43, 3.13)
6+ times	2.7 (29)	4.01 (2.56, 6.30)	6.8 (11)	14.71 (7.39, 29.27)	5.5 (8)	13.34 (6.05, 29.38)	7.1 (12)	14.36 (7.39, 27.92)	5.5 (10)	9.97 (4.91, 20.27)	3.2 (11)	4.67 (2.43, 9.00)
Everyday 0 Builliad or ad	4.8 (22)	2/.4/ (I5.95, 4/.5/)	20.4 (43)	103.15 (94.02, 283.11) mething on Ecochools or on	(C4) 8.06 ( beliee	238.30 (133.21, 419.97)	(04) C.62	(10.117,10.71) 67.671	(04) 6.12	114.90 (05.91, 200.51)	12.4 (45)	02.12 (20.99, 109.80)
9. Duilled of pi	77.8 (846)	1.00	51.2 (84)	1.00	46.6 (69)	1.00	49.4 (84)	1.00	54.1 (100)	1.00	70.2 (245)	1.00
1–5 times 6+ times	13.0 (141) 4 1 (44)	1.95(1.60, 2.39) 2 74 (1 92 3 91)	15.9 (26) 7 3 (12)	3.64 (2.29, 5.79) 6 38 (3 20 12 72)	17.6 (26) 5 4 (8)	4.54 (2.80, 7.37) 5 71 (2 54 12 84)	17.7 (30)	3.99 (2.55, 6.24) 6 17 (3 09 12 31)	16.2 (30) 7 0 (13)	3.41 (2.20 (5.29) 5 77 (2 98 11 15)	12.9 (45) 4 9 (17)	2.06 (1.47, 2.90) 3.45 (2.01 5.91)
Everyday	5.2 (56)	11.05 (7.30, 16.70)	25.6 (42)	65.73 (40.53, 106.62)	30.4 (45)	93.96 (57.32, 154.02)	25.9 (44)	67.88 (41.77, 110.30)	22.7 (42)	52.86 (32.61, 85.70)	12.0 (42)	23.18 (14.70, 36.57)

AOR adjusted odds ratio. AOR adjusted for mental and emotional well-being and feelings of sadness/hopelessness

Bullying	Marijuana		Cocaine	,	Methamp	hetamines	Ecstasy		LSD		Prescriptic	on or OTC drugs
experience type	% (n)	AOR (95% CI)	% (u)	AOR (95% CI)	% (u)	AOR (95% CI)	% $(n)$	AOR (95% CI)	% (n)	AOR (95% CI)	$\mathcal{O}_{0}^{\prime}\left( n ight)$	AOR (95% CI)
1. Physically threater Never 1–5 times 6+ times Everyday	ed or injured 56.8 (1724) 31.6 (959) 6.8 (206) 4.9 (148)	you 1.00 1.60 (1.46, 1.76) 2.15 (1.79, (2.60) 4.82 (3.70, 6.28)	42.8 (222) 23.5 (122) 11.2 (58) 22.5 (117)	1.00 1.49 (1.18, 1.87) 4.32 (3.15, 5.93) 27.07 (20.06, 36.52)	41.3 (148) 16.5 (59) 10.6 (38) 31.6 (113)	1.00 1.18 (0.86, 1.61) 4.55 (3.09, 6.72) 42.36 (30.79, 58.29)	42.2 (213) 24.8 (125) 10.1 (51) 23.0 (116)	1.00 1.53 (1.22, 1.93) 3.72 (2.66, 5.18) 27.25 (20.15, 36.86)	44.5 (234) 23.4 (123) 9.1 (48) 23.0 (121)	1.00 1.41 (1.12, 1.77) 3.28 (2.34, 4.59) 26.81 (19.89, 36.13)	45.1 (324) 29.7 (213) 8.9 (64) 16.3 (117)	1.00 1.73 (1.44, 2.08) 3.10 (2.31, 4.17) 18.50 (13.83, 24.74
<ul> <li>2. Intreatened of mju Never</li> <li>1–5 times</li> <li>6+ times</li> <li>Everyday</li> <li>3. Bullied, taunted, o.</li> </ul>	red you with 76.7 (2324) 16.3 (493) 3.0 (91) 4.1 (123)	a weapon such as a gr 1.00 3.02 (55, 3.44) 4.68 (3.37, 6.50) 10.22 (7.11, 14.70)	49.5 (257) 49.5 (257) 21.0 (109) 7.5 (39) 22.0 (114)	2000 1.00 4.92 (3.86, 6.27) 13.24 (8.86, 19.77) 80.60 (55.89, 116.23)	43.8 (156) 17.7 (63) 7.0 (25) 31.5 (112)	$\begin{array}{c} 1.00\\ 4.84\ (3.53, 6.62)\\ 14.08\ (8.69,\ 22.82)\\ 144.70\ (98.36,\ 212.86)\end{array}$	47.7 (240) 22.3 (112) 7.0 (35) 23.1 (116)	1.00 5.22 (4.10, 6.65) 12.15 (8.01, 18.42) 92.19 (63.49, 133.87)	51.2 (268) 20.0 (105) 7.1 (37) 21.8 (114)	1.00 4.45 (3.49, 5.68) 12.00 (8.02, 17.95) 79.31 (54.78, 114.83)	58.8 (421) 21.0 (150) 4.8 (34) 15.5 (111)	1.00 3.88 (3.16, 4.77) 6.69 (4.46, 10.05) 48.41 (33.65, 69.63)
Never 1–5 times 6+ times Everyday 4 Said something ha	62.6 (1886) 23.2 (699) 8.2 (247) 6.0 (181) 1 about vour	1.00 0.87 (0.78, 0.96) 0.88 (0.75, 1.03) 2.09 (1.69, 2.58) race or culture	49.6 (255) 16.0 (82) 9.5 (49) 24.9 (128)	1.00 0.83 (0.64, 1.07) 1.41 (1.02, 1.94) 11.11 (8.53, 14.48)	41.9 (148) 12.2 (43) 12.2 (43) 33.7 (119)	1.00 0.84 (0.59, 1.18) 2.44 (1.69, 3.51) 20.43 (15.20, 27.46)	46.7 (232) 17.9 (89) 10.7 (53) 24.8 (123)	$\begin{array}{c} 1.00\\ 0.94\ (0.73, 1.21)\\ 1.62\ (1.18, 2.22)\\ 11.06\ (8.45, 14.49) \end{array}$	49.2 (256) 16.2 (84) 10.8 (56) 23.9 (124)	1.00 0.83 (0.65, 1.08) 1.58 (1.16, 2.15) 10.48 (8.03, 13.68)	50.0 (357) 22.3 (159) 9.8 (70) 17.9 (128)	$\begin{array}{c} 1.00\\ 1.08 \ (0.89, 1.32)\\ 1.32 \ (1.00, 1.74)\\ 7.68 \ (5.97, 9.88)\end{array}$
Never 1–5 times 6+ times Everyday 5 Said comothing hose	6.7 (202) 6.7 (203) 6.7 (203) 6.7 (202)	1.00 1.17 (1.05, 1.31) 1.33 (1.12, 1.59) 2.96 (2.41, 3.64)	47.2 (244) 18.4 (95) 8.7 (45) 25.7 (133)	$\begin{array}{c} 1.00\\ 1.85 \ (1.45, 2.37)\\ 2.55 \ (1.82, 3.57)\\ 15.06 \ (11.66, 19.46)\end{array}$	40.7 (144) 14.4 (51) 9.0 (32) 35.9 (127)	1.00 1.78 (1.28, 2.48) 3.34 (2.23, 5.00) 26.47 (19.95, 35.12)	48.1 (241) 17.6 (88) 8.6 (43) 25.8 (129)	1.00 1.66 (1.29, 2.15) 2.36 (1.68, 3.33) 14.11 (10.90, 18.28)	50.1 (263) 17.0 (89) 8.4 (44) 24.6 (129)	1.00 1.56 (1.21, 2.00) 2.17 (1.54, 3.05) 13.00 (10.06, 16.79)	56.2 (402) 17.5 (125) 8.7 (62) 17.7 (127)	1.00 1.33 (1.08, 1.65) 1.90 (1.43, 2.55) 8.33 (6.52, 10.66)
Never Never 1–5 times 6+ times Everyday	82.3 (2470) 9.2 (275) 3.6 (107) 5.0 (151)	250,000 01,011,011,011,011,011,011,011,011	58.8 (300) 58.8 (300) 10.6 (54) 7.7 (39) 22.9 (117)	, 1.00 1.99 (1.46, 2.70) 4.69 (3.25, 6.79) 24.93 (18.71, 33.21)	48.3 (168) 11.2 (39) 8.9 (31) 31.6 (110)	1.00 2.77 (1.91, 4.01) 7.45 (4.90, 11.34) 44.81 (32.84, 61.15)	58.0 (289) 10.8 (54) 8.2 (41) 222.9 (114)	1.00 2.01 (1.48, 2.73) 4.96 (3.46, 7.12) 24.02 (17.99, 32.06)	58.2 (303) 11.1 (58) 8.1 (42) 22.7 (118)	1.00 2.13 (1.59, 2.86) 4.95 (3.46, 7.07) 24.76 (18.58, 32.98)	67.4 (477) 10.7 (76) 6.1 (43) 15.8 (112)	1.00 1.62 (1.25, 2.10) 3.02 (2.13, 4.27) 14.18 (10.71, 18.76)
<ul> <li>6. Said something ba Never</li> <li>1–5 times</li> <li>6+ times</li> <li>Everyday</li> <li>7 Asked for mersonal</li> </ul>	d about your 62.7 (1894) 22.6 (681) 8.2 (248) 6.5 (197) information	body shape, size, or a 1.00 1.12 (1.01, 1.24) 1.28 (1.10, 1.50) 2.76 (2.24, 3.40) over the internet (e o	ppearance 50.3 (259) 17.5 (90) 8.4 (43) 23.9 (123) address pho	1.00 1.10 (0.86, 1.42) 1.62 (1.15, 2.28) 11.29 (8.68, 14.70) me number or bat name)	44.6 (157) 13.1 (46) 9.7 (34) 32.7 (115)	1.00 1.04 (0.74, 1.46) 2.45 (1.65, 3.63) 20.18 (15.06, 27.04)	50.2 (250) 17.1 (85) 8.2 (41) 24.5 (122)	1.00 1.07 (0.83, 1.39) 1.54 (1.09, 2.18) 11.24 (8.62, 14.66)	50.9 (265) 16.3 (85) 8.6 (45) 24.2 (126)	1.00 1.02 (0.79, 1.31) 1.68 (1.21, 2.34) 11.18 (8.60, 14.53)	52.3 (372) 23.0 (164) 7.2 (51) 17.6 (125)	1.00 1.35 (1.11, 1.64) 1.25 (0.92, 1.70) 7.68 (5.97, 9.87)
Never 1–5 times 6+ times Everyday 8 Made voulfeel uns	73.7 (2221) 16.0 (482) 5.3 (159) 5.0 (152) afe when you	1.00 1.34 (1.19, 1.50) 1.75 (1.43, 2.14) 7.31 (5.41, 9.87)	53.3 (275) 53.3 (275) 14.2 (73) 8.9 (46) 23.6 (122) them over th	1.00 1.64 (1.25, 2.15) 4.04 (2.89, 5.65) 39.86 (29.25, 54.32)	45.7 (161) 11.9 (42) 9.9 (35) 32.4 (114)	1.00 1.81 (1.28, 2.57) 5.86 (3.98, 8.64) 67.16 (48.23, 93.52)	53.6 (266) 13.7 (68) 8.1 (40) 24.6 (122)	1.00 1.57 (1.19, 2.07) 3.49 (2.45, 4.97) 40.93 (30.00, 55.84)	<i>52.5</i> (272) 15.6 (81) 8.3 (43) 23.6 (122)	1.00 1.87 (1.45, 2.43) 3.79 (2.69, 5.35) 42.51 (31.11, 58.09)	60.1 (428) 16.0 (114) 7.6 (54) 16.3 (116)	1.00 1.53 (1.23, 1.91) 2.87 (2.11, 3.90) 23.15 (17.11, 31.32)
Never Never 1–5 times 6+ times Everyday 9 Bullied or nicked o	89.3 (2695) 5.4 (164) 1.4 (43) 3.9 (177)	1.20 (0.99, 1.45) 2.15 (1.42, 3.26) 11.22 (7.52, 16.73) th the internet (e.g. po	62.0 (321) 62.0 (321) 10.2 (53) 5.2 (27) 22.6 (117) sted somethi	1.000 3.50 (2.55, 4.80) 12.17 (7.52, 19.72) 109.45 (72.05, 166.27) 109 on Facebook or email	50.0 (177) 11.9 (42) 6.2 (22) 31.9 (113) ed vou)	1.00 5.92 (4.12, 8.52) 18.00 (10.54, 30.76) 190.62 (124.78, 291.19)	62.6 (313) 9.4 (47) 5.0 (25) 23.0 (115)	1.00 3.01 (2.16, 4.20) 10.78 (6.58, 17.66) 108.44 (71.54, 164.39)	63.7 (333) 9.4 (49) 4.8 (25) 22.2 (116)	1.00 3.00 (2.17, 4.16) 11.31 (6.93, 18.47) 113.06 (73.68, 173.48)	72.0 (515) 9.7 (69) 3.4 (24) 15.0 (107)	1.00 2.61 (1.98, 3.45) 6.25 (3.80, 10.28) 53.98 (36.21, 80.46)
Never 1–5 times 6+ times Everyday	84.1 (2538) 9.0 (272) 2.7 (82) 4.1 (125)	1.00 1.23 (1.06, 1.43) 1.90 (1.42, 2.54) 6.98 (5.01, 9.72)	59.7 (310) 12.3 (64) 6.2 (32) 21.8 (113)	1.00 2.51 (1.88, 3.36) 5.96 (3.95, 9.00) 47.95 (34.25, 67.12)	47.6 (169) 13.5 (48) 8.5 (30) 30.4 (108)	1.00 4.08 (2.90, 5.75) 12.20 (7.87, 18.93) 91.05 (63.78, 129.96)	61.0 (306) 10.8 (54) 6.4 (32) 21.9 (110)	1.00 2.01 (1.48, 2.74) 5.77 (3.82, 8.70) 46.06 (32.87, 64.53)	60.4 (317) 12.4 (65) 5.9 (31) 21.3 (112)	1.00 2.46 (1.84, 3.27) 5.76 (3.82, 8.68) 47.18 (33.65, 66.15)	67.4 (481) 12.6 (90) 5.0 (36) 15.0 (107)	1.00 2.14 (1.67, 2.72) 4.25 (2.90, 6.23) 28.17 (20.22, 39.23)

AOR adjusted odds ratio. AOR adjusted for mental and emotional well-being and feelings of sadness/hopelessness

Bullying	Marijuana		Cocaine		Methamp	hetamines	Ecstasy		LSD		Prescriptio	n or OTC drugs
experience type	% (n)	AOR (95% CI)	% (n)	AOR (95% CI)	(u)	AOR (95% CI)	% (n)	AOR (95% CI)	% (u)	AOR (95% CI)	% (u)	AOR (95% CI)
<ol> <li>Physically threat Never</li> <li>Stimes</li> <li>times</li> <li>times</li> <li>terryday</li> </ol>	tened or injur 48.7 (576) 41.3 (489) 8.3 (98) 1.7 (20)	ed you 1.00 2.53 (2.20, 2.91) 2.70 (2.09, 3.48) 3.00 (1.74, 5.17)	31.5 (34) 51.9 (56) 13.0 (14)	1.00 4.38 (2.74 (6.98) 5.97 (3.06, 11.65) 8.21 (2.73, 24.72)	39.7 (27) 41.2 (28) 13.2 (9)	1.00 2.52 (1.41, 4.50) 4.63 (2.08, 10.31) 10.60 (3.45, 32.60)	33.0 (37) 50.0 (56) 14.3 (16) -	1.00 4.03 (2.58, 6.31) 6.22 (3.32, 11.65) 5.70 (1.67, 19.50)	32.7 (34) 50.0 (52) 13.5 (14) -	1.00 4.09 (2.55, 6.58) 5.69 (2.91, 11.14) 7.78 (2.57, 23.50)	47.9 (235) 41.6 (204) 7.9 (39) 2.7 (13)	1.00 2.61 (2.12, 3.21) 2.74 (1.89, 3.97) 4.89 (2.58, 9.24)
2. Threatened or ir Never 1–5 times 6+ times Everyday	jjured you wi 81.4 (954) 15.9 (186) 2.4 (28) -	th a weapon such as 1.00 4.50 (3.66, 5.54) 5.03 (3.00, 8.45) 2.55 (0.74, 8.79)	a gun, knifé 65.7 (71) 23.2 (25) 7.4 (8) -	, or club 1.00 5.83 (3.54, 9.62) 15.89 (7.08, 35.66) 41.14 (11.48, 147.40)	69.1 (47) 19.1 (13) -	1.00 4.64 (2.40, 9.00) 14.61 (5.42, 39.35) 42.76 (10.71, 170.63)	55.0 (61) 31.5 (35) 10.8 (12) -	1.00 10.38 (6.56, 16.42) 31.91 (15.79, 64.49) 34.99 (8.94, 137.01)	59.6 (62) 28.9 (30) 8.7 (9) -	1.00 7.89 (4.87, 12.79) 20.61 (9.38, 45.27) 28.31 (7.09, 113.08)	80.9 (394) 15.4 (75) 2.5 (12) 1.2 (6)	1.00 3.60 (2.72, 4.78) 4.84 (2.50, 9.34) 14.71 (4.60, 47.03)
<ul> <li>3. Bullhed, taunted Never</li> <li>1–5 times</li> <li>6+ times</li> <li>Everyday</li> </ul>	or ndiculed 40.6 (475) 35.6 (416) 15.1 (177) 8.6 (101)	you 1.00 1.18 (1.02, 1.37) 0.95 (0.78, 1.16) 1.33 (1.03, 1.73)	41.9 (44) 38.1 (40) 12.4 (13) 7.6 (8)	1.00 1.09 (0.69, 1.71) 0.61 (0.32, 1.20) 0.70 (0.30, 1.64)	39.7 (27) 27.9 (19) 16.2 (11) 16.2 (11)	1.00 0.93 (0.51, 1.70) 0.93 (0.43, 1.98) 1.86 (0.82, 4.23)	36.7 (40) 30.3 (33) 20.2 (22) 12.8 (14)	1.00 1.11 (0.69, 1.80) 1.43 (0.82, 2.49) 1.88 (0.95, 3.71)	36.9 (38) 27.2 (28) 24.3 (25) 11.7 (12)	1.00 0.93 (0.55, 1.55) 1.57 (0.91, 2.71) 1.37 (0.66, 2.85)	33.1 (159) 36.6 (176) 19.1 (92) 11.2 (54)	1.00 1.64 (1.30, 2.06) 1.83 (1.38, 2.42) 2.58 (1.81, 2.68)
<ul> <li>4. Said something Never</li> <li>1–5 times</li> <li>6+ times</li> <li>Everyday</li> </ul>	bad about yo 56.7 (666) 27.7 (325) 11.3 (133) 4.3 (50)	ur race or culture 1.00 2.03 (1.75, 2.36) 2.83 (2.27, 3.53) 3.12 (2.16, 4.51)	48.1 (51) 25.5 (27) 16.0 (17) 10.4 (11)	1.00 1.99 (1.22, 3.26) 4.07 (2.28, 7.26) 7.38 (3.63, 15.03)	54.4 (37) 25.0 (17) 11.8 (8) 8.8 (6)	1.00 1.76 (0.96, 3.22) 2.64 (1.19, 5.83) 5.61 (2.23, 14.07)	47.2 (51) 25.9 (28) 16.7 (18) 10.2 (11)	1.00 2.21 (1.37, 3.56) 4.39 (2.50, 7.73) 8.03 (3.96, 16.27)	49.5 (50) 27.7 (28) 13.9 (14) 8.9 (9)	1.00 2.22 (1.37, 3.58) 3.18 (1.71, 5.93) 4.80 (2.15, 10.68)	58.1 (282) 22.7 (110) 13.6 (66) 5.6 (27)	1.00 1.62 (1.28, 2.04) 3.23 (2.40, 4.34) 3.89 (2.46, 6.15)
5. Said something Never 1–5 times 6+ times Everyday	bad about yo 70.9 (825) 18.3 (213) 7.6 (88) 3.2 (37)	ur sexual orientatior 1.00 1.99 (1.67, 2.37) 2.62 (2.01, 3.42) 2.56 (1.69, 3.90)	1 or gender it 66.7 (72) 18.5 (20) 8.3 (9) 6.5 (7)	Jentity 1.00 1.86 (1.10, 3.15) 2.49 (1.21, 5.13) 3.90 (1.68, 9.06)	60.6 (40) 18.2 (12) 13.6 (9) -	1.00 2.31 (1.18, 4.52) 4.94 (2.30, 10.61) 5.96 (2.17, 16.37)	61.8 (68) 17.3 (19) 12.7 (14) 8.2 (9)	1.00 1.85 (1.08, 3.17) 4.24 (2.31, 7.78) 5.93 (2.75, 12.76)	59.8 (61) 21.6 (22) 9.8 (10) 8.8 (9)	1.00 2.23 (1.32, 3.77) 3.06 (1.52, 6.16) 5.44 (2.51, 11.80)	67.8 (329) 17.9 (87) 9.3 (45) 5.0 (24)	1.00 2.08 (1.61, 2.69) 3.42 (2.42, 4.84) 4.35 (2.66, 7.11)
6. Said something Never 1–5 times 6+ times Every day	bad about yo 31.5 (369) 37.2 (435) 19.0 (222) 12.3 (144)	ur body shape, size, 1.00 1.54 (1.33, 1.80) 1.51 (1.25, 1.83) 2.01 (1.59, 2.54)	or appearan 36.5 (39) 29.0 (31) 16.8 (18) 17.8 (19)	cc 1.00 1.04 (0.63, 1.71) 1.10 (0.60, 2.00) 1.87 (0.99, 3.52)	33.3 (22) 24.2 (16) 22.7 (15) 19.7 (13)	1.00 0.92 (0.47, 1.80) 1.53 (0.75, 3.15) 2.44 (1.12, 5.33)	37.2 (42) 32.7 (37) 18.6 (21) 11.5 (13)	1.00 1.06 (0.67, 1.69) 1.05 (0.59, 1.84) 1.14 (0.57, 2.27)	37.9 (39) 27.2 (28) 21.4 (22) 13.6 (14)	1.00 0.82 (0.49, 1.37) 1.09 (0.62, 1.93) 1.14 (0.58, 2.26)	31.4 (154) 34.5 (169) 18.2 (89) 15.9 (78)	1.00 1.52 (1.21, 1.92) 1.64 (1.23, 2.18) 3.03 (2.20, 4.16)
7. Asked for perso Never 1–5 times 6+ times Every day	nal miormatik 53.3 (624) 30.3 (354) 12.8 (150) 3.6 (42)	on over the internet 1.00 1.99 (1.72, 2.30) 3.56 (2.87, 4.41) 4.79 (3.18, 7.23)	(e.g., addres; 49.1 (52) 24.5 (26) 17.0 (18) 9.4 (10)	s, phone number, or last 1.00 1.60 (0.98, 2.63) 4.12 (2.34, 7.26) 9.61 (4.59, 20.13)	(111) 111) 1110 1110 1110 1110 1110 1110	1.00 2.56 (1.40, 4.67) 4.10 (1.87, 9.00) 18.16 (7.99, 41.28)	41.3 (45) 28.4 (31) 18.4 (20) 11.9 (13)	1.00 2.28 (1.42, 3.67) 5.08 (2.89, 8.92) 15.75 (7.98, 31.06)	41.2 (42) 27.5 (28) 21.6 (22) 9.8 (10)	1.00 2.20 (1.34, 3.62) 5.51 (3.13, 9.69) 11.97 (5.63, 25.44)	51.8 (252) 30.2 (147) 13.1 (64) 4.9 (24)	1.00 2.06 (1.66, 2.56) 3.55 (2.62, 4.81) 6.29 (3.87, 10.25)
8. Made you reer Never 1–5 times 6+ times Everyday	nsare wnen 5 69.7 (819) 20.7 (243) 7.6 (89) 2.0 (24)	ou were in contact 1.00 1.74 (1.48, 2.04) 2.64 (2.02, 3.46) 2.46 (1.50, 4.04)	with them ov 63.6 (68) 24.3 (26) 8.4 (9) -	/er the internet 1.00 2.10 (1.30, 3.38) 2.64 (1.27, 5.46) 3.76 (1.30, 10.85)	63.2 (43) 20.6 (14) 10.3 (7) -	1.00 1.86 (0.99, 3.47) 2.95 (1.21, 7.18) 6.46 (2.19, 19.05)	63.1 (70) 18.9 (21) 11.7 (13) 6.3 (7)	1.00 1.64 (0.99, 2.71) 3.46 (1.82, 6.58) 6.96 (3.01, 16.06)	61.0 (64) 23.8 (25) 10.5 (11) -	1.00 2.18 (1.34, 3.53) 3.06 (1.52, 6.18) 4.90 (1.86, 12.93)	66.1 (325) 21.1 (104) 9.8 (48) 3.1 (15)	1.00 1.96 (1.55, 2.49) 3.65 (2.58, 5.16) 4.05 (2.25, 7.31)
<ul> <li>9. Builled of picke</li> <li>Never</li> <li>1–5 times</li> <li>6+ times</li> <li>Everyday</li> </ul>	a on you unc 49.2 (577) 30.2 (355) 14.4 (169) 6.2 (73)	ugn me memet (e.g. 1.00 2.45 (2.11, 2.85) 2.90 (2.36, 3.55) 3.26 (2.39, 4.43)	5., posted sor 49.5 (52) 28.6 (30) 15.2 (16) 6.7 (7)	neumig on Facebook of 1.00 2.05 (1.27, 3.31) 2.60 (1.43, 4.73) 2.41 (1.03, 5.60)	r emailed you 50.0 (33) 18.2 (12) 22.7 (15) 9.1 (6)	1) 1.00 3.85 (1.96, 2.75) 3.85 (1.96, 7.56) 3.75 (1.46, 9.61)	49.6 (55) 23.4 (26) 15.3 (17) 11.7 (13)	1.00 1.57 (0.96, 2.57) 2.36 (1.32, 4.24) 4.63 (2.38, 8.99)	50.0 (52) 24.0 (25) 18.3 (19) 7.7 (8)	1.00 1.58 (0.95, 2.63) 2.72 (1.54, 4.83) 2.43 (1.09, 5.41)	54.4 (267) 23.6 (116) 15.7 (77) 6.3 (31)	1.00 1.63 (1.29, 2.07) 2.84 (2.14, 3.76) 2.74 (1.80, 4.18)
AOR adjusted oc	lds ratio. AC	OR adjusted for m	iental and e	motional well-being	and feeling	s of sadness/hopeless	sness-data	a suppressed due to	confidentia	lity restrictions ( $n <$	(9)	

 Table 5
 Association between past-year bully victimization and past-month drug use among girls in grades 7 to 9 in Manitoba

Table 6 Assoc	iation betwe	sen past-year bully	victimizat	ion and past-month o	lrug use aı	nong girls in grades 1	0 to 12 in	Manitoba				
Bullying	Marijuana		Cocaine		Methamp	hetamine	Ecstasy		TSD		Prescriptio	n or OTC drugs
experience type	% (u)	AOR (95% CI)	% (n)	AOR (95% CI)	% (u)	AOR (95% CI)	$\mathcal{O}_{0}^{\prime}\left( u ight)$	AOR (95% CI)	$\mathcal{O}_{0}(n)$	AOR (95% CI)	% (u)	AOR (95% CI)
1. Physically threater Never	ned or injured 56.5 (1401)	you 1.00	44.8 (117)	1.00	38.9 (28)	1.00	41.6 (96)	1.00	40.1 (79)	1.00	48.5 (321)	1.00
1-5 times	36.3 (899)	2.43 (2.19, 2.69)	40.6 (106)	2.70 (2.05, 3.57)	34.7 (25)	2.83 (1.59, 5.03)	42.4 (98)	2.97 (2.21, 3.99)	44.7 (88)	3.21 (2.33, 4.42)	40.8 (270)	2.70 (2.27, 3.22)
6+ times	6.1 (152)	2.80 (2.25, 3.48)	10.3 (27)	4.25 (2.71, 6.65)	12.5 (9)	6.28 (2.80, 14.09)	11.7 (27)	5.18 (3.28, 8.17)	10.2 (20)	4.55 (2.70, 7.65)	8.8 (58)	3.92 (2.87, 5.36)
Everyday	1.1 (26)	3.37 (1.99, 5.72)	4.2 (11)	12.02 (5.96, 24.22)	13.9 (10)	41.96 (18.08, 97.38)	4.3 (10)	13.08 (6.32, 27.10)	5.1 (10)	15.37 (7.35, 32.15)	2.0 (13)	6.07 (3.19, 11.54)
2. I hreatened or inju	red you with .	a weapon such as a gu	n, knife, or $c_1$	100	2000	1 00	10717 2 0L	1 00	0000000000	100	064 (676)	1 00
Never 1_5 times	(c612) / 88 (737) 0 6 (737)	1.00 3 67 (7 00 / 30)	(01) / 1/	5.71 (4.06 8.05)	(65) 0.00	1.00 8 45 (4 28 16 67)	(091) C.0/	1.00 5 45 (3 78 7 86)	00.8 (129) 21.8 (42)	1.00 6 97 (4 78 10 16)	(000) 4.08	1.00 3.00 (2.28, 3.04)
6+ times	1.2 (29)	3.67 (2.12, 6.33)	5.0 (13)	15.07 (7.81, 29.08)	15.71 (11)	76.27 (34.54, 168.40)	6.6 (15)	20.47 (10.91, 38.41)	6.7 (13)	22.10 (11.33, 43.09)	2.1 (14)	5.61 (2.98, 10.57)
Every day	0.5 (13)	8.69 (3.37, 22.39)	4.3 (11)	67.95 (27.50, 167.87)	14.3 (10)	214.64 (79.58, 578.95)	4.4 (10)	61.93 (25.06, 153.04)	4.7 (9)	60.37 (24.15, 150.91)	1.5(10)	18.57 (7.50, 45.96)
3. Bullied, taunted, c	r ridiculed yo						i c					
Never	48.0 (1184)	1.00 1.16 /1 05 1.20	48.7 (127)	1.00	34.8 (24) 14 5 (10)	1.00	(c6) c.14	1.00	35.0 (69)	1.00	40.8 (268) 24.7 (228)	1.00
1-5 unics 6+ times	(914) 0.00 14 6 (359)	1 33 (1 16 1 54)	(10) 1.52	0.79 (0.36, 1.06) 1.18 (0.81 1.71)	(01) C.+1 21 7 (15)	0.09 (0.32, 1.21) 2 87 (1 43 5 75)	(0/) 0.0c 16.6 (38)	1.12 (0.61, 1.34) 1 45 (0 98 2 15)	(00) 0.00	1.43 (1.02, 2.00) 2 03 (1 34 3 09)	(072) /.42 (113) (113)	1.41 (1.17, 1.70)
Every day	4.5 (110)	1.72 (1.34, 2.21)	10.0 (26)	2.73 (1.71, 4.35)	29.0 (20)	13.28 (6.62, 26.64)	11.4 (26)	3.74 (2.32, 6.03)	13.2 (26)	5.31 (3.23, 8.74)	7.3 (48)	3.08 (2.17, 4.36)
4. Said something be	d about your	race or culture										
Never	70.5 (1738)	1.00	59.5 (154)	1.00	35.2 (25)	1.00	57.6 (132)	1.00	58.2 (114)	1.00	65.6 (434)	1.00
1–5 times	19.9 (491)	1.16(1.03, 1.30)	20.1 (52)	1.31 (0.95, 1.82)	26.8 (19)	3.56 (1.93, 6.57)	24.0 (55)	1.64 (1.19, 2.26)	23.5 (46)	1.55 (1.09, 2.20)	20.5 (136)	1.23 (1.01, 1.51)
6+ times	6.8 (168)	1.50 (1.24, 1.82)	10.0 (26)	2.30 (1.49, 3.54)	18.3 (13)	8.61 (4.26, 17.40)	10.0 (23)	2.32 (1.47, 3.67)	10.2 (20)	2.32 (1.42, 3.80)	10.3(68)	2.26 (1.71, 2.98)
Everyday	2.8 (70)	2.68 (1.93, 3.73)	10.4 (27)	8.97 (5.66, 14.22)	19.7 (14)	27.04 (13.13, 55.67)	8.3 (19)	6.81 (4.03, 11.52)	8.2 (16)	6.24 (3.54, 11.01)	3.6 (24)	2.82 (1.79, 4.46)
5. Said something be	id about your	sexual orientation or g	ender identity	/								
Never	79.2 (1951)	1.00	70.4 (183)	1.00	56.9 (41)	1.00	64.9 (150)	1.00	66.7 (130)	1.00	73.4 (484)	1.00
I-5 times 64 times	13.6 (334)	1.58 (1.37, 1.82) 1 95 (1 56 - 2 45)	15.4 (40)	1.63 (1.13, 2.34) 2 17 (1 30 3 65)	16.7 (12) 9.7 (7)	2.21 (1.12, 4.39) 3 70 (1 52 9 01)	19.1 (44) 0 1 (71)	2.23 (1.57, 3.17) 3.10 (1.00 5.05)	19.5 (38) 8.7 (16)	2.21 (1.51, 3.22) 2 86 (1 67 4 92)	16.4 (108) 6.2 (41)	1.88 (1.50, 2.35) 2 20 (1 55 - 3 10)
Everyday	2.0 (50)	3.32 (2.21, 4.99)	7.3	9.40 (5.47, 16.14)	16.7 (12)	22.41 (10.85, 46.26)	6.9 (16)	9.01 (5.07, 16.02)	5.6 (11)	6.51 (3.34, 12.72)	4.0 (26)	5.58 (3.45, 9.02)
			(19)									
6. Said something be	id about your	body shape, size, or ap	pearance									
Never	34.7 (854)	1.00	36.5 (95)	1.00	38.0 (27)	1.00	27.5 (63)	1.00	35.4 (69)	1.00	30.4 (200)	1.00
1-5 times	40.7 (1002)	1.50 (1.35, 1.66)	34.6 (90)	1.03 (0.77, 1.40)	23.9 (17)	$0.73\ (0.38, 1.37)$	39.3 (90)	1.57 (1.13, 2.19)	34.9 (68)	2.21 (1.51, 3.22)	40.1 (264)	1.58 (1.30, 1.92)
6+ times Every day	(644) 1.81 (667) 63)	1.84 (1.60, 2.11) 2 14 (1 73 2 65)	(0C) 7761 0 6 (75)	1.42 (0.99, 2.04) 2 00 (1 25 3 22)	18.3 (13) 19.7 (14)	1.34 (0.65, 2.75) 3 94 (1 91 8 12)	10 9 (75)	2.19 (1.49, 3.24) 3.00 (1.88 - 5.08)	19.0(37)	2.86 (1.67, 4.92) 6 51 (3 33-12-72)	21.2 (140) 8 4 (55)	2.21 (1.75, 2.79)
7. Asked for persona	1 information	over the internet (e.g.,	address, phoi	ne number, or last name)							()	
Never	57.3 (1412)	1.00	52.9 (138)	1.00	33.3 (24)	1.00	48.3 (111)	1.00	49.5 (97)	1.00	49.8 (328)	1.00
1-5 times	28.6 (704)	1.62 (1.46, 1.81)	24.9 (65)	1.35(0.997, 1.83)	22.2 (16)	2.20 (1.16, 4.18)	27.8 (64)	1.65 (1.21, 2.26)	24.5 (48)	1.43 (1.01, 2.03)	32.3 (213)	2.00 (1.67, 2.40)
6+ times	11.7 (289)	2.54 (2.16, 2.98)	13.4 (35)	2.27(1.53, 3.35)	20.8 (15)	6.29 (3.16, 12.52)	13.5 (31)	2.46 (1.62, 3.73)	15.3 (30)	2.86 (1.87, 4.37)	13.2 (87)	2.74 (2.13, 3.54)
Everyday	2.4 (58)	3.92 (2.67, 5.74)	8.8 (23)	10.48 (6.30, 17.42)	23.6 (17)	45.07 (22.19, 91.55)	10.4 (24)	14.04 (8.45, 23.33)	10.7 (21)	12.47 (7.22, 21.53)	4.7 (31)	7.02 (4.48, 11.00)
8. Made you feel un	safe when you	were in contact with t	them over the	t internet		00	01000		10110 2 02			
Never	78.0 (1930)	1.00	6/.8 (1/9)	1.00	47.3 (35)	1.00	62.9 (146)	1.00 3.10 /1 50 3.02	59.6 (118)	1.00	70.0 (465)	1.00
1–5 times	16.0 (395) 1.8 (110)	$1.40\ (1.23,\ 1.59)$	18.6 (49)	1.70 (1.23, 2.36)	16.2 (12)	2.51 (1.28, 4.95)	22.4 (52)	2.19 (1.58, 3.03)	25.3 (50)	2.59 (1.84, 3.66)	22.0 (146)	2.09 (1.71, 2.55)
0+ times Eventique	4.8 (119) 1 2 (31)	2.21 (1./3, 2.81) 2 44 (1 50 - 2.00)	8.0 (21) 5 7 (15)	0.14 (1.95, 5.08) 0.67 (5.13-18.04)	18.9 (14) 17.6 (13)	12.// (0.4/, 23.18) 13.11 /20.06 03.02)	8.0 (2U) 6.0 (14)	5./4 (2.28, 0.15) 11 05 (5 78 21 12)	9.0 (19) 5 6 (11)	4.42 (2.04, 7.38) 10 75 /5 36 21 54)	(96) 1.0 2 0 (10)	2.15 (1.48, 5.14) 5 05 (2 41 - 10 27)
9. Bullied or picked	on vou throug	h the internet (e.g., pos	sted somethin	12 on Facebook or emails	(cr) or (r	17:11 (F0:00) 11:7F)	(11) 000	(711.02 (201.02) (211.12)	(11) 0.0	10.10 (0.00, 21.04)	(11) 1.7	(1001 (11))
Never	44.8 (117)	1.00	58.0 (152)	1.00	44.4 (32)	1.00	53.5 (123)	1.00	52.0 (102)	1.00	62.1 (410)	1.00
1-5 times	40.6 (106)	1.91 (1.70, 2.14)	21.4 (56)	1.54 (1.12, 2.12)	15.3 (11)	1.73 (0.85, 3.50)	27.0 (62)	2.14 (1.56, 2.94)	24.0 (47)	1.94 (1.35, 2.78)	23.6 (156)	1.73 (1.42, 2.10)
6+ times	10.3 (27)	2.40 (2.00, 2.88)	14.1 (37)	3.08 (2.09, 4.53)	18.1 (13)	5.59 (2.74, 11.38)	11.7 (27)	2.68 (1.72, 4.18)	13.3 (26)	3.30 (2.10, 5.19)	10.3 (68)	2.37 (1.79, 3.14)
Everyday	4.2 (11)	2.75 (1.93, 3.93)	6.5 (17)	5.64 (3.23, 9.83)	22.2 (16)	26.41 (13.17, 52.99)	7.8 (18)	7.58 (4.37, 13.12)	10.7 (21)	10.96 (6.44, 18.65)	3.9 (26)	3.60 (2.27, 5.71)

AOR adjusted odds ratio. AOR adjusted for mental and emotional well-being and feelings of sadness/hopelessness

I

victimization types and six different illicit drug types create new knowledge about the specific relationships between bullying victimization and different types of drug use. Across grade and gender, being threatened or injured with a weapon everyday resulted in the largest odds of all drug use types, with methamphetamines being the drug type that was most strongly related. For boys in grades 7 to 9 and 10 to 12, internet-related victimization also resulted in large effect sizes for most drug types. These results may indicate that targeted interventions to reduce threats or injuries with a weapon and internet victimization may be associated with the largest reductions in drug use.

Across grade and gender, a strong dose-response relationship was noted with increasing frequency of bullying victimization corresponding to increasing odds of drug use. While other studies have examined the accumulation of victimization experiences on several mental health and social outcomes (Evans et al. 2014; Kelleher et al. 2013), none have examined this relationship with illicit drug use as the outcome. These results provide evidence for the cumulative effects of bullying victimization and may identify those most at risk for illicit drug use.

Significant grade differences in the relationships between bullying victimization and drug use types were found, with those in grades 7 to 9 noting stronger relationships than those in grades 10 to 12. These findings suggest that bullying prevention and intervention strategies should begin in elementary grades and continue through to grade 12. Gender differences were also noted for some drug use types, with girls indicating stronger relationships between any bullying victimization and drug use compared to boys. These results show that reductions in bullying victimization may have larger associations with reductions in some drug use types for girls compared to boys.

This study was unable to determine the mechanisms by which bullying victimization is related to drug use; however, it is possible that those who experience bullying victimization may use drugs as coping mechanisms to escape their painful reality—one they feel is out of their own control. This is important to understand so that bullying victims can be provided with healthy coping strategies and identified by professionals in the education and health care systems as potentially higherrisk individuals for using drugs. Additionally, an area for future research is identifying effective protective factors that can moderate the relationship between bullying victimization and poor outcomes such as illicit drug use (Sigurdson et al. 2014).

## Limitations

These results should be interpreted in the context of several limitations. First, this study is cross-sectional in nature; therefore, causal inferences cannot be made. Second, due to the low prevalence of everyday bullying victimization and specific drug use types, many logistic regression models resulted in very large estimates with wide confidence intervals. This is an indicator that both events are rare, but largely associated with one another. Third, bullying victimization was measured using retrospective self-report items, which may be subject to recall bias and social desirability bias. However, many previous studies have used past 12-month time frames for measuring bullying victimization (Carlyle and Steinman 2007; Haynie et al. 2001; Hemphill et al. 2015; Schneider et al. 2012) and others have noted that alternatives to self-reported bullying victimization (i.e., peer-reports) may also be inaccurate because peers may not always be present when bullying occurs (Branson and Cornell 2009; De Los and Prinstein 2004; Volk et al. 2017). Fourth, confounding variables such as socioeconomic status, diagnosed mental health problems, or experiencing violence in the home were not assessed.

This study provides evidence to support the relationship between nine bullying victimization types and six drug use types among both boys and girls in grades 7 to 12. Strong dose-response relationships indicate the importance of recognizing cumulative victimization experiences on adolescent outcomes. Significant grade and gender differences show that early and gender-specific bullying intervention and prevention strategies could be associated with the greatest reductions in illicit drug use; however, bullying prevention and intervention efforts are required for all students. Implementing evidencebased bullying prevention programs could also help to reduce illicit drug use and direct students towards a healthy and positive life trajectory.

**Acknowledgements** The authors would like to acknowledge the Department of Epidemiology and Cancer Registry, CancerCare Manitoba for supporting the use of Youth Health Survey data.

**Funding** Preparation of this article was supported by Canadian Institutes of Health Research (CIHR) New Investigator Award (Afifi) and CIHR Foundation Scheme Award (Afifi).

#### **Compliance with ethical standards**

**Conflict of interest** There are no conflicts of interest to declare by any author. The results and conclusions are those of the authors and no official endorsement by CancerCare Manitoba is intended or should be inferred.

## References

- Arseneault, L. (2017). The long-term impact of bullying victimization on mental health. World Psychiatry, 16(1), 27–28.
- Bender, D., & Losel, F. (2011). Bullying at school as a predictor of delinquency, violence and other anti-social behaviour in adulthood. *Criminal Behaviour and Mental Health, 21*, 99–106.
- Berthold, K., & Hoover, J. (2000). Correlates of bullying and victimization among intermediate students in the midwestern USA. *School Psychology International*, 21(1), 65–78.
- Boak A, Hamilton, Hayley A, Adlaf, Edward M, Mann RE (2014) Drug use among Ontario students [Internet]. Available from: http://www. britannica.com/EBchecked/topic/172024/drug-use.

- Bouffard, L. A., & Koeppel, M. D. H. (2017). Sex differences in the health risk behavior outcomes of childhood bullying victimization. *Victims and Offenders*, 12(4), 549–565.
- Boyce WF (2004) Young people in Canada: their health and well-being [Internet]. Health Canada; Available from: http://www.phac-aspc. gc.ca/hp-ps/dca-dea/publications/hbsc-2004/index-eng.php.
- Branson, C. E., & Cornell, D. G. (2009). A comparison of self and peer reports in the assessment of middle school bullying. *Journal of Applied School Psychology*, 25, 5–27.
- Canadian Centre on Substance Abuse (2007) Substance abuse in Canada: youth in focus [Internet]. Canadian Centre on Substance Abuse. Available from: http://www.ccsa.ca/ResourceLibrary/ccsa-011521-2007-e.pdf.
- Carbone-Lopez, K., Esbensen, F., & Brick, B. T. (2010). Correlates and consequences of peer victimization: gender differences in direct and indirect forms of bullying. *Youth Violence and Juvenile Justice*, 8(4), 332–350.
- Carlyle, K. E., & Steinman, K. J. (2007). Demographic differences in the prevalence, co-occurrence, and correlates of adolescent bullying at school. *The Journal of School Health*, 77(9), 623–629.
- De Los, R. A., & Prinstein, M. J. (2004). Applying depression-distortion hypotheses to the assessment of peer victimization in adolescents. *Journal of Clinical Child and Adolescent Psychology*, 33(2), 325– 335.
- DeVoe J, Murphy C. (2011). Student reports of bullying and cyber-bullying: results from the 2007 school crime supplement to the national crime victimization survey. *National Center Education Statistics*, 1–52. Retrieved from: https://nces.ed.gov/pubs2011/2011316.pdf.
- Evans, C. B. R., Smokowski, P. R., & Cotter, K. L. (2014). Cumulative bullying victimization: an investigation of the dose-response relationship between victimization and the associated mental health outcomes, social supports, and school experiences of rural adolescents. *Children and Youth Services Review*, 44, 256–264.
- Freeman, J., King, M., & Pickett, W. (2011). The health of Canada's young people: a mental health focus. Ontari: Public Health Agency of Canada.
- Goebert, D., Else, I., Matsu, C., Chung-Do, J., & Chang, J. Y. (2011). The impact of cyberbullying on substance use and mental health in a multiethnic sample. *Maternal and Child Health Journal*, 15(8), 1282–1286.
- Griffin, R. S., & Gross, A. M. (2004). Childhood bullying: current empirical findings and future directions for research. Aggression and Violent Behavior, 9, 379–400.
- Haynie, D. L., Nansel, T., Eitel, P., Crump, A. D., Saylor, K., Yu, K., et al. (2001). Bullies, victims and bully/victims: distinct groups of at-risk youth. *Journal of Early Adolescence*, 21(1), 29–49.
- Health Canada (2015) Canadian Tobacco Alcohol and Drugs Survey (CTADS): 2015 summary [Internet]. Available from: https://www. canada.ca/en/health-canada/services/canadian-tobacco-alcoholdrugs-survey/2015-summary.html.
- Hemphill, S. A., Tollit, M., Kotevski, A., & Heerde, J. A. (2015). Predictors of traditional and cyber-bullying victimization: a longitudinal study of Australian secondary school students. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 30(15), 2567–2590.
- Johnston LD, Malley PMO, Miech RA, Bachman JG, Schulenberg JE. (2017) Monitoring the future: National survey results on drug use, 1975–2016: overview, key findings on adolescent drug use [Internet]. Ann Arbor: Institute for Social Research University of Michigan. Available from: http://www.monitoringthefuture.org/ pubs/monographs/mtf-overview2016.pdf.
- Kaltiala-Heino, R., Rimpelä, M., Rantanen, P., & Rimpelä, A. (2000). Bullying at school—an indicator of adolescents at risk for mental disorders. *Journal of Adolescence*, 23(6), 661–674.
- Kann, L., Kinchen, S., Shanklin, S. L., Flint, K. H., Kawkins, J., Harris, W. A., et al. (2014). Youth risk behavior surveillance—United States, 2013. *MMWR Surveillance Summaries*, 63(4), 1–168.

- Kelleher, I., Keeley, H., Corcoran, P., Ramsay, H., Wasserman, C., Carli, V., et al. (2013). Childhood trauma and psychosis in a prospective cohort study: cause, effect and directionality. *The American Journal* of *Psychiatry*, 170(7), 734–741.
- Keyes, C. L. M. (2002). The mental health continuum: from languishing to flourishing in life. *Journal of Health and Social Behavior*, 43(2), 207–222.
- Keyes, C. L. M., Wissing, M., Potgieter, J. P., Temane, M., Kruger, A., & van Rooy, S. (2008). Evaluation of the mental health continuum short form (MHC—SF) in Setswana-speaking Africans. *Clinical Psychology & Psychotherapy*, 15, 181–192.
- Luk, J. W., Wang, J., & Simons-Morton, B. G. (2010). Bullying victimization and substance use among U.S. adolescents: mediation by depression. *Prevention Science*, 11(4), 355–359.
- Modecki, K. L., Minchin, J., Harbaugh, A. G., Guerra, N. G., et al. (2014). Bullying prevalence across contexts: A meta-analysis measuring cyber and traditional bullying. *The Journal of Adolescent Health*, 55(5), 602–611.
- Moore, S. E., Norman, R. E., Suetani, S., Thomas, H. J., Sly, P. D., & Scott, J. G. (2017). Consequences of bullying victimization in childhood and adolescence: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *World Journal of Psychiatry*, 7(1), 60.
- Nansel, T., Overpeck, M., Pilla, R., Ruan, W., Simons-Morton, B., & Scheidt, P. (2001). Bullying behaviors among US youth. *JAMA*, 285(16), 2094–2100.
- Niemelä, S., Brunstein-Klomek, A., Sillanmäki, L., Helenius, H., Piha, J., Kumpulainen, K., et al. (2011). Childhood bullying behaviors at age eight and substance use at age 18 among males. A nationwide prospective study. *Addictive Behaviors*, 36(3), 256–260.
- Olweus, D. (1993). *Bullying at school: what we know and what we can do*. New York: Blackwell Publishing Ltd.
- Partners in Planning for Healthy Living (2013) manitoba youth health survey 2012/2013 user guide [Internet]. Winnipeg, Manitoba; Available from: http://partners.healthincommon.ca/wp-content/ uploads/2013/10/Manitoba-YHS-2012-YHS-User-Guide.pdf.
- Radford, L., Corral, S., Bradley, C., & Fisher, H. L. (2013). The prevalence and impact of child maltreatment and other types of victimization in the UK: findings from a population survey of caregivers, children and young people and young adults. *Child Abuse & Neglect*, 37(10), 801–813.
- Radliff, K. M., Wheaton, J. E., Robinson, K., & Morris, J. (2012). Illuminating the relationship between bullying and substance use among middle and high school youth. *Addictive Behaviors*, 37(4), 569–572.
- Schneider, S. K., Donnell, L. O., Stueve, A., & Coulter, R. W. S. (2012). Cyberbullying, school bullying, and psychological distress: a regional census of high school students. *American Journal of Public Health*, 102(1), 171–177.
- Sigurdson, J. F., Wallander, J., & Sund, A. M. (2014). Is involvement in school bullying associated with general health and psychosocial adjustment outcomes in adulthood? *Child Abuse & Neglect*, 38(10), 1607–1617.
- Skapinakis, P., Bellos, S., Gkatsa, T., Magklara, K., Lewis, G., Araya, R., et al. (2011). The association between bullying and early stages of suicidal ideation in late adolescents in Greece. *BMC Psychiatry*, 11, 22.
- Takizawa, R., Maughan, B., & Arseneault, L. (2014). Adult health outcomes of childhood bullying victimization: evidence from a fivedecade longitudinal British birth cohort. *The American Journal of Psychiatry*, 171(7), 777–784.
- Tharp-Taylor, S., Haviland, A., & D'Amico, E. J. (2009). Victimization from mental and physical bullying and substance use in early adolescence. *Addictive Behaviors*, 34(6–7), 561–567.
- Valdebenito, S., Tto, M., & Eisner, M. (2015). Prevalence rates of drug use among school bullies and victims: a systematic review and meta-

analysis of cross-sectional studies. *Aggression and Violent Behavior*, 23, 137–146.

- Vivolo-Kantor, A. M., Martell, B. N., Holland, K. M., & Westby, R. (2014). A systematic review and content analysis of bullying and cyber-bullying measurement strategies. *Aggression and Violent Behavior*, 19(4), 423–434.
- Volk, A. A., Veenstra, R., & Espelage, D. L. (2017). So you want to study bullying? Recommendations to enhance the validity, transparency, and compatibility of bullying research. *Aggression and Violent Behavior*, 36, 34–43.
- Wang, W., Vaillancourt, T., Brittain, H. L., McDougall, P., Krygsman, A., Smith, D., et al. (2014). School climate, peer victimization, and

academic achievement: results from a multi-informant study. *School Psychology Quarterly*, 29(3), 360–377.

- Westerhof, G. J., & Keyes, C. L. M. (2010). Mental illness and mental health: the two continua model across the lifespan. *Journal of Adult Development*, 17(2), 110–119.
- Wolke, D., & Lereya, S. T. (2015). Long-term effects of bullying. Archives of Disease in Childhood, 100(9), 879–885.
- Wolke, D., Copeland, W. E., Angold, A., & Costello, E. J. (2013). Impact of bullying in childhood on adult health, wealth, crime, and social outcomes. *Psychological Science*, 24(10), 1958–1970.