

Erratum to: When Quality Trumps Quantity: Siblings and the Development of Peer Relationships

Deniz Yucel · Douglas B. Downey

Published online: 4 February 2015

© Springer Science+Business Media Dordrecht 2015

Erratum to: Child Ind Res (2014)
DOI 10.1007/s12187-014-9276-0

The published article unfortunately contained errors in Tables 1 and 3. These tables are corrected as follows:

The online version of the original article can be found at <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s12187-014-9276-0>.

D. Yucel (✉)

Department of Sociology, William Paterson University of New Jersey, 300 Pompton Road, 465,
Raubinger Hall, Wayne, NJ 07470, USA
e-mail: yuceld@wpunj.edu

D. B. Downey

Department of Sociology, The Ohio State University, 238 Townshend Hall, 1885 Neil Ave. Mall,
Columbus, OH 43210, USA
e-mail: downey32@gmail.com

Table 1 Descriptive statistics of all variables from wave 1 of “understanding society” data ($N=4899$)

Variables	Mean/ percentages*	Standard deviation	Metric	Description
Dependent variable				
Peer relationship quality	8.26	1.65	0–10	This study uses the Strengths and Difficulties Questionnaire (SDQ). Originally, the SDQ is made up of 25 items, which measures both negative and positive behaviors in children. Each item is scored on a 3-point Likert-type scale. Items are rescaled and positive behaviors were reverse coded. Five items each are aggregated into five subscales (emotional problems, conduct problems, hyperactivity/inattention, peer relationship problems, and pro-social behavior). For this study, we only use the scale on peer relationship problems. To measure peer relationship problems, the following five questions are asked. i) “Usually on own. Generally plays alone or keeps to themselves.” ii) “Has one good friend or more.” iii) “Generally liked by others own age.” iv) “Other children or young people pick on or bully.” v) “Gets on better with adults.” The SDQ was completed by the young person as part of the self-completion questionnaire. The youth responded to questions as “Not true” “Somewhat true” or “Certainly true”. Responses were coded as 0, 1, and 2. Items 1, 4, and 5 are reverse coded. The total scale ranges from 0 to 10, with higher scores indicating better peer relationships. The alpha for this scale is moderate with an alpha of 0.52.
Independent variable				
No sibling	0.14	–	0–1	Having no sibling living in the household (0 = No, 1 = Yes)
One sibling	0.42	–	0–1	Having one sibling living in the household (0 = No, 1 = Yes)
Two siblings	0.27	–	0–1	Having two siblings living in the household (0 = No, 1 = Yes)
Three siblings	0.11	–	0–1	Having three siblings living in the household (0 = No, 1 = Yes)
Four siblings	0.04	–	0–1	Having four siblings living in the household (0 = No, 1 = Yes)
At least five siblings	0.02	–	0–1	Having at least five siblings living in the household (0 = No, 1 = Yes)
Different dimensions of sibship				
Number of brothers	0.79	0.84	0–3	Total number of brothers living in the household
Number of sisters	0.77	0.81	0–3	Total number of sisters living in the household
Full siblings	1.38	1.06	0–4	Total number of full siblings living in the household

Table 1 (continued)

Variables	Mean/ percentages*	Standard deviation	Metric	Description
Half siblings	0.11	0.39	0–2	Total number of half siblings living in the household
Step siblings	0.02	–	0–1	Having a step sibling living in the household (0 = No, 1 = Yes)
Adopted or foster siblings	0.01	–	0–1	Having adopted/foster sibling living in the household (0 = No, 1 = Yes)
Siblings who are under 10 years old	0.58	0.81	0–3	Total number of siblings living in the household who are under 10 years old
Siblings who are between 10 and 15 years old	0.59	0.65	0–2	Total number of siblings living in the household who are between 10 and 15 years old
Siblings who are older than 15 years old	0.41	0.64	0–2	Total number of siblings living in the household who are older than 15 years old
Sibling relationship quality	25.35	5.87	8–32	Target children were asked: “How often do any of your brothers or sisters do any of the following to you at home?” with the options “hit, kick, or push you”, “take your belongings”, “call you nasty names” and “make fun of you”. Response categories determine the frequency of each option: “never”, “not much (1–3 times in the last 6 months)”, “quite a lot (more than 4 times in the last 6 months)”, “a lot (a few times every week)”. These items are first reverse coded and then added so that higher number on this scale indicates less victimization of sibling bullying. Following these questions, children were asked whether they were the perpetrator of bullying towards their siblings “How often do you do any of the following to your brothers or sisters at home?” with the same options and response categories as mentioned above. These items are first reverse coded and then added so that higher number on this scale indicates less report of being a perpetrator of sibling bullying. These two groups of questions (being the victim and perpetrator of sibling bullying) were added together. Alpha = .80.
Child’s age in years	12.78	1.40	10–15	Child’s age in years. (Target child is between 10 and 15 years of age).
Parent’s age	42.53	5.71	25–65	Average of both parent’s age (in years)
Mother with a degree	0.20	–	0–1	(0 = No, 1 = Yes)

Table 1 (continued)

Variables	Mean/ percentages*	Standard deviation	Metric	Description
Mother with A levels or higher	0.32	–	0–1	(0 = No, 1 = Yes)
Mother with GCSE O level	0.26	–	0–1	(0 = No, 1 = Yes)
Mother with less than GCSE level (reference)	0.22	–	0–1	(0 = No, 1 = Yes)
Father with a degree	0.24	–	0–1	(0 = No, 1 = Yes)
Father with A levels or higher	0.31	–	0–1	(0 = No, 1 = Yes)
Father with GCSE O level	0.21	–	0–1	(0 = No, 1 = Yes)
Father with less than GCSE level (reference)	0.24	–	0–1	(0 = No, 1 = Yes)
Socioeconomic status (log of family income)	7.96	0.87	0–20,000 British Pound	Gross monthly household income (month before the interview). It has a skewed distribution, therefore I took the log of the income measure.
White (reference)	0.73	–	0–1	(0 = No, 1 = Yes)
Asian	0.14	–	0–1	(0 = No, 1 = Yes)
Other race	0.13	–	0–1	(0 = No, 1 = Yes)
Male	0.50	–	0–1	(0 = No, 1 = Yes)
Number of friends	5.58	2.71	0–9	“How many close friends do you have?”
Mother’s health	3.44	1.09	1–5	(1 = Poor, 2 = Fair, 3 = Good, 4 = Very Good, 5 = Excellent)
Father’s health	3.53	1.06	1–5	(1 = Poor, 2 = Fair, 3 = Good, 4 = Very Good, 5 = Excellent)
Two biological parents	0.59	–	0–1	1 = Lives with two biological parents, 0 = everything else.
Parent–child relationship	3.17	0.50	1.5 to 4	As part of the youth questionnaire; children are asked the following six questions. 1) “How often do you quarrel with your mother?” 2) “How often do you quarrel with your father?” 3) “How often do you talk to mother about things that matter?” 4) “How often do you talk to father about things that matter?” The answer categories are from “most days”, “more than once a week”, “less than once a week” and “hardly ever.” In addition, the following two questions are asked. 5) “How often are your parents interested in how you do at school?” 6) “How often do your parents attend parent’s evenings at school?” The answer categories for these two questions are “always or nearly always”, “sometimes”, “hardly ever”, and “never.” Questions 2–6 are reverse coded so that higher scores indicate

Table 1 (continued)

Variables	Mean/ percentages*	Standard deviation	Metric	Description
				better parent–child relationship. These six items are summed and averaged. Higher number on this scale represents better parent–child relationship. Alpha of the six questions 0.63, which indicates an acceptable consistency.

* Percentages rather than means are presented for the nominal (categorical) variables. These unweighted descriptive statistics are derived from one of the five datasets with imputed missing values

Table 3 OLS regression model predicting peer relationship quality

Independent variable	Model 1 (sibship size only)	Model 2 (sibship size and control variables)	Model 3 (sibship size, control variables and child-sibling relationship quality)	Model 4 (gender of siblings, control variables and child-sibling relationship quality)	Model 5 (type of sibling, control variables and child-sibling relationship quality)	Model 6 (birth order and age spacing of siblings, control variables and child-relationship quality)
	Unstandardized coefficient	Unstandardized coefficient	Unstandardized coefficient	Unstandardized coefficient	Unstandardized coefficient	Unstandardized coefficient
Two siblings	0.023 (0.058)	0.044 (0.056)	0.061 (0.056)			
Three siblings	-0.071 (0.080)	0.012 (0.080)	0.027 (0.080)			
Four siblings	-0.137 (0.122)	-0.057 (0.121)	-0.043 (0.120)			
At least five siblings	-0.304 (0.161)	-0.188 (0.161)	-0.174 (0.161)			
Different dimensions of sibship						
Number of Brothers				0.010 (0.032)		
Number of Sisters				-0.047 (0.033)		
Full siblings					0.016 (0.029)	
Half Siblings					-0.175** (0.064)	
Step Siblings					-0.082 (0.149)	
Adopted or foster siblings					0.024 (0.217)	
Siblings who are under 10 years old						-0.090** (0.033)
Siblings who are between						0.039 (0.039)

Table 3 (continued)

Independent variable	Model 1 (sibship size only)	Model 2 (sibship size and control variables)	Model 3 (sibship size, control variables and child-sibling relationship quality)	Model 4 (gender of siblings, control variables and child-sibling relationship quality)	Model 5 (type of sibling, control variables and child-sibling relationship quality)	Model 6 (birth order and age spacing of siblings, control variables and child-relationship quality)
	Unstandardized coefficient	Unstandardized coefficient	Unstandardized coefficient	Unstandardized coefficient	Unstandardized coefficient	Unstandardized coefficient
10 and 15 years old						
Siblings who are older than 15 years old			0.021*** (0.004)	0.020*** (0.004)	0.021*** (0.005)	0.008 (0.041)
Sibling relationship quality						0.021*** (0.005)
Control variables						
Child's age		0.034 (0.019)	0.031 (0.018)	0.030 (0.018)	0.032 (0.019)	0.023 (0.019)
Parent's age		0.011* (0.005)	0.010 (0.005)	0.009 (0.005)	0.008 (0.005)	0.006 (0.006)
Mother with less than GCSE level (reference)						
Mother with GCSE O level		0.085 (0.085)	0.100 (0.085)	0.102 (0.084)	0.125 (0.084)	0.108 (0.085)
Mother with A levels or higher		0.156 (0.082)	0.174* (0.082)	0.175* (0.082)	0.195* (0.082)	0.174* (0.082)
Mother with a degree		0.088 (0.097)	0.114 (0.097)	0.116 (0.097)	0.133 (0.096)	0.114 (0.097)

Table 3 (continued)

Independent variable	Model 1 (sibship size only)	Model 2 (sibship size and control variables)	Model 3 (sibship size, control variables and child-sibling relationship quality)	Model 4 (gender of siblings, control variables and child-sibling relationship quality)	Model 5 (type of sibling, control variables and child-sibling relationship quality)	Model 6 (birth order and age spacing of siblings, control variables and child-relationship quality)
	Unstandardized coefficient	Unstandardized coefficient	Unstandardized coefficient	Unstandardized coefficient	Unstandardized coefficient	Unstandardized coefficient
Father with less than GCSE level (reference)						
Father with GCSE O level	0.149 (0.140)	0.163 (0.140)	0.163 (0.140)	0.164 (0.139)	0.167 (0.138)	0.165 (0.139)
Father with A levels or higher	0.133 (0.125)	0.142 (0.126)	0.142 (0.126)	0.143 (0.126)	0.146 (0.127)	0.142 (0.127)
Father with a degree	0.040 (0.115)	0.053 (0.118)	0.053 (0.118)	0.055 (0.118)	0.053 (0.118)	0.061 (0.118)
Socioeconomic status (log of family income)	0.022 (0.031)	0.024 (0.031)	0.024 (0.031)	0.026 (0.031)	0.035 (0.031)	0.023 (0.031)
White (reference)						
Asian	0.022 (0.080)	0.004 (0.081)	0.004 (0.081)	0.006 (0.081)	-0.021 (0.081)	0.016 (0.080)
Other race	0.187* (0.079)	0.182* (0.079)	0.182* (0.079)	0.176*(0.079)	0.164*(0.078)	0.189*(0.078)
Male	-0.129** (0.049)	-0.129** (0.049)	-0.129** (0.049)	-0.131** (0.049)	-0.126** (0.049)	-0.126** (0.049)
Number of friends	0.143*** (0.009)	0.144*** (0.009)	0.144*** (0.009)	0.143*** (0.009)	0.143*** (0.009)	0.143*** (0.009)

Table 3 (continued)

Independent variable	Model 1 (sibship size only)	Model 2 (sibship size and control variables)	Model 3 (sibship size, control variables and child-sibling relationship quality)	Model 4 (gender of siblings, control variables and child-sibling relationship quality)	Model 5 (type of sibling, control variables and child-sibling relationship quality)	Model 6 (birth order and age spacing of siblings, control variables and child-relationship quality)
	Unstandardized coefficient	Unstandardized coefficient	Unstandardized coefficient	Unstandardized coefficient	Unstandardized coefficient	Unstandardized coefficient
Mother's health		0.121*** (0.025)	0.124*** (0.025)	0.123*** (0.025)	0.120*** (0.025)	0.126*** (0.025)
Father's health		0.023 (0.035)	0.018 (0.035)	0.016 (0.035)	0.018 (0.035)	0.018 (0.035)
Parent-child relationship		0.323*** (0.060)	0.246*** (0.063)	0.246*** (0.063)	0.245*** (0.063)	0.245*** (0.063)
Family structure		0.161** (0.054)	0.156** (0.054)	0.155** (0.054)	0.104 (0.058)	0.155** (0.054)
Sample	4188	4188	4188	4188	4188	4188

+ $p < 0.10$, * $p < 0.05$, ** $p < 0.01$, *** $p < 0.001$ (two-tailed tests). Standard errors are in parentheses