

Sibling Bullying, School Bullying, and Children's Subjective Well-Being Before and During the COVID-19 Pandemic in Indonesia

Ihsana Sabriani Borualogo¹ · Ferran Casas^{2,3}

Accepted: 23 January 2023 / Published online: 8 February 2023 © The Author(s), under exclusive licence to Springer Nature B.V. 2023

Abstract

The aims of this study are threefold. The first aim is to examine the prevalence of sibling and school bullying before and during the COVID-19 pandemic in Indonesia. The second aim is to investigate the subjective well-being (SWB) of children who were bullied or never bullied before and during COVID-19. The third aim is to investigate factors associated with sibling and school bullying before and during the COVID-19 pandemic. This study uses two separate cross-sectional datasets from the Children's Worlds survey in Indonesia. Data in Study 1 were collected in October 2017 (N=12,794; 48.2% boys; 51.8% girls, mean age=10.56), while data in Study 2 were collected from July to September 2021 (N=2,222; 46.1% boys; 53.9% girls; mean age = 10.77). Five items were used to measure sibling and school bullying. The five-item version of the Children's Worlds Subjective Well-Being Scale (CW-SWBS5) was used as the SWB indicator. Three groups of independent variables (family, friends and school climate) were analysed using linear regression to investigate the contribution of each variable to sibling and school bullying. Results show that the prevalence of sibling bullying during the COVID-19 pandemic is higher than before the pandemic, while the frequency of school bullying incidents during COVID-19 is lower than before COVID-19. SWB scores of children during COVID-19 are lower than SWB scores of children before the COVID-19 pandemic, both for bullied or never-bullied children. The fact that children report that parents listen to them and take what they say into account is positively associated with a lower frequency of being bullied at home before and during COVID-19 and being bullied at school only during the pandemic. Although samples are not strictly comparable, the SWB indicators used in both studies showed sensitivity to the changes in children's lives in previous studies. Therefore, the SWB indicators are supposed to be sensitive to changes associated with children's new everyday life COVID-19 has implied.

Extended author information available on the last page of the article

Keywords Children · COVID-19 · School Bullying · Sibling Bullying · Subjective Well-Being

The World Health Organization (WHO) declared the novel SARS-CoV-2 coronavirus (COVID-19) a pandemic on 11 March 2020 (WHO, 2020). COVID-19 has been an ongoing pandemic since then. It has not only affected the physical health of people worldwide but also affected mental health and well-being in adults (O'Connor et al., 2021) and children and adolescents (Borualogo & Casas, 2021a; Bravo-Sanzana et al., 2022; Cowie & Myers, 2021; Ravens-Sieberer et al., 2021). Effects of the pandemic are experienced not only in high-income countries (Cowden et al., 2021; Kohls et al., 2021; Pancani et al., 2021; Pieh et al., 2021) but also in low- and middleincome countries (Kola et al., 2021; Wang et al., 2021). The number of COVID-19 cases increased rapidly (WHO, 2020), and many countries instituted lockdowns to respond to critical situations and prevent the spread of the virus (BBC, 2020). One consequence of the lockdown was the closing of schools, which changed education dramatically. Students did not go to school and were confined at home. Learning and teaching were undertaken remotely and on digital platforms (Adedoyin & Soykan, 2020).

In Indonesia, students were forced to learn online from March 2020 (Kamil & Kuwado, 2020) until September 2021 (Asmara, 2021). Limited face-to-face learning started in September 2021, which means students' school attendance is limited to a maximum of 50% in the classroom and can only be carried out in areas with a relatively low number of COVID-19 cases (Harbani, 2021). In addition to this limited face-to-face learning, health and safety protocols were implemented. Protocols included social distancing, the mandatory wearing of masks for all students and teachers, no extracurricular events, and the canteen cannot be opened (Harbani, 2021). As a result of these restrictions on limited face-to-face learning, most students learned in smaller groups. They had fewer opportunities for social interaction with other students at school than before the pandemic.

Regarding fewer opportunities to interact with other students at school, several studies confirmed a decreasing number of school bullying incidents (Abramson, 2021; Martinez & Temkin, 2021; Yang et al., 2021; Yourtown, 2021; Vaillancourt et al., 2021). Literature studies in Indonesia did not show information on school bullying incidents during the COVID-19 pandemic. In fact, bullying incidents in Indonesia before the pandemic were high (Borualogo & Gumilang, 2019), putting Indonesia in the fifth highest position out of 78 countries based on the Programme for International Students Assessment (PISA; OECD 2019). Limited studies on bullying before and during COVID-19 in Indonesia leave a gap in information about this issue. Research on bullying before and during the COVID-19 pandemic is essential since several mass media sources reported an increase in cyberbullying incidents during the COVID-19 pandemic in Indonesia, particularly among students (Mashabi & Galih, 2020; Ramadhanty, 2021). UNICEF Indonesia indicated increasing cyberbullying cases during the pandemic (Mashabi & Galih, 2020). Moreover, the Minister of Education, Culture, Research and Technology stated that online learning during the COVID-19 pandemic makes children more vulnerable to becoming victims of cyberbullying (Ramadhanty, 2021). Using the Children's Worlds data before and during COVID-19, this study will be the first to examine sibling and school bullying before and during the COVID-19 pandemic in Indonesia.

Children's Worlds is a pioneer in collecting reliable and representative data worldwide in as many countries as possible on children's lives and their perception and evaluation of their lives (Ben-Arieh, 2019; Casas 2019; Gross-Manos et al., 2021). The Children's Worlds project (International Survey of Children's Well-Being; ISC-WeB; www.isciweb.org) aims to improve knowledge about children's well-being, including children's voices in the research (Ben-Arieh, 2019; Casas 2019; Gross-Manos et al., 2021). It has collected data from children ages 8, 10 and 12 (Andresen et al., 2019; Ben-Arieh, 2019; Casas 2019; Gross-Manos et al., 2021). In the third wave of data collection, Children's Worlds involved 35 countries (Rees et al., 2020). Indonesia participated in the third wave of the ISCWeB in 2017–2018. In 2021, a focused Children's Worlds survey involved more than 20 countries, asking about children's perceptions and evaluations during the COVID-19 pandemic, including their SWB, and Indonesia also took part in the study. In both studies, Children's Worlds included questions on sibling and school bullying, the SWB of children, and factors related to the SWB of children.

Bullying victimisation among children is defined as exposure to aggressive action from one or more children that is intended to harm and involves a power imbalance (Olweus, 1993; Smith, 2016; Volk et al., 2014). This definition was originally intended to characterise face-to-face aggressive behaviour that may be physical (e.g., being hit), verbal (e.g., being called unkind names), or emotional (e.g., being left out), which was known as traditional bullying. There are two types of this traditional bullying: sibling and school bullying. Although sibling bullying victimisation has been reported as the most frequent form of family violence (Dantchev & Wolke, 2019), studies on that topic are still limited, and it has rarely been investigated during COVID-19. We only identified two studies investigating bullying during the COVID-19 pandemic (Bacher-Hicks et al., 2022; Vaillancourt et al., 2021) and both studies investigated school bullying.

Subjective well-being (SWB) is defined as a person's evaluation of their lives, the degree to which their thoughtful appraisals and affective reactions indicate that their lives are desirable and proceeding well (Diener, 1984; Diener et al., 2015). In recent decades, SWB studies of children have been expanding. Savahl et al., (2019) defined children's SWB as the results of children's cognitive and affective evaluation of their lives, the circumstances affecting their lives, and the social context in which they live. Casas (2016) stated three strong predictors of children's SWB: bullying, perception of safety, and respect for children and inclusion of their voices. Several studies confirmed Casas' statement about bullying as one strong predictor of SWB of children. A study using the second wave of the Children's Worlds project showed that children who had been bullied had significantly lower SWB than those who had not (Bradshaw et al., 2017). A study in Chile and South Africa also showed a negative relationship between bullying victimisation and SWB (Varela et al., 2020), as well as a study in Algeria (Tiliouine, 2015).

Several studies revealed factors related to bullying. A study in Sweden showed that bullied children had poorer relationships with parents and teachers than nonvictims (Bjereld et al., 2017). It is difficult for the victims to talk to their parents because they perceive that their parents do not listen. They also have low confidence regarding talking to their teachers (Bjereld et al., 2017). Other studies showed that perceived social support from family (Lee et al., 2022; Shaheen et al., 2019) and friends (Lee et al., 2022) significantly predicted lower bullying victimisation.

The current study is the first in Indonesia to empirically investigate bullying and SWB of children using the two Children's Worlds datasets from 2017 to 2018 and 2021 – before and during COVID-19. The aims of this study are threefold. The first aim is to examine the prevalence of school bullying and sibling bullying before and during the COVID-19 pandemic in Indonesia. The second aim is to compare the SWB of children before and during the pandemic regarding their bullying experiences at home and school. The third aim is to compare factors related to sibling and school bullying before and during COVID-19.

We proceeded with three research questions: (1) Were there any differences in the prevalence of bullying victimisation before and during the COVID-19 pandemic? (2) Were there any differences in SWB of Indonesian children before and during the COVID-19 pandemic, particularly when they were involved in bullying victimisation? and (3) Which factors were related to bullying incidents before and during the COVID-19 pandemic?

1 Methods

This study used two independent datasets of cross-sectional studies of the Children's Worlds international survey conducted in West Java, Indonesia, in two periods. Study 1 was conducted in October 2017, and Study 2 was conducted from July to September 2021. These datasets are analysed together because they included the same measures, all sampled were children from West Java (although different participants), and the data were collected at different times (before and during the COVID-19 pandemic), which allowed for an examination of population-based differences in bullying victimisation, at school by mates and at home by siblings.

1.1 Procedure and Ethical Approval

Ethical approval was gained separately from the ethical committees. Study 1 gained ethical approval from the ethical committee in Universitas Padjadjaran, while Study 2 gained ethical approval from Konsorsium Psikologi Ilmiah Nusantara (Nusantara Scientific Psychology Consortium).

Study 1 was a representative sample of children aged 10 and 12 years old in West Java Province and was conducted in face-to-face data collection using paper and pencil tests. Study 2 was a convenience sample of children 10, 11 and 12 years old in West Java Province and was conducted using internet-based data collection during the COVID-19 social restriction in Indonesia.

Before starting the data collection in both studies, the research team sent informed consent through teachers who helped spread the consent to parents. In Study 1, teachers sent printed informed consent to parents, while in Study 2, it was included in the

Google Form. All participants were required to have parental consent. After written parental consent was obtained, children were also informed that the data would be treated confidentially, and they were free to answer the questions. In Study 2, all information was written on the Google Form. All questionnaires in both studies were anonymous.

1.2 Data Depuration

In Study 1, depuration procedures were conducted in two steps. First, 179 cases with incomplete questionnaires and missing gender were excluded. Second, following the recommendation from Casas (2016), who stated that cases with three or more missing values in an SWB scale should be eliminated for further analysis, children with more than three missing values in the CW-SWBS5 items were excluded. The remaining missing values in the SWB scales were substituted with multiple imputations using regression.

In Study 2, we checked for systematic responses to questionnaires. Eighty-seven cases with systematic responses were excluded from the dataset.

1.3 Sample

Stratified cluster random sampling was used, with schools being the sampling unit and participants chosen randomly from 267 schools. A representative sample of children 10 and 12 years old (mean age=10.56) in West Java Province was obtained in Study 1 (N=12,794; 48.2% girls; 51.8% boys). A convenience sample of children age 10, 11 and 12 years old (mean age=10.77) in West Java Province was obtained in Study 2 (N=2,222; 46.1% boys; 53.9% girls). Since schools had been closed, Study 2 was designed as an internet-based survey. Sending informed consent to parents and online data collection with students was more accessible with teachers' assistance. The research team recruited teachers in West Java and asked for their assistance in sending the online questionnaire link to the parents. Table 1 presents the participants' details.

1.4 Instruments

Both studies used the same items to measure bullying victimisation, dependent variables, and SWB. All measures are from the Children's Worlds international survey (Rees et al., 2020). Several independent variables regress to bullying items in both studies. These variables are from previous studies on predictors of bullying victimisation (Borualogo et al., 2022): family relationships, relationships with friends, and school climate. The questionnaires in English were agreed upon in the Children's Worlds project by all the participating research teams in different countries. Each local researcher translated them into the country's language and back-translated them. In Indonesia, the questionnaires were translated into the Indonesian language and back-translated following the guidance of translation and adaptation of the questionnaires from Van de Vijver & Hambleton (1996) and Van de Vijver (2015). The Children's Worlds international team approved the back-translated questionnaires.

	Study 1						Study 2					
	Boys		Girls		Total		Boys		Girls	8	To	Total
	u	%	 ц	%	- u	%	- u	%	= 	%	u	%
10 years old	2,947	23.0	3,114	24.3	6,061	47.4	436		9.6	517	23.3	953 42.9
11 years old	:	1	1	ł	1	1	388		17.5	432	19.4	820 36.9
12 years old	3,223	25.2	3,510	27.4	6,733	52.6	200		9.0	249	11.2	449 20.2
Total	6,170	48.2	6,624	51.8	12,794	100	1,024		46.1	1,198	53.9	2,222 100

2ľ.
1
0
0
4
C)
Š
P
anc
ur
9
<u>.</u>
6
P
ž
ви
00
\sim
Ю.
- i
01
2
÷.,
2
2
5
- 1
G
un
а
~
2
÷.,
2
1
5
~
2
-
5
5
0
S
1
5
g
.д.
10
<u>ت</u> .
+
2
2
1
, -
e 1

1.5 Bullying Victimisation

Five items were used to measure the frequency of different types of bullying victimisation: two items for the frequency of bullying victimisation by siblings and three items for the frequency of school bullying victimisation, taken from the Children's Worlds international survey (Rees et al., 2020) and translated into Indonesian (Borualogo & Casas, 2021b, c). Sibling bullying victimisation was measured by the frequency of two types of bullying: physical ("How often in the last month have you been hit by your siblings?") and verbal ("How often in the last month have you been called unkind names by your siblings?"). School bullying victimisation was measured by the frequency of physical ("How often in the last month have you been hit by other children in school?"), verbal ("How often in the last month have you been called unkind names by other children in school?"), and emotional bullying ("How often in the last month have you been left out by other children in your class?") (Borualogo & Casas, 2021b, c; Rees et al., 2020). These items are scored on a fourpoint frequency scale using four response options: 0=Never, 1=Once, 2=Two or three times, and 3=More than three times (Borualogo & Casas, 2021b, c).

1.6 Family

1.6.1 Satisfaction with Family

One item was used to measure satisfaction with family ("How satisfied are you with the people you live with?"). This item is scored using an 11-point scale where 0=Not at all satisfied and 10=Totally satisfied (Rees et al., 2020).

1.6.2 Relationships in Family

Five items were used to measure family relationships: (1) "There are people in my family who care about me"; (2) "If I have a problem, people in my family will help me"; (3) "We have a good time together in my family"; (4) "I feel safe at home"; and (5) "My parents listen to me and take what I say into account." These items are scored using a five-point scale where 0=I do not agree, 1=I agree a little, 2=I agree somewhat, 3=I agree a lot, and 4=I totally agree (Rees et al., 2020). Cronbach's alpha for Study 1 was 0.668 and 0.846 for Study 2.

1.7 Friends

1.7.1 Satisfaction with Friends

One item was used to measure satisfaction with friends ("How satisfied are you with the relationship you have with your friends?"). This item is scored using an 11-point scale where 0=Not at all satisfied and 10=Totally satisfied (Rees et al., 2020).

1.7.2 Relationship with Friends

Four items were used to measure the relationship with friends: (1) "I have enough friends"; (2) "My friends are usually nice to me"; (3) "Me and my friends get along well together"; and (4) "If I have a problem, I have a friend who will support me". These items are scored using a five-point scale where 0=I do not agree, 1=I agree a little, 2=I agree somewhat, 3=I agree a lot, and 4=I totally agree (Rees et al., 2020). Cronbach's alpha for Study 1 was 0.681 and 0.877 for Study 2.

1.8 School Climate

Six items were used to measure school climate: (1) "My teachers care about me"; (2) "If I have a problem at school, my teacher will help me"; (3) "If I have a problem at school, other children will help me"; (4) "There are a lot of arguments between children in my class"; (5) "My teachers listen to me and take what I say into account"; and (6) "I feel safe at school". These items are scored using a five-point scale where 0=I do not agree; 1=I agree a little; 2=I agree somewhat; 3=I agree a lot; 4=I totally agree (Rees et al., 2020). Cronbach's alpha for Study 1 was 0.587 and 0.592 for Study 2.

1.9 Children's Worlds Subjective Well-Being Scale 5 (CW-SWBS5)

The Children's Worlds Subjective Well-Being Scale (CW-SWBS) is a multi-item cognitive, context-free psychometric scale (Casas & González-Carrasco, 2021; Rees et al., 2020) validated and translated into Indonesian (Borualogo et al., 2019; Borualogo & Casas, 2019). CW-SWBS5 includes five items with an 11-point scale from 0=do not agree at all to 10=totally agree. The items are: (1) "I enjoy my life", (2) "My life is going well", (3) "I have a good life", (4) "The things happen in my life are excellent", and (5) "I am happy with my life". For Indonesia, using representative samples, the original fit indices for 10-year-olds were $\chi 2=75.17$, df=5, p=.000, comparative fit index (CFI)=0.995 and root mean square error of approximation (RMSEA)=0.043 (0.035 - 0.052) (Borualogo & Casas, 2019). For 12-year-olds, the original fit indices were $\chi 2=93.79$, df=5, p=.000, CFI=0.995 and RMSEA=0.047 (0.039 - 0.056) (Borualogo & Casas, 2019). Cronbach's alpha for Study 1 was 0.861 and 0.939 for Study 2.

1.10 Data Analysis

In each study, mean scores, cross-tabulation and frequencies were calculated separately using SPSS 25. Mean differences between gender and age groups were tested using ANOVA. Linear regression was used to analyse the contribution of independent variables (family relationships, relationships with friends and school climate) on each bullying item, with age groups and gender as control variables. The scores for CW-SWBS5 were transformed into a 0–100 scale to make them visually comparable in the tables.

2 Results

2.1 Prevalence of Bullying

Children in Study 2 reported experiencing sibling bullying more frequently than children in Study 1, as presented in Table 2, particularly those who reported being bullied twice or more. In total, 11.8% of children in Study 1 reported being hit two or three times by a sibling, while the incidence was 12.7% of children in Study 2. As many as 7.1% of children in Study 1 reported being called unkind names by siblings two or three times, while 8.5% of children in Study 2 reported it.

In Study 1, more boys (6.1%) reported being hit by siblings than did girls (5.7%). In contrast, in Study 2, more girls (6.8%) reported being hit by siblings than did boys (5.9%). For being victimised verbally by siblings, in both studies, more girls reported being called unkind names by siblings (3.6% and 4.6%, respectively) than did boys (3.5% and 3.8%, respectively).

The most frequent sibling bullying incident in Study 1 and Study 2 was being hit by siblings. The most frequent school bullying incident in Study 1 and Study 2 was being called unkind names by other children in the class.

Table 2 also shows that children in Study 1 reported being victimised at school more frequently in three bullying incidents two or three times and more than three times than children in Study 2. In total, 15.9% and 24.6% of children in Study 1 reported being bullied verbally two or three times and more than three times in the last month, respectively. Of children in Study 2, 9.9% and 9.6% reported being bullied verbally two or three times in the last month, respectively.

In total, 16.0% and 12.8% of children in Study 1 reported being bullied physically two or three times and more than three times in the last month, respectively. In comparison, 9.9% and 4.0% of children in Study 2 reported being bullied physically, respectively.

2.2 SWB of Children Before and During the COVID-19 Pandemic

2.2.1 Study 1

Table 3 shows that in Study 1, there were no significant SWB mean differences between ages for all bullying incidents. In contrast, SWB means score differences for any bullying incidents in Study 1 were significantly different between genders. The lowest SWB mean score was displayed by children who reported being called unkind names by siblings more than three times (M=82.66; SD=18.44). Children who reported having been hit by siblings two or three times displayed the highest SWB mean scores (M=85.66; SD=16.18) of children who reported having been bullied in any other bullying incidents.

2.2.2 Study 2

In Study 2, significant SWB mean scores differed between age groups for being left out by other children. The lowest SWB mean scores were shown by children who reported having been called unkind names by siblings two or three times (M=72.20; SD=20.79). The highest SWB mean scores for children who reported having been bullied were shown by children who reported having been hit by siblings more than three times (M=80.11; SD=20.48).

2.2.3 Comparing the Two Studies

However, for any bullying incidents in two studies, children who reported never being bullied displayed significantly higher SWB scores than those who reported having been bullied. In both studies, the highest SWB mean scores for never being bullied were displayed by children who reported never being called unkind names by other children at school (in Study 1: M=89.62; SD=14.51; in Study 2: M=83.45; SD=19.79). The lowest SWB mean scores for never been bullied were displayed by children who reported never being called unkind names by scheler who reported never being called unkind names by siblings in Study 1 (M=89.22; SD=14.24) and children who reported never being hit by other children in class in Study 2 (M=82.50; SD=20.18). In Study 1, SWB mean scores of children who reported having been bullied ranged from M=82.66 to M=85.66 and ranged from M=72.20 to M=80.11 in Study 2.

In Study 2, children who reported having been bullied two or three times in any bullying incidents displayed lower SWB mean scores than children who reported having been bullied more than three times in any bullying incidents. In contrast, in Study 1, children who reported having been bullied more than three times in any bullying incidents displayed lower SWB mean scores than those who reported having been bullied two or three times in any bullying incidents.

2.3 Factors Related to Sibling and School Bullying

Regression analysis for Study 1 and Study 2, as presented in Table 4, displayed interesting findings. The models in Study 2 were able to explain higher percentages (11.0 -22.7%) of the variability of the dependent variables than the models in Study 1 (3.1 -6.4%). In Study 1, the model for being left out by other children in class explained 6.4% of the variability of the dependent variables, the highest percentage among other models in Study 1. In Study 2, the highest percentage was also for being left out by other children in the class, which explained 22.7% of the variability of the dependent variables.

2.3.1 Study 1

In Study 1, a negative Beta score indicated that being a boy increases the probability of being hit and called unkind names by siblings and other children at school. In contrast, a positive Beta score indicated that being a girl increases the probability of being left out by other children in the class. A positive Beta score indicated that being older increases the probability of a child being called unkind names by siblings and other children at school. In contrast, a negative Beta score indicated that being younger children increases the probability of being left out by other children in the class.

Table 2 $Fr\epsilon$	Table 2 Frequency of bullying incidents in Study 1 and Study 2	lying in	cident	s in Stu	dy I ar	the Study	v 2															
		Study 1	_									Study	2									
		Boys		Girls		10 years old	rs old	12 years old	rs old	Total		Boys		Girls		10 years old		11 years old		12 years old	Total	
		u	%	u	%	u	%	u	%	u	%	u	%	_	%	, u		n %		%	ц	%
Hit by	Never	2,589	20.7	3,140	25.1	2,871	22.9	2,858	22.8	5,729	45.7	604	28.6	725	34.3	618	29.3 4	476 23	22.5 23	235 11	1 1,329	63.0
sibling	Once	1,525	12.2	1,703	13.6	1,263	10.1	1,965	15.7	3,228	25.8	147	7.0	146	6.9	117	5.5	115 5.	4 61	1 2.5	293	13.9
	2 or 3 times	763	6.1	1.2	5.7	734	5.9	748	6.0	1,482	11.8	125	5.9	143	6.8	95 ,	4.5	95 4.	4.5 78	3.7	268	12.7
	>3 times	1,136	9.1	952	7.6	1,045	8.3	1,043	8.3	2,088	16.7	102	4.8	119	5.6	83	3.9 8	86 4.	1 52	2.5	221	10.5
	Total	6,013	48.0	6,514	52.0	5,913	47.2	6,614	52.8	12,527	100	978	46.3	1,133	53.7	913 4	43.2	772 30	36.6 42	426 20.2		100
Called	Never	3,669	30.2		33.3	3,700	30.4	4,013	33.0	7,713	63.5	721		803	38.0	710		542 25	25.6 27	272 12.9		172.1
unkind	Once	1,020	8.4		10.8	931	7.7	1,404	11.6	2,335	19.2	100	4.7	139	6.6	, 78		103 4.	9 49			11.3
names by	2 or 3 times	424	3.5	435	3.6	453	3.7	406	3.3	859	7.1	81	3.8	98	4.6	99	3.1	58 2.	2.7 55	5 2.6		8.5
sıblings	>3 times	672	5.5		4.7	556	4.6	690	5.7	1,246	10.3	68	3.2	104	4.9	48		79 3.	3.7 45	5 2.1		8.1
	Total	5,785	47.6		52.4	5,640	46.4	6,513	53.6	12,153	100	970	45.9	1,144	54.1	911 4	43.1	782 31	37.0 421	21 19.9		
Hit by	Never	2,360	18.4	3,338	26.1	2,725	21.3	2,973	23.2	5,698	44.5	675		850	40.9	690	33.2 5	564 2	27.1 271	71 13.0	0 1,525	
other	Once	1,768	13.8		12.8	1,673	13.1	1,735	13.6	3,408	26.6	140	6.7	127	6.1	102 4		102 4.	4.9 63			
children	2 or 3 times	1,055	8.2	7997	7.8	943	7.4	1,109	8.7	2,052	16.0	66		106	5.1			69 3.	3 59) 2.8		
	>3 times	987	7.7	649	5.1	720	5.6	916	7.2	1,636	12.8	40	1.9	43	2.1	32	1.5	25 1.	1.2 26	5 1.3	83	
	Total	6,170	48.2	6,624	51.8	6,061	47.4	6,733	52.6	12,794	100	954		1,126	54.1	901 4		760 30		419 20.1		
Called un-	Never	2,220	17.4	2,451	19.2	2,338	18.3	2,333	18.2	4,671	36.5	662	31.9			664	32.0 4	497 24	24.0 237	37 11.4		
kind names	Once	1,371	10.7		12.3	1,420	11.1	1,523	11.9	2,943	23.0	126	6.1	14	6.9	95 4		114 5.	5.5 61			
by other	2 or 3 times 1,006	1,006	7.9	1,030	8.1	978	7.6	1,058	8.3	2,036	15.9	83	4.0			67	3.2	78 3.	3.8 60			9.9
children	>3 times	1,573	12.3	1,571	12.3	1,325	10.4	1,819	14.2	3,144	24.6	76	3.7		6.0	65		75 3.	6 60) 2.9	200	9.6
	Total	6,170	48.2	6,624	51.8	6,061	47.4	6,733	52.6	12,794	100	947	45.7	1,126	54.3	891 4	43.0	764 30	36.9 418	18 20.2		-
Left out	Never	3,289	25.7	3,093	24.2	2,928	22.9	3,454	27.0	6,382	49.9	742	35.7	708	34.1	687	_	515 24	24.8 24	248 11.9		_
by other	Once	1,411	11.0	1,648	12.9	1,466	11.5	1,593	12.5	3,059	23.9	111	5.3	167	8.0	7 06		112 5.	4 76	3.7	278	
children	2 or 3 times	800	6.3	974	7.6	867	6.8	907	7.1	1,774	13.9	57	2.7	132	6.4	68	3.3	73 3.	5 48	3.2.3	189	9.1
	>3 times	670	5.2	606	7.1	800	6.3	<i>617</i>	6.1	1,579	12.3	51	2.5	108	5.2	54	.,	58 2.	2.8 47	7 2.3	159	
	Total	6,170	48.2	6,624	51.8	6,061	47.4	6,733	52.6	12,794	100	961	46.3	1,115	53.7	899 4	43.3	758 30	36.5 41	419 20.2	2 2,076	100

Not perceiving a family that cares for them, perceiving parents who do not listen and do not take what they say into account, not feeling satisfied with friends, not getting along with friends, not having teachers who care about children, not feeling safe at school, and perceiving a lot of arguments in class appear to be associated with a higher frequency of children reporting having been hit by siblings. In contrast, having enough friends is associated with a lower frequency of children reporting having been hit by siblings.

Being unsatisfied with family, not perceiving that their family cares, perceiving that family is not helping when they have a problem, feeling unsatisfied with friends, perceiving friends are not usually nice, not getting along well with friends, not feeling safe at school and many arguments in class appear to be associated with a higher frequency of reporting being called unkind names by siblings. In Study 2, not perceiving a family who cares about them, not perceiving having a good time together with family, not feeling safe at home, parents not listening to children and not taking what they say into account, feeling unsatisfied with friends, perceiving teachers not helping when they have a problem, and perceiving a great number of arguments in class are associated with lower frequency of being called unkind names by siblings.

2.3.2 Study 2

In Study 2, being a boy increases the probability of being hit by other children at school, while being a girl increases the probability of being left out by other children in the class. Being older increases the probability of being called unkind names by siblings and other children at school and being left out by other children in the class. Reporting not having a good time with the family, perceiving parents not listening or taking what they say into account, not feeling satisfied with friends, perceiving that other children do not help when having problems, and perceiving there are many arguments in class appear to be associated with more frequently being hit by siblings.

2.3.3 Comparing the Two Studies

In both studies, age significantly contributed to verbal sibling bullying and verbal and emotional school bullying. Age did not contribute to sibling and school physical bullying in either study. Gender showed a significant contribution in both studies related to physical and emotional school bullying. Gender significance was observed in physical and verbal sibling bullying and verbal school bullying only in Study 1. Gender showed significant contributions to all bullying incidents in Study 1.

Feeling unsatisfied with friends and perceiving a great number of arguments between children in class is associated with a higher frequency of reporting having been hit by other children in class in both studies. In Study 1, children's perception that the teacher will help if they have a problem at school appears to be associated with a higher frequency of being hit by other children at school. In contrast, in Study 2, the same perception is associated with a lower frequency of being hit by other children at school.

In Study 1, feeling safe at school, perceiving friends are usually nice and getting along well with friends appear to be related to a reported lower frequency of being hit

		Study 1			Study 2		
		М	Ν	SD	М	Ν	SD
			Been hit	by sibling			
10 years	Never	89.34**	2,871	15.41	82.95**	618	20.33
old	Once	86.74**	1,263	16.49	78.08**	117	21.41
	2 or 3 times	85.65**	734	16.98	76.42**	95	21.12
	>3 times	85.27**	1,045	17.65	78.41**	83	21.69
	Total	87.61	5,913	16.34	81.23	913	20.80
11 years	Never				82.81**	476	21.91
old	Once				79.58**	115	19.79
	2 or 3 times				78.02**	95	18.47
	>3 times				83.07**	86	20.26
	Total				81.77	772	21.07
12 years	Never	89.74**	2,858	13.27	82.34**	235	20.03
old	Once	86.37**	1,965	14.42	73.87**	61	23.06
	2 or 3 times	85.67**	748	15.36	73.77**	78	19.18
	>3 times	83.74**	1,043	16.35	77.92**	52	18.55
	Total	87.33	6,614	14.55	79.02	426	20.47
Boys	Never	88.96**	2,589	14.85	82.99**	604	20.67
	Once	85.22**	1,525	15.99	78.19**	147	21.81
	2 or 3 times	85.35**	763	15.67	77.87**	125	18.68
	>3 times	85.16**	1,136	16.69	82.04**	102	20.19
	Total	86.84++	6,013	15.71	81.51	978	20.64
Girls	Never	90.01**	3,140	13.97	82.63**	725	21.00
	Once	87.68**	1,703	14.49	77.39**	146	20.60
	2 or 3 times	85.99**	719	16.71	74.77**	143	20.42
	>3 times	83.73**	952	17.39	78.45**	119	20.67
	Total	88.04++	6,514	15.13	80.53	1,133	21.03
Total	Never	89.54**	5,729	14.38	82.79**	1,329	20.85
	Once	86.52**	3,228	15.27	77.79**	293	21.18
	2 or 3 times	85.66**	1,482	16.18	76.22**	268	19.65
	>3 times	84.51**	2,088	17.03	80.11**	221	20.48
	Total	87.46**	12,527	15.42	80.98**	2,111	20.85
		Beer	n called unkin	d names by	sibling		
10 years	Never	89.35**	3,700	15.22	83.42**	710	19.75
old	Once	85.97**	931	16.35	78.23**	87	20.63
	2 or 3 times	83.99**	453	17.31	69.79**	66	22.77
	>3 times	83.14**	556	19.15	74.92**	48	24.73
	Total	87.75	5,640	16.17	81.49	911	20.71
11 years	Never				83.97**	542	20.82
old	Once				77.67**	103	20.98
	2 or 3 times				73.62**	58	18.41
	>3 times				80.76**	79	20.90
	Total				82.05	782	20.89

 Table 3 Mean scores for CW-SWBS by gender and age groups for each bullying incidents

Table 3	(continued)
Table J	(continued)

		Study 1			Study 2		
		M	Ν	SD	M	N	SD
12 years	Never	89.11**	4,013	13.28	81.63**	272	19.82
old	Once	85.87**	1,404	14.67	79.84**	49	17.02
	2 or 3 times	84.01**	406	15.48	73.60**	55	20.76
	>3 times	82.27**	690	17.84	70.53**	45	22.83
	Total	87.37	6,513	14.47	79.19	421	20.31
Boys	Never	88.53**	3,669	14.86	83.14**	721	20.35
	Once	85.54**	1,020	15.61	80.56**	100	20.24
	2 or 3 times	83.20**	424	15.56	74.12**	81	20.50
	>3 times	82.55**	672	18.18	77.91**	68	20.87
	Total	86.92++	5,785	15.63	81.76	970	20.54
Girls	Never	89.85**	4,044	13.63	83.44**	803	19.99
	Once	86.19**	1,315	15.17	76.70**	139	19.80
	2 or 3 times	84.78**	435	17.28	70.61**	98	20.99
	>3 times	82.79**	574	18.75	75.50**	104	24.03
	Total	88.11++	6,368	14.95	80.80	1,144	20.87
Total	Never	89.22**	7,713	14.24	83.29**	1,524	20.15
	Once	85.91**	2,335	15.36	78.32**	239	20.04
	2 or 3 times	84.00**	859	16.46	72.20**	179	20.79
	>3 times	82.66**	1,246	18.44	76.45**	172	22.80
	Total	87.54**	12,153	15.29	81.24**	2,114	20.72
		Bee	en hit by othe	er children ir	n class		
10 years	Never	89.43**	2,725	15.54	83.33**	690	19.17
old	Once	86.63**	1,673	16.57	75.90**	102	22.54
	2 or 3 times	85.29**	943	16.67	75.84**	77	24.39
	>3 times	84.80**	720	18.36	73.94**	32	24.08
	Total	87.46	6,061	16.46	81.52+	901	20.48
11 years	Never				82.46**	564	21.06
old	Once				84.43**	102	18.62
	2 or 3 times				72.69**	69	20.92
	>3 times				86.32**	25	20.16
	Total				81.97+	760	20.89
12 years	Never	89.23**	2,973	13.50	80.48**	271	20.75
old	Once	86.80**	1,735	14.27	79.21**	63	20.01
	2 or 3 times	84.91**	1,109	15.21	73.35**	59	17.78
	>3 times	84.71**	916	16.64	72.31**	26	21.10
	Total	87.28	6,733	14.57	78.77+	419	20.41
Boys	Never	88.91**	2,360	14.93	82.81**	675	20.02
5	Once	86.09**	1,768	15.72	80.87**	140	20.17
	2 or 3 times	85.01**	1,055	15.93	77.19**	99	21.29
	>3 times	84.43**	987	17.10	76.80**	40	22.83
	Total	86.72++	6,170	15.79	81.69	954	20.37

Table 3 (continued)

		Study 1			Study 2		
		M	Ν	SD	М	Ν	SD
Girls	Never	89.62**	3,338	14.21	82.26**	850	20.31
	Once	87.39**	1,640	15.11	78.91**	127	21.48
	2 or 3 times	85.17**	997	15.86	71.15**	106	21.25
	>3 times	85.23**	649	17.88	77.49**	43	22.65
	Total	87.97++	6,624	15.19	80.65	1,126	20.87
Total	Never	89.33**	5,698	14.51	82.50**	1,525	20.18
	Once	86.71**	3,408	15.44	79.94**	267	20.79
	2 or 3 times	85.09**	2,052	15.89	74.07**	205	21.44
	>3 times	84.75**	1,636	17.41	77.16**	83	22.60
	Total	87.37**	12,794	15.49	81.13**	2,080	20.64
		Been called u	unkind names	by other ch	ildren at schoo	ol	
10 years	Never	89.62**	2,338	15.43	84.08**	664	18.46
old	Once	87.08**	1,420	16.38	79.28**	95	22.34
	2 or 3 times	85.52**	978	17.19	67.58**	67	24.11
	>3 times	85.49**	1,325	17.31	74.34**	65	25.61
	Total	87.46	6,061	16.46	81.62	891	20.51
11 years	Never				83.12**	497	21.56
old	Once				81.79**	114	19.48
	2 or 3 times				75.38**	78	19.21
	>3 times				78.45**	75	21.56
	Total				81.67	764	21.15
12 years	Never	89.62**	2,333	13.52	82.36**	237	19.53
old	Once	87.29**	1,523	14.14	75.87**	61	18.35
	2 or 3 times	85.45**	1,058	14.52	75.27**	60	20.84
	>3 times	85.33**	1,819	15.78	75.43**	60	23.19
	Total	87.28	6,733	14.57	79.40	418	20.33
Boys	Never	88.98**	2,220	15.02	83.91**	662	19.54
	Once	86.50**	1,371	15.24	78.39**	126	21.57
	2 or 3 times	84.47**	1,006	16.54	75.57**	83	21.13
	>3 times	85.15**	1,573	16.44	75.37**	76	22.78
	Total	86.72++	6,170	15.79	81.76	947	20.48
Girls	Never	90.20**	2,451	14.00	83.03**	736	20.01
	Once	87.78**	1,572	15.26	80.59**	144	19.24
	2 or 3 times	86.49**	1,030	15.10	70.92**	122	21.79
	>3 times	85.65**	1,571	16.44	76.72**	124	23.82
	Total	87.97++	6,624	15.19	80.71	1,126	20.92
Total	Never	89.62**	4,671	14.51	83.45**	1,398	19.79
	Once	87.19**	2,943	15.26	79.57**	270	20.35
	2 or 3 times	85.49**	2,036	15.85	72.80**	205	21.59
	>3 times	85.40**	3,144	16.44	76.21**	200	23.38
	Total	87.37**	12,794	15.49	81.19**	2,073	20.72

		Study 1			Study 2		
		M	Ν	SD	M	N	SD
		Been	left out by ot	her children	in class		
10 years	Never	89.60**	2,928	15.34	84.45**	687	17.80
old	Once	86.84**	1,466	15.82	76.78**	90	25.53
	2 or 3 times	85.11**	867	17.42	70.41**	68	26.44
	>3 times	83.34**	800	19.13	67.59**	54	24.21
	Total	87.46	6,061	16.46	81.61+	899	20.57
11 years	Never				84.20**	515	20.47
old	Once				76.28**	112	22.48
	2 or 3 times				75.48**	73	19.18
	>3 times				82.00**	58	18.57
	Total				82.02+	758	20.78
12 years	Never	89.39**	3,454	12.98	82.54**	248	18.26
old	Once	86.43**	1,593	14.20	74.31**	76	22.68
	2 or 3 times	84.53**	907	15.53	73.04**	48	21.27
	>3 times	82.88**	779	18.61	74.55**	47	23.05
	Total	87.28	6,733	14.57	79.06+	419	20.40
Boys	Never	89.08**	3,289	14.23	83.96**	742	18.78
	Once	85.39**	1,411	15.62	74.14**	111	24.25
	2 or 3 times	83.28**	800	17.36	72.53**	57	23.33
	>3 times	82.04**	670	19.09	76.59**	51	23.08
	Total	86.72++	6,170	15.79	81.76	961	20.40
Girls	Never	89.92**	3,093	13.97	84.12**	708	18.97
	Once	87.68**	1,648	14.36	77.08**	167	22.98
	2 or 3 times	86.07**	974	15.61	73.26**	132	22.27
	>3 times	83.89**	909	18.68	74.11**	108	22.49
	Total	87.97++	6,624	15.19	80.81	1,115	20.84
Total	Never	89.49**	6,382	14.11	84.04**	1,450	18.87
	Once	86.62**	3,059	14.99	75.91**	278	23.49
	2 or 3 times	84.82**	1,774	16.48	73.04**	189	22.54
	>3 times	83.11**	1,579	18.87	74.91**	159	22.64
	Total	87.37**	12,794	15.49	81.25**	1,076	20.64

Table 3	(continued)
lable 5	(commueu)

Notes:

Study 1: Differences between age groups are all non-significant, while differences between gender all are significant.

Study 2: Differences between age-groups and between genders are all non-significant, excepting for been hit and left out by other children between age-groups)

by other children in the class. In contrast, in Study 2, feeling safe at school is associated with a higher frequency of being hit by other children in the class. However, the other two items (perceiving friends are usually nice and getting along well with friends) do not display a significant association with reporting being hit. In Study 1, reporting having enough friends appears to be associated with a higher frequency of being hit by other children in the class, which is a surprising result, while in Study 2, no significant association is observed between having enough friends and being victimised.

	Study 1							Study 2						
	В	SE	β	t	d	Lower	Upper	в	SE	β	÷	d	Lower	Upper
							Been hit l	3cen hit by siblings						
Age	003	.011	002	233	.816	024	.019	.055	.029	.040	1.912	.056	001	.111
Gender	148	.022	067	-6.840	000	191	106	072	.043	034	-1.655	860.	157	.013
Satisfaction with family	007	.006	013	-1.245	.213	018	.004	.018	.013	.036	1.331	.183	008	.044
Family care	051	.015	039	-3.516	000	080	023	.010	.034	600.	.282	.778	057	.077
Family will help	.005	.013	.004	399	069.	021	.031	027	.035	026	781	.435	096	.041
Have a good time in family	.012	.014	.010	.901	.368	014	.039	096	.036	088	-2.679	.007	167	026
Feel safe at home	.022	.014	.017	1.583	.113	005	.050	.005	.023	.005	.227	.821	039	.049
Parents listen to children	027	.013	024	-2.070	.038	053	001	094	.034	087	-2.736	900.	161	026
Satisfaction with friends	012	.006	022	-2.036	.042	024	000.	030	.013	064	-2.353	.019	055	005
Have enough friends	.029	.013	.024	2.261	.024	.004	.054	.062	.035	.055	1.775	.076	007	.130
Friends are nice	010	.014	- 009	701	.483	037	.017	051	.038	045	-1.330	.184	125	.024
Get along well with friends	097	.014	085	-7.045	000.	124	070	031	.038	026	815	.415	104	.043
Friends support	001	.011	011	061	.951	023	.022	.034	.031	.032	1.085	.278	027	.095
Teachers care	035	.016	027	-2.226	.026	066	004	.061	.033	.058	1.855	.064	004	.126
Teachers help	012	.015	- 009	764	.445	042	.018	067	.035	062	-1.895	.058	136	.002
Other children help	-009	.014	008	671	.502	037	.018	086	.030	083	-2.897	.004	144	028
Teachers listen to children	.014	.013	.012	1.060	.289	012	.040	039	.032	036	-1.235	.217	102	.023
Feel safe at school	050	.014	040	-3.522	000	078	022	.032	.018	.038	1.790	.074	003	.068
A lot arguments in class	.044	.008	.055	5.464	000	.028	.059	.144	.017	.175	8.248	000.	.110	.178
	Adjusted	$R^2 = .031;$	F = 18.640;	Adjusted $R^2 = .031$; $F = 18.640$; dfl = 19; df2 = 10328; p < .01	= 10328; F	i<.01		Adjusted	Adjusted $R2 = .110;$; F=14.772;	dfl = 19; df2=2091; p<.01	2=2091; p <	:.01	
						Been	Been called unkind names by siblings	d names by	siblings					
Age	.026	.010	.027	2.680	.007	.007	.045	.084	.026	.067	3.219	.001	.033	.135
Gender	044	.019	022	-2.241	.025	082	005	.029	.039	.015	.745	.456	048	.107
Satisfaction with family	019	.005	040	-3.704	000.	029	- 009	.004	.012	600.	.349	.727	020	.028
Family care	032	.013	027	-2.406	.016	057	006	052	.032	055	-1.638	.102	115	.010
Family will help	005	.012	004	383	.701	028	.019	020	.032	021	639	.523	083	.042
Have a good time together	.003	.012	.003	.257	<i>T9T</i> .	021	.027	071	.033	070	-2.139	.033	136	006

	Study 1							Study 2						
	В	SE	β	t	р	Lower	Upper	В	SE	β	t	b	Lower	Upper
Feel safe at home	008	.013	007	635	.525	033	.017	057	.021	061	-2.741	.006	097	016
Parents listen to children	022	.012	022	-1.873	.061	046	.001	069	.031	070	-2.197	.028	130	007
Satisfaction with friends	021	.005	042	-3.843	000.	032	010	027	.012	062	2.283	.023	050	004
Have enough friends	.020	.011	.019	1.706	.088	003	.042	051	.032	049	-1.572	.116	114	.013
Friends are nice	051	.012	051	-4.106	000.	075	027	005	.035	005	147	.883	074	.064
Get along well with friends	057	.012	056	-4.579	000.	081	033	.001	.035	.001	.017	780.	067	.068
Friends support	.008	.010	.010	.816	.415	012	.028	.018	.028	.019	.631	.528	038	.074
Teachers care	008	.014	007	574	.566	036	.020	.033	.030	.034	1.094	.274	026	.093
Teachers help	011	.014	011	840	.401	038	.015	069	.032	070	-2.118	.034	132	005
Other children help	.024	.013	.024	1.866	.062	001	.048	010	.027	010	357	.721	063	.043
Teachers listen to children	011	.012	011	938	.348	035	.012	.019	.029	.019	.650	.516	038	.076
Feel safe at school	050	.013	045	-3.918	000.	075	025	.023	.016	.030	1.418	.156	- 009	.055
A lot arguments in class	.032	.007	.045	4.447	000.	.018	.046	.107	.016	.142	6.748	.000	.076	.138
	Adjusted	R2=.032	; F=18.594	Adjusted $R2 = .032$; $F = 18.594$; $df1 = 19$; $df2 = 10107$; $p < .01$	= 10107; F	o<.01		Adjusted	R2=.118;	F = 15.865;	F = 15.865; dfl = 19; df2 = 2094; p < .01	=2094; p <	:.01	
						Been	Been hit by other children at school	children at	school					
Age	.019	.010	.018	1.847	.065	001	.039	.033	.022	.030	1.467	.142	011	.077
Gender	287	.020	135	-14.085	000.	327	247	114	.034	069	-3.379	.001	180	048
Satisfaction with family	005	.005	011	-1.048	.294	016	.005	.001	.011	.004	.141	.888	019	.022
Family care	013	.014	011	984	.325	040	.013	068	.027	082	-2.527	.012	120	015
Family help	.013	.012	.012	1.052	.293	011	.038	048	.028	056	-1.736	.083	103	.006
Have a good time	.016	.013	.013	1.239	.216	- 009	.041	008	.028	- 009	284	LLL.	063	.047
Feel safe at home	.003	.013	.003	.254	.800	022	.029	060	.017	076	-3.453	.001	095	026
Parents listen to children	.003	.012	.002	.219	.827	022	.027	030	.027	035	-1.108	.268	083	.023
Satisfaction with friends	026	.006	048	-4.510	000.	037	015	031	.010	084	-3.091	.002	051	011
Have enough friends	.036	.012	.032	2.978	.003	.012	.059	008	.028	- 009	284	.776	062	.046
Friends are nice	027	.013	025	-2.060	.039	052	001	047	.030	052	-1.555	.120	106	.012
Get along well with friends	086	.013	- 079	-6.657	.000	111	061	023	.030	024	761	.447	081	.036

Table 4 (continued)

	Study 1							Study 2						
	в	SE	β	t	d	Lower	Upper	в	SE	β	÷	d	Lower	Upper
Friend supports	011	.011	012	-1.054	.292	032	.010	.023	.025	.027	.931	.352	025	.071
Teachers care	.003	.015	.003	.212	.832	026	.032	.084	.026	660.	3.204	.001	.032	.135
Teachers help	.044	.014	.037	3.057	.002	.016	.072	065	.028	076	-2.309	.021	120	010
Other children help	005	.013	004	349	.727	030	.021	017	.023	021	740	.459	063	.028
Teachers listen to children	.014	.012	.013	1.098	.272	011	.038	.008	.025	.010	.340	.734	041	.058
Feel safe at school	107	.013	090	-8.023	000.	133	081	.049	.014	.073	3.484	.001	.021	.077.
A lot arguments in class	090.	.008	.078	7.937	000.	.045	.074	.145	.014	.220	10.551	000.	.118	.172
	Adjusted	R2 = .050;	F = 30.125;	Adjusted $R2 = .050$; $F = 30.125$; $df1 = 19$; $df2 = 10484$; $p < .01$:=10484; ₁	o<.01		Adjusted	R2=.153;	F = 20.715;	Adjusted $R2 = .153$; $F = 20.715$; df $I = 19$; df $2 = 2060$; $p < .01$	=2060; p <	:.01	
					В	Been called unkind names by other children at school	rkind names	by other ch	ildren at so	chool				
Age	.059	.012	.049	5.098	000.	.036	.082	.109	.027	.082	4.015	000.	.056	.162
Gender	081	.023	034	-3.503	000.	126	036	.057	.041	.028	1.386	.166	024	.137
Satisfaction with family	.007	.006	.013	1.221	.222	004	.019	001	.013	003	104	.918	026	.023
Family care	012	.015	009	801	.423	043	.018	069	.033	068	-2.096	.036	133	004
Family help	.010	.014	.008	.721	.471	018	.038	053	.033	052	-1.600	.110	118	.012
Have a good time	600.	.014	.006	.607	.544	019	.037	019	.035	018	556	.578	088	.049
Feel safe at home	.046	.015	.033	3.081	.002	.017	.075	075	.021	078	-3.561	.000	116	034
Parents listen to children	015	.014	012	-1.030	.303	042	.013	083	.032	080	-2.579	.010	146	020
Satisfaction with friends	031	.006	051	-4.769	000.	044	018	041	.012	091	-3.411	.001	065	017
Have enough friends	.026	.014	.020	1.919	.055	001	.053	.040	.033	.036	1.209	.227	025	.106
Friends are nice	074	.015	062	-5.077	000.	103	046	075	.036	069	-2.069	.039	146	004
Get along well with friends	108	.015	088	-7.383	000	137	080	045	.036	039	-1.236	.216	115	.026
Friend supports	.002	.012	.002	.159	.874	022	.026	.030	.030	.029	1.023	.306	028	680.
Teachers care	.010	.017	.007	.575	.565	023	.042	.150	.032	.147	4.769	.000	680.	.212
Teachers help	.010	.016	.008	.643	.520	021	.042	071	.033	069	-2.133	.033	137	006
Other children help	026	.015	021	-1.714	.087	055	.004	068	.028	068	-2.412	.016	123	013
Teachers listen to children	.022	.014	.018	1.577	.115	005	.050	.014	.030	.013	.449	.653	046	.073
Feel safe at school	049	.015	036	-3.228	.001	078	019	.034	.017	.042	2.022	.043	.001	.068
A lot arguments in class	.070	600.	.081	8.176	000	.053	.086	.158	.017	.198	9.576	000.	.126	.191

bennind	non IIIII non	
9	-	
4	۲	
٥	P	
~	5	

🖄 Springer

2 010 020 005 SE Study 1 B -.009 -.042 124 Satisfaction with family _ Gender Age Tat

Upper -.010-.809 -.008 -.025 -.028 -.025 018 105 000 109 012 003 141 138 050 081 080 194 281 Lower -.018 -.086 -.125 -.070 -.032 -.209 -.141 -.051 -.120 -.154 -.127 -.027 - .098 036 025 .135 014 137 020 Adjusted R2 = .166; F = 22.711, dfl = 19; df2 = 2053; p < .01008 049 000 012 000 384 178 000 167012 005 007 063 005 736 002 329 001 001 ٩ 11.020 -1.859 -2.505 -2.804 -1.973 -2.703 -1.347-4.907 -2.662 3.288 2.809 -.338 -3.054 3.243 5.6741.384 2.520 -.871 777 -.022 -.042 -.154 -.053 -.068 -.058 -.088 -.056 -.082 -.084 -.011 050 043 084 027 065 219 091 Ξ -Been left out by other children in class 015 019 029 015 024 030 030 033 033 027 025 027 037 011 030 031 011 031 031 SE -.010-.048 -.029 -.089 -.010-.040-.149 -.060 -.083 -.061 -.077 043 088 209 081 .027 050 164 .061 ш Upper -.022 -.059 - .069 -.036 -.063 -.001 016 035 024 047 075 055 163 035 045 043 029 081 001 Lower -.010-.019 -.018 -.109 -.118 -.017-.061 -.003 -.006 -.021 -.032 -.058 -.011 -.051 -.114 .019 085 007 .052 Adjusted R2 = .040; F = 24.102; dfl = 19; df2 = 10484; p < .01000 000 716 195 000 525 092 145 745 496 000 323 440 012 000 000 000 960 001 ٩ -1.695 -8.402 -6.658 -7.362 -2.019 -4.141 6.218 .680 2.510 -6817 8.946 .687 .457 .297 3.350 364 636 325 987 -.040 -.018 -.008 -.089 -.080 -.087 -.025 -.076 059 018 015 010 004 015 029 007 003 641 087 013 012 012 013 012 006 012 013 013 010 014 0.14013 012 .013 .007 -.008-.047 -.084-.094 -.026 -.089 018 012 004 019 047 600 021 004 031 066 Get along well with friends **Feachers** listen to children Parents listen to children Satisfaction with friends A lot arguments in class Have enough friends Other children help Feel safe at school Have a good time Feel safe at home Friends are nice Friend supports Teachers help Teachers care Family care Family help

Study 2

Adjusted R2 = .227; F = 33.106; dfl = 19; df2 = 2056; p < .01

Adjusted R2 = .064; F = 38.565; dfl = 19; df2 = 10484; p < .01

Feeling safe at home is associated with a higher frequency of being called unkind names by other children at school in Study 1, while in Study 2, it appears to be associated with a lower frequency of that kind of bullying incident. Feeling unsatisfied with friends, perceiving friends are not usually nice, and perceiving a lot of arguments at school appears to be associated with a higher frequency of being called unkind names by other children in both studies. Not feeling safe at school appears to be associated with a higher frequency of being called unkind names by other children is both studies. Not feeling safe at school appears to be associated with a higher frequency of being called unkind names by other children at school in Study 1 but a lower frequency of being called unkind names by other children at school in Study 2. Perceiving family does not care about them, reporting parents not listening to them and not taking what they say into account and perceiving teachers and other children not helping when they have a problem appear to be associated with a higher frequency of being called unkind names by other children at school in Study 2, but not in Study 1.

In both studies, feeling unsatisfied with friends, perceiving friends are not usually nice, perceiving other children are not helping when they have a problem, not feeling safe at school, and perceiving many arguments between children in class appear to be associated with a higher frequency of being left out by other children in the class. Not getting along well with friends is associated with a higher frequency of being left out by other children only in Study 1, while perceiving teachers as helping and listening to children is associated with a lower frequency of being left out by other children in Study 1. None of the family variables contributes to emotional bullying at school in Study 1. In Study 2, perceiving family as not helping when they have a problem, not feeling safe at home, perceiving parents do not listen to them, and perceiving not having enough friends are associated with a high frequency of being left out by other children have a problem is associated with a lower frequency of being left out by other children in the value as a problem is associated with a high frequency of being left out by other children have a problem is associated with a lower frequency of being left out by other children have a problem is associated with a lower frequency of being left out by other children have a problem is associated with a lower frequency of being left out by other children have a problem is associated with a lower frequency of being left out by other children have a problem is associated with a lower frequency of being left out by other children have a problem is associated with a lower frequency of being left out by other children have a problem is associated with a lower frequency of being left out by other children in Study 2.

3 Discussion

3.1 Prevalence of Bullying

The first aim of this study was to analyse the prevalence of sibling and school bullying before and during the COVID-19 pandemic in Indonesia. Before COVID-19, the percentage of children reporting being called unkind names by other children in school was the highest among other bullying incidents. In total, more children reported being bullied at school than being bullied by siblings at home (Table 2). However, during COVID-19, the percentage of children reporting being hit by siblings is higher than the percentage of children reporting being bullied for any other bullying incident (Study 2; Table 2). Since children were confined at home during COVID-19, they were in contact with siblings more frequently. A study in Indonesia showed that 45.7% of children reported having to take care of their siblings several times during the lockdown, and 50.9% of participants in this study reported they were bored due to not having various activities (Borualogo & Casas, 2021a). Relationships with siblings are often described as emotionally ambivalent (Brody, 2004). Although children take care of their siblings several times a day and are warm in their relationships with them, a possible explanation for these results is that they may get bored or tired and have conflicts with siblings more often during the COVID-19 confinement, and consequently bullying relationships with siblings may have increased. In contrast, a study among U.S. children of Latin American origins showed that school closure was linked to more sibling positivity in families with more children (Sun et al., 2021).

Perkins et al., (2021) explained that sibling bullying was more likely to occur during the COVID-19 pandemic because of the confinement at home combined with economic, interpersonal and social relationships where abuse already exists. A review study also showed that surveys reported increased violence in the family, including child abuse-related injuries treated in hospitals (Cappa & Jijon, 2021; Kourti et al., 2021) also found that children being confined at home led to constant contact between siblings, resulting in increased bullying incidents. As for Indonesian cases, during the COVID-19 pandemic, the economic situation at home worsened since some parents lost their jobs (Putri, 2020). Many parents were forced to work in the informal sectors and leave their children less supervised. Fontanesi et al., (2020) predicted there would be an increase in sibling bullying during the COVID-19 pandemic due to the absence of parents supervision while parents were working away from home. The situation may be getting worse, as children may have less access to reporting sibling bullying because of limited support services using hotlines (Field, 2021; Kourti et al., 2021). Several institutions in Indonesia provide hotlines, particularly for school bullying reports. Unfortunately, there are no specific hotlines for sibling bullying. However, these hotlines still need to more clearly disseminate the message that children can access them easily and can also report sibling bullying incidents.

All schools in Indonesia were closed during the COVID-19 pandemic, starting in March 2020 (Kamil & Kuwado, 2020) until September 2021 (Asmara, 2021). Children were compelled to learn online and had fewer opportunities to interact socially at school. This might be the reason for the lower percentage of school bullying during COVID-19. Aligned with this finding, a survey in Germany showed that 46% of parents reported that their children are less likely to be victimised during school closure during COVID-19 (Werner & Woessmann, 2021). However, this might be a pseudo-reduction because children's increased presence online might be tied to other types of bullying, particularly cyberbullying. Several studies revealed that the number of cyberbullying cases increased during the school closure (Barlett et al., 2021). UNICEF Indonesia pointed out an increase in cyberbullying cases in the country during the COVID-19 pandemic (Mashabi & Galih, 2020). The Indonesian Minister of Education, Culture, Research and Technology stated that the pandemic triggered increased cyberbullying among children (Ramadhanty, 2021). Since there are no scientific reports on cyberbullying cases in Indonesia, further studies are needed to investigate whether children who are victimised at school are vulnerable to being cyberbullied during remote learning. In contrast, a longitudinal study on the social and psychological effect of the COVID-19 pandemic on middle school students in Northeastern Pennsylvania revealed that one in nine students experienced a significant rise (11.7%) in bullying victimisation from year 4 to year 5, the years straddling the COVID-19 pandemic (Walters et al., 2021).

The current study showed that girls and younger children were more likely to report being bullied than boys and older children during the COVID-19 pandemic. In contrast, boys and older children were more likely to report being bullied than girls and younger children before COVID-19, except for sibling bullying. These results aligned with a study in Mexico and Chile that revealed girls experienced a higher prevalence of bullying victimisation during the COVID-19 pandemic (Bravo-Sanzana et al., 2022), although in contrast, late adolescents experienced a higher prevalence of bullying victimisation (Bravo-Sanzana et al., 2022). Results of the current study also aligned with a study in Canada that revealed girls were more likely to report being bullied during the COVID-19 and elementary school students reported higher bullying involvement than secondary school students (Vaillancourt et al., 2021).

Both studies' most prevalent bullying victimisation was verbal bullying (Table 2). These results aligned with a study in five Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN) countries, including Indonesia, which showed name-calling was the most prevalent (13.5%) type of bullying victimisation (Pengpid & Pletzer, 2019).

3.2 SWB of Children Before and During the COVID-19 Pandemic

The study's second aim was to compare the SWB of children, whether they experienced being bullied or had never been bullied at home and school before and during the COVID-19 pandemic. Although the samples are not strictly comparable, children in Study 1 display higher SWB scores than children in Study 2. These results suggest that positive indicators have decreased from Study 1 to Study 2, meaning from before the COVID-19 data collection to during the COVID-19 data collection.

Children in Study 2 who reported being bullied by siblings more than three times display significantly higher SWB scores than children who reported being bullied two or three times. These results suggest that children may have adapted to adverse situations, such as being bullied by siblings more times during the COVID-19 pandemic. During COVID-19, children were confined at home, most likely without parents' supervision, which may explain the fact that they experienced more frequent bullying by siblings, but adapted to being victimised at home.

The pandemic has brought changes in school life for children, from offline to online learning to limited social interactions with friends. With fewer opportunities to interact socially at school, school bullying rates are lower during the pandemic than before the pandemic (Table 2). Children who reported never being bullied during the pandemic display lower SWB scores than those who were never bullied before the pandemic. Although it is not strictly comparable between samples, this result suggests their situations during the pandemic affected children's SWB. These results aligned with a longitudinal study that concluded the detrimental effect of the COVID-19 pandemic on children's SWB (Steinmayr et al., 2022). Another study in Indonesia also revealed lower SWB scores of children during the COVID-19 pandemic (Borualogo & Casas, 2022). In the current study, the SWB was worse when they experienced being bullied, both before and during the pandemic. Like before the pandemic, children reporting any kind (physical, verbal, emotional) of school bullying during the pandemic displayed significantly lower SWB scores than those who reported never being bullied during the pandemic.

3.3 Factors Related to Sibling and School Bullying

The third aim of the study was to investigate factors related to sibling and school bullying before and during COVID-19. The current study revealed several interesting yet unexpected findings on factors related to sibling and school bullying before and during the COVID-19 pandemic. Children have experienced life changes during the pandemic that may have affected their social relationships, particularly school-related experiences, including bullying. Different situations in children's lives before and during the COVID-19 pandemic apparently contributed differently to their bullying experiences at home by siblings and at school by mates.

A previous study in Indonesia with a sample of elementary and secondary school students showed the importance of being listened to by parents when children experienced school bullying (Borualogo, 2021; Casas, 2016) also stated that being listened to by parents is a strong predictor of children's SWB. It is important for children and adolescents to feel adequately heard concerning their SWB (Corominas et al., 2020). The current study exposes that for sibling bullying, parents listening to children is essential to protect children from being victimised by siblings both before and during the pandemic. However, for school bullying, parents listening to children protects them from being bullied at school only during COVID-19. This is probably because children have more frequent interactions with their parents during the pandemic, encouraging them to share their experiences with their parents.

In addition to the explanation above, teachers listening to children protected children in Study 1 from being left out by other children in the class. However, this variable is not associated with any bullying indicator in Study 2. During remote learning, children did not meet in person with their teachers. Therefore, children might have fewer opportunities to communicate with teachers, just as in offline classes.

A surprising association is observed in Study 1. Children's perception that teachers will help if they have a problem at school is associated with a higher frequency of being hit by other children. A previous study in Indonesia shows that children prefer to report to parents rather than teachers to get help when they have problems at school, including bullying (Borualogo et al., 2020). This is most likely because when they report to teachers, teachers reprimand the perpetrators, and in many cases, it makes perpetrators more aggressive toward victims for reporting them to teachers. In the end, it causes the children to experience repeated bullying incidents.

None of the family variables in Study 1 was associated with children's experiences of being bullied at school, except for feeling safe at home, which was associated with a lower frequency of being called unkind names by other children at school. However, several family variables (e.g., having people in the family who care about children, family helping children when they have a problem, and parents listening to children) were associated with school bullying indicators in Study 2. Even feeling safe at home was associated with all three school bullying indicators. During the COVID-19 pandemic, while children were more frequently together with their family members, the family's contribution to children's school life apparently changed. This is not surprising since children's school life moved to home. They participated in online learning from home, and the online learning process may have involved other family members.

School climate was associated differently with bullying before and during the pandemic. Feeling safe at school protects children from bullying, both by siblings and at school before COVID-19, but apparently only protects children from being bullied at school during COVID-19. Perceiving many arguments in class increased the probability of children being bullied in all five bullying indicators – at home and school – before and during the pandemic. These indicators of a positive school climate (i.e., feeling safe at school and not perceiving many arguments in class) represent essential

conditions that protect children from being bullied at school both before and during COVID-19.

Perceptions about friends displayed diverse associations with being bullied at home and school in both studies. In both studies, satisfaction with friends was associated with a lower probability of being victimised by siblings at home and classmates at school. Friends being perceived as usually nice was associated with a lower probability of verbal and emotional bullying in both studies. These results suggest that before and during the pandemic, friends play important roles in children's lives, particularly in protecting them from being bullied. Although children probably did not have many opportunities to meet with their friends during the lockdown, relationships with friends still appeared important in protecting them from being bullied during remote learning. Another study in Indonesia also showed the importance of having good relationships with friends during the COVID-19 pandemic and staying in contact with them using online communication (Borualogo, 2021). However, surprising results are observed in Study 1, where reporting having enough friends was associated with a higher frequency of being hit by siblings and other children in the class. A study in England revealed that even though children have enough friends, asking them for help while they experience bullying is the least-used coping strategy (Kanetsuna & Smith, 2002), and children prefer to ask adults for help. A study in Japan showed that children were often bullied by a number of mates perceived as real friends (Kanetsuna & Smith, 2002). In these cases, being bullied by so-called friends appeared especially shameful and more challenging to cope with. This may be related to the surprising findings in Indonesia, where perceiving having enough friends was associated with a higher frequency of being bullied.

4 Conclusion

The prevalence of sibling bullying during the COVID-19 pandemic appeared to be higher than before the pandemic. The frequency of school bullying during COVID-19 was lower than before COVID-19 in Indonesia. However, further study is needed to determine whether the incidents are really decreasing or moving to another type of bullying, as may be the case of cyberbullying.

During COVID-19, more girls and children 11 years old reported being bullied than boys and older children in all bullying indicators. This contrasts with the situation before COVID-19, where more boys and older children reported being bullied in all bullying indicators.

Although samples are not strictly comparable, the SWB levels during the COVID-19 data collection seem to decrease compared to those before the COVID-19. At the same time, the frequency of all types of bullying apparently increased for the COVID-19 data collection. In previous studies, indicators used in the Children's Worlds project showed sensitivity to changes in children's lives. Therefore, SWB indicators should be sensitive to changes associated with children's new everyday life that COVID-19 has implied. However, this sample is not strictly comparable with the available pre-COVID-19 sample. School climate and relationships with family and friends were associated differently with sibling and school bullying before and during COVID-19.

This study has some limitations. First, it is only focused on sibling and school bullying before and during the COVID-19 pandemic. However, several studies indicated an increasing number of cyberbullying incidents during COVID-19. Unfortunately, this study did not collect data about cyberbullying. Therefore, future studies shall investigate cyberbullying, particularly to better understand whether children involved in a sibling or school bullying are more vulnerable to cyberbullying victimisation. Second, the sample in Study 2 is convenient. Therefore, the results cannot be generalised. Third, both studies are cross-sectional, and data collected in Study 1 and Study 2 may not be strictly comparable.

Acknowledgements For Study 1, data collection was supported by Universitas Islam Bandung (UNISBA), UNICEF Indonesia, and Statistics Indonesia (BPS). UNICEF Indonesia funded this survey, which was also supported by BAPPENAS (Indonesian Ministry of National Development Planning). Thank you to all enumerators who helped in data collection and to all participating schools and children.

For Study 2, data collection was funded by the Jacobs Foundation. Thank you to the Jacobs Foundation and the Children's Worlds team, who supported the study.

Declarations

Compliance with Ethical Standards The authors declare that they have no conflict of interest to disclose. This research involving human participants. Ethical approval for each study was obtained from the appropriate ethics committee in Indonesia prior to the survey being conducted. Active parent consent was gained prior to the survey being conducted. Children were also informed that their data will be treated confidentially and they were free to join or not join the survey.

References

- Abramson, A. (2021, September 1). Capturing the benefits of remote learning: How education experts are applying lessons learned in the pandemic to promote positive outcomes for all students. *Monitor on Psychology*, 52(6), 46. https://www.apa.org/monitor/2021/09/cover-remote-learning
- Adedoyin, O. B., & Soykan, E. (2020). COVID-19 pandemic and online learning: the challenges and opportunities. *Interactive Learning Environments*. https://doi.org/10.1080/10494820.2020.1813180.
- Andresen, S., Bradshaw, J., & Kosher, H. (2019). Young children's perceptions of their lives and wellbeing. *Child Indicators Research*, 12, 1–7. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12187-018-9551-6.
- Asmara, C. G. (2021, August 31). Jokowi: Sekolah tatap muka dimulai September 2021 [Jokowi: Faceto-face school starts on September 2021]. CNBC Indonesia. https://www.cnbcindonesia.com/ news/20210831114903-4-272537/jokowi-sekolah-tatap-muka-dimulai-september-2021
- Bacher-Hicks, A., Goodman, J., Green, J. G., & Holt, M. (2022). The COVID-19 pandemic disrupted both school bullying and cyberbullying (no. w29590). National Bureau of Economic Research.
- Barlett, C. P., Simmers, M. M., Roth, B., & Gentile, D. (2021). Comparing cyberbullying prevalence and process before and during the COVID-19 pandemic. *The Journal of Social Psychology*, 161(4), 408–418. https://doi.org/10.1080/00224545.2021.1918619.

- BBC. (2020). Coronavirus: The world in lockdown in maps and charts. BBC. https://www.bbc.com/news/ world-52103747
- Bjereld, Y., Daneback, K., & Petzold, M. (2017). Do bullied children have poor relationships with their parents and teachers? A cross-sectional study of swedish children. *Children and Youth Services Review*, 73, 347–351. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.childyouth.2017.01.012.
- Ben Arieh, A. (2019). The well-being of the world's children: Lessons from the international survey of children's well-being. In D. Kutsar & K. Raid (Eds.), *Children's subjective well-being in local and international perspectives*. Statistikaamet. 18–29. https://www.stat.ee/sites/default/files/2020-07/ Childrens Subjective Well-Being in Local and International Perspectives.pdf
- Borualogo, I. S. (2021). The role of parenting style to the feeling of adequately heard and subjective wellbeing in perpetrators and bullying victims. *Jurnal Psikologi*, 48(1), 96–117. https://doi.org/10.22146/ jpsi.61860.
- Borualogo, I. S., & Casas, F. (2019). Adaptation and validation of the children's Worlds Subjective Well-Being Scale (CW-SWBS) in Indonesia. Jurnal Psikologi, 46, 102–116. https://doi.org/10.22146/ jpsi.38995.
- Borualogo, I. S., & Casas, F. (2021a). Children's and adolescents' reports on their quality of life during the COVID-19 pandemic. *Psikohumaniora: Jurnal Penelitian Psikologi*, 6(2), 153–170. https://doi. org/10.21580/pjpp.v6i2.8572.
- Borualogo, I. S., & Casas, F. (2021b). The relationship between frequent bullying and subjective well-being in Indonesian children. *Population Review*, 60(1), 26–50. https://doi.org/10.1353/prv.2021.0002.
- Borualogo, I. S., & Casas, F. (2021c). Subjective well-being of bullied children in Indonesia. Applied Research in Quality of Life, 16(2), 753–772. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11482-019-09778-1.
- Borualogo, I. S., & Casas, F. (2022). Subjective well-being of children and adolescents during the COVID-19 pandemic in Indonesia: Two data collections. *Current Psychology*. https://doi.org/10.1007/ s12144-022-03346-x.
- Borualogo, I. S., González-Carrasco, M., & Casas, F. (2022). Examining predictors of bullying in Indonesian children [Manuscript under review]. Faculty of Psychology Universitas Islam Bandung, Indonesia; Research Institute on Quality of Life, Universitat de Girona, Spain; Doctoral Program on Education and Society, Faculty of Education and Social Sciences, Universidad Andrés Bello, Chile.
- Borualogo, I. S., & Gumilang, E. (2019). Kasus perundungan anak di Jawa Barat: Temuan awal Children's Worlds Survey di Indonesia [Bullying cases of children in West Java: first findings of children's worlds survey in Indonesia]. *Psympathic*, 6(1), 15–30. https://doi.org/10.15575/psy.v6i1.4439.
- Borualogo, I. S., Gumilang, E., Mubarak, A., Khasanah, A. N., Wardati, M. A., Diantina, F. P., Permataputri, I., & Casas, F. (2019). Process of translation of the Children's Worlds Subjective Well-Being Scale in Indonesia. *Proceedings of the Social and Humaniora Research Symposium* (SoRes 2018), 307, 180–183. https://doi.org/10.2991/sores-18.2019.42
- Borualogo, I. S., Wahyudi, H., & Kusdiyati, S. (2020). Bullying victimisation in elementary school students in Bandung City. *Proceedings of the Social and Humaniora Research Symposium* (SoRes 2019), 409, 112–116. https://doi.org/10.2991/assehr.k.200225.024
- Bradshaw, J., Crous, G., Rees, G., & Turner, N. (2017). Comparing children's experiences of schoolsbased bullying across countries. *Children and Youth Services Review*, 80, 171–180. https://doi. org/10.1016/j.childyouth.2017.06.060.
- Bravo-Sanzana, M., Oriol, X., & Miranda, R. (2022). Characterization of wellbeing and its relationship with exposure to violence in mexican and chilean early and late adolescents during the COVID-19 pandemic. *Child Indicators Research*, 15, 553–578. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12187-021-09905-1.
- Brody, G. H. (2004). Sibling's direct and indirect contributions to child development. *Current Direction in Psychological Science*, 13, 124–126. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.0963-7214.2004.00289.x.
- Cappa, C., & Jijon, I. (2021). COVID-19 and violence against children: a review of early studies. *Child Abuse and Neglect*, 116(2), 105053. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chiabu.2021.105053.
- Casas, F. (2016). Children, adolescents and quality of life: the social sciences perspective over two decades. In F. Maggino (Ed.), A life devoted to quality of life. Festschrift in Honor of Alex C. Michalos (pp. 3–21). Springer Publisher. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-20568-7_1.
- Casas, F. (2019). Introduction to the special section on children's subjective well-being. *Child Development*, 90(2), 333–343. https://doi.org/10.1111/cdev.13129.
- Casas, F., & González–Carrasco, M. (2021). Analysing comparability of four multi-item well-being psychometric scales among 35 countries using children's worlds 3rd wave 10 and 12-year-olds samples. *Child Indicators Research*, 14, 1829–1861. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12187-021-09825-0.

- Corominas, M., González-Carrasco, M., & Casas, F. (2020). The importance of feeling adequately heard by adults and enjoying time with family in relation to children's subjective well-being. *Child Indicators Research*, 13, 193–214. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12187-019-09680-0.
- Cowden, R. G., Davis, E. B., Counted, V., Chen, Y., Rueger, S. Y., VanderWeele, T. J., Lemke, A. W., Glowiak, K. J., & Worthington, E. L. Jr. (2021). Suffering, mental health, and psychological wellbeing during the COVID-19 pandemic: a longitudinal study of U.S. adults with chronic health conditions. *Wellbeing Space and Society*, 2, 100048. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.wss.2021.100048.
- Cowie, H., & Myers, C. A. (2021). The impact of the COVID pandemic on the mental health and wellbeing of children and young people. *Children and Society*, 35(1), 62–74. https://doi.org/10.1111/ chso.12430.
- Dantchev, S., & Wolke, D. (2019). Trouble in the nest: antecedents of sibling bullying victimization and perpetration. *Developmental Psychology*, 55(5), 1059–1071. https://doi.org/10.1037/dev0000700.
- Diener, E. (1984). Subjective well-being. Psychological Bulletin, 95(3), 542–575. https://doi. org/10.1037/0033-2909.95.3.542.
- Diener, E., Oishi, S., & Lucas, R. E. (2015). National Accounts of subjective well-being. American Psychological Association, 70(3), 234–242. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0038899.
- Field, T. (2021). Aggression and violence affecting youth during the COVID-19 pandemic: a narrative review. Journal of Psychiatry Research Reviews and Reports, 3(3), 1–6. https://www.onlinescientificresearch.com/articles/aggression-and-violence-affecting-youth-during-the-covid19-pandemic-anarrative-review.pdf.
- Fontanesi, L., Marchetti, D., Mazza, C., Di Giandomenico, S., Roma, P., & Verrocchio, M. C. (2020). The effect of the COVID-19 lockdown on parents: a call to adopt urgent measures. *Psychological Trauma: Theory Research Practice and Policy*, 12(S1), S79–S81. https://doi.org/10.1037/tra0000672.
- Gross-Manos, D., Kosher, H., & Ben-Arieh, A. (2021). Research with children: Lessons learned from the International Survey of Children's wellbeing. *Child Indicators Research*, 14, 2097–2118. https://doi. org/10.1007/s12187-021-09829-w.
- Harbani, R. I. (2021, August 6). Kapan sekolah tatap muka dimulai? Ini kata Mendikbud Nadiem Makarim [When does face-to-face school begin? This is what Ministry of Education and Culture Nadiem Makarim says]. DetikEdu. https://www.detik.com/edu/sekolah/d-5672042/ kapan-sekolah-tatap-muka-dimulai-ini-kata-mendikbud-nadiem-makarim
- Kamil, I., & Kuwado, F. J. (2020, September 3). Kilas balik pembelajaran jarak jauh akibat pandemi COVID-19 [Flashback of distance learning dur to the COVID-19 pandemic]. Kompas.com. https://nasional.kompas.com/read/2020/09/03/10063201/ kilas-balik-pembelajaran-jarak-jauh-akibat-pandemi-covid-19?page=all
- Kanetsuna, T., & Smith, P. K. (2002). Pupils insights into bullying, and coping with bullying. *Journal of School Violence*, 1(3), 5–29. https://doi.org/10.1300/J202v01n03_02.
- Kohls, E., Baldofski, S., Moeller, R., Klemm, S. L., & Rummel-Kluge, C. (2021). Mental health, social and emotional well-being, and perceived burdens of university students during COVID-19 pandemic lockdown in Germany. *Frontiers in Psychiatry*, 12, 441. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyt.2021.643957.
- Kola, L., Johrt, B. A., Hanlon, C., Naslund, J. A., Sikander, S., Balaji, M., Benjet, C., Cheung, E. Y. L., Eaton, J., Gonsalves, P., Hailemariam, M., Luitel, N. P., Machado, D. B., Misganaw, E., Omigbodun, O., Roberts, T., Salisbury, T. T., Shidhaye, R., Sunkel, C., & Patel, V. (2021). COVID-19 mental health impact and responses in low-income and middle-income countries: reimagining global mental health. *The Lancet Psychiatry*, 8(6), 535–550. https://doi.org/10.1016/S2215-0366(21)00025-0.
- Kourti, A., Stavridou, A., Panagouli, E., Psaltopoulou, T., Spiliopoulou, C., Tsolia, M., Sergentanis, T. N., & Tsitsika, A. (2021). Domestic violence during the COVID-19 pandemic: a systematic review. *Trauma Violence and Abuse*. https://doi.org/10.1177/15248380211038690.
- Lee, J., Roh, B. R., & Yang, K. E. (2022). Exploring the association between social support and patterns of bullying victimization among school-aged adolescents. *Children and Youth Services Review*, 136, 106418. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.childyouth.2022.106418.
- Martinez, M., & Temkin, D. (2021, October 27). School bullying has decreased during the COVID-19 pandemic, but schools should prepare for its return. *Child Trends*. https://www.childtrends.org/blog/ school-bullying-has-decreased-during-the-covid-19-pandemic-but-schools-must-be-prepared-forits-return
- Mashabi, S., & Galih, B. (2020, November 28). UNICEF: Risiko cyber bullying semakin besar di masa pandemic COVID-19 [UNICEF: The risk of cyberbullying is getting bigger during the COVID-19 pandemic]. Kompas.com. https://nasional.kompas.com/read/2020/11/28/12045141/ unicef-risiko-cyber-bullying-semakin-besar-di-masa-pandemi-covid-19

- Nippon.com. School bullying drops by 15.6% in Japan during pandemic. Nippon.com. https://www.nippon.com/en/japan-data/h01142/
- O'Connor, R. C., Wetherall, K., Cleare, S., McClelland, H., Melson, A. J., Niedzwiedz, C. L., O'Carroll, R. E., O'Connor, D. B., Platt, S., Scowcroft, E., Watson, B., Zortea, T., Ferguson, E., & Robb, K. A. (2021). Mental health and well-being during the COVID-19 pandemic: longitudinal analyses of adults in the UK COVID-19 mental health and wellbeing study. *The British Journal of Psychiatry*, 218(6), 326–333. https://doi.org/10.1192/bjp.2020.212.
- OECD. (2019). PISA 2018 results (volume III): what school life means for students' lives. PISA. OECD Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1787/acd78851-en.
- Olweus, D. (1993). Bullying at school: what we know and what we can do. Blackwell Publishers.
- Pancani, L., Marinucci, M., Aureli, N., & Riva, P. (2021). Forced social isolation and mental health: a study on 1,006 Italians under COVID-19 lockdown. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 12, 1540. https://doi. org/10.3389/fpsyg.2021.663799.
- Pengpid, S., & Peltzer, K. (2019). Bullying victimization and externalizing and internalizing symptoms among in-school adolescents from five ASEAN countries. *Children and Youth Services Review*, 106, 104473. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.childyouth.2019.104473.
- Perkins, N. H., Rai, A., & Grossman, S. F. (2021). Physical and emotional sibling violence in the time of COVID-19. Journal of Family Violence. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10896-021-00249-6.
- Pieh, C., Budimir, S., Delgadillo, J., Barkham, M., Fontaine, J. R. J., & Probst, T. (2021). Mental health during COVID-19 lockdown in the United Kingdom. *Psychosomatic Medicine*, 83(4), 328–337. https://doi.org/10.1097/PSY.
- Putri, C. A. (2020, October 7). Survei: Karena COVID-19, 35% pekerja di Indonesia kena PHK. CNBC Indonesia. https://www.cnbcindonesia.com/news/20201007145144-4-192535/ survei-karena-covid-19-35-pekerja-di-indonesia-kena-phk
- Ramadhanty, R. (2021, June 25). Nadiem sebut pandemic picu meningkatnya cyber bullying di kalangan anak [Nadiem said pandemic triggers increased cyberbullying among children]. Dream.co.id. https:// www.dream.co.id/news/nadiem-sebut-pandemi-picu-meningkatnya-cyber-bullying-di-kalangananak-2106251.html
- Ravens-Sieberer, U., Kaman, A., Erhart, M., Devine, J., Schlack, R., & Otto, C. (2021). Impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on quality of life and mental health in children and adolescents in Germany. *European Child and Adolescent Psychiatry*. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00787-021-01726-5.
- Rees, G., Savahl, S., Lee, B. J., & Casas, F. (2020). Children's views on their lives and well-being in 35 countries: A report on the Children's Worlds project, 2016–19. Children's Worlds Project (ISCWeB). https://isciweb.org/wp-content/uploads/2020/07/Childrens-Worlds-Comparative-Report-2020.pdf
- Savahl, S., Montserrat, C., Casas, F., Adams, S., Tiliouine, H., Benninger, E., & Jackson, K. (2019). Children's experiences of bullying victimization and the influence on subjective well-being: a multinational comparison. *Child Development*, 20(2), 1–18. https://doi.org/10.1111/cdev.13135.
- Shaheen, A. M., Hamdan, K. M., Albqoor, M., Othman, A. K., Amre, H. M., & Hazeem, M. N. A. (2019). Perceived social support from family and friends and bullying victimization among adolescents. *Children and Youth Services Review*, 107, 104503. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.childyouth.2019.104503.
- Smith, P. K. (2016). Bullying: definition, types, causes, consequences, and intervention. Social and Personality Psychology Compass, 10(9), 519–532. https://doi.org/10.1111/spc3.12266.
- Steinmayr, R., Paschke, P., & Wirthwein, L. (2022). Elementary school students' subjective well-being before and during the COVID-19 pandemic: a longitudinal study. *Journal of Happiness Study*. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10902-022-00537-y.
- Sun, X., Updegraff, K. A., McHale, S. M., Hochgraf, A. K., Gallagher, A. M., & Umaña-Taylor, A. J. (2021). Implications of COVID-19 school closure for sibling dynamics among U.S. Latinx children: a prospective, daily diary study. *Developmental Psychology*, 57(10), 1708–1718. https://doi. org/10.1037/dev0001196.
- Tiliouine, H. (2015). School bullying victimisation and subjective well-being in Algeria. *Child Indicators Research*, 8, 133–150. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12187-014-9286-y.
- Vaillancourt, T., Brittain, H., Krygsman, A., Farrell, A. H., Landon, S., & Pepler, D. (2021). School bullying before and during COVID-19: results from a population-based randomized design. *Aggressive Behavior*, 47(5), 557–569. https://doi.org/10.1002/ab.21986.
- Van de Vijver, F. J. R. (2015). Methodological aspects of cross-cultural research. In M. Gelfand, Y Hong, & C. Y. Chiu (Eds.), *Handbook of advances in culture & psychology* (Vol. 5, pp. 101–160). Oxford University Press.

- Van de Vijver, F. J. R., & Hambleton, R. K. (1996). Translating tests: some practical guidelines. *European Psychologist*, 1(2), 88–99. https://doi.org/10.1027/1016-9040.1.2.89.
- Varela, J. J., Adams, S. S., S., & Reyes, F. (2020). Examining the relationship among bullying, school climate and adolescent well-being in Chile and South Africa: a cross cultural comparison. *Child Indicators Research*, 13, 819–838. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12187-019-09648-0.
- Volk, A. A., Dane, A. V., & Marini, Z. A. (2014). What is bullying? A theoretical redefinition. *Developmental Review*, 34(4), 327–343. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.dr.2014.09.001.
- Walters, G. D., Runell, L., & Kremser, J. (2021). Social and psychological effects of the COVID-19 pandemic on middle-school students: attendance options and changes over time. *School Psychology*, 36(5), 277–284. https://doi.org/10.1037/spq0000438.
- Wang, C., Tee, M., Roy, A. E., Fardin, M. A., Srichokchatchawan, W., Habib, H. A., Tran, B. X., Hussain, S., Hoang, M. T., Le, X. T., Ma, W., Pham, H. Q., Shirazi, M., Taneepanichskul, N., Tan, Y., Tee, C., Xu, L., Xu, Z., Vu, G. T., & Kuruchittham, V. (2021). The impact of COVID-10 pandemic on physical and mental health of Asians: a study of seven middle-income countries in Asia. *Plos One*, *16*(2), e0246824. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0246824.
- Werner, K., & Woessmann, L. (2021). The legacy of COVID-19 in education. Discussion paper no. 291.
- WHO (2020, 11 March). WHO Director-General's opening remarks at the media briefing on COVID-19–11 March 2020. https://www.who.int/director-general/speeches/detail/ who-director-general-s-opening-remarks-at-the-media-briefing-on-covid-19---11-march-2020
- Yang, X., Harrison, P., Huang, J., Liu, Y., & Zahn, R. (2021). The impact of COVID-19-related lockdown on adolescent mental health in China: A prospective study. Available at SSRN3792956.
- Yourtown (2021). Kids Helpline 2020 Insights Report: National Statistical Overview. https://www.yourtown.com.au/sites/default/files/document/2020%20Insights%20Kids%20Helpline.pdf

Publisher's Note Springer Nature remains neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in published maps and institutional affiliations.

Springer Nature or its licensor (e.g. a society or other partner) holds exclusive rights to this article under a publishing agreement with the author(s) or other rightsholder(s); author self-archiving of the accepted manuscript version of this article is solely governed by the terms of such publishing agreement and applicable law.

Authors and Affiliations

Ihsana Sabriani Borualogo¹ · Ferran Casas^{2,3}

Ihsana Sabriani Borualogo ihsana.sabriani@unisba.ac.id

- ¹ Faculty of Psychology, Universitas Islam Bandung, Jln. Tamansari No. 1, 40116 Bandung, West Java, Indonesia
- ² Doctoral Program on Education and Society, Faculty of Education and Social Sciences, Universidad Andrés Bello, Santiago, Chile
- ³ Research Institute on Quality of Life, Universitat de Girona, Girona, Spain