

Population Review

Volume 60, Number 1, 2021

Type: Article, pp. 26-50

The Relationship Between Frequent Bullying and Subjective Well-Being in Indonesian Children

Authors: Ihsana Sabriani Borualogo and Ferran Casas

Affiliations: Faculty of Psychology, Universitas Islam Bandung, Indonesia (Borualogo); Research Institute on Quality of Life, Universitat de Girona, Spain, and the Doctoral Program on Education and Society, Faculty of Education and Social Science, Universidad Andrés Bello, Chile (Casas).

Corresponding author/address: Ihsana Sabriani Borualogo, Faculty of Psychology Universitas Islam Bandung, Indonesia; email: ihsana.sabriani@unisba.ac.id

Abstract

The aim of this study was to ascertain the relationship between bullying (at home and at school) and subjective well-being (SWB) across three age groups (8, 10, and 12 years old) in Indonesia. This was a cross-sectional study that used data from the third wave of the Children's Worlds Survey (N = 21,002; 49.4% boys, 50.6% girls), which was conducted in West Java Province, Indonesia. Bullying actions were measured by self-reported frequency of being a victim of each action by siblings and by other children during the last month. For the data analysis, a subsample was considered for each kind of bullying report (physical, verbal, and psychological) stating children were bullied more than three times and reports stating children were never bullied. SWB was measured using the Children's Worlds Subjective Well-Being Scale (CW-SWBS) and the Overall Life Satisfaction scale (OLS). Data were analysed using linear regression and explained using Cummins' theory of homeostasis. Being bullied demonstrates a significant negative contribution to the SWB of Indonesian children. Gender displays significant SWB differences, with girls showing higher scores than boys. Age also displays significant differences in SWB scores, with an increase from 8 to 10 years old and a decrease from 10 to 12. Bullied children seem to adapt to the bullying and maintain rather high levels of SWB, but in general their scores are significantly lower than non-bullied children, with the exception of children 8 years of age. Bullying is a serious problem which needs to be taken into account in order to help these children whose mental health might be at serious risk.

Keywords

Bullying, children, Indonesia, overall life satisfaction, school, siblings, subjective well-being

1. Introduction

Studies on bullying have appeared in much international research over the last 40 years (Olweus 1978, 1994, 1997; Smith and Sharp 1994; Smith and Brain 2000; Espelage and Swearer 2003; Lai, Ye and Chang 2008; Wolke and Skew 2012; Savahl et al. 2019). Bullying has been described as a subtype of violent behaviour – a specific form of aggression – that implies negative actions targeted to the physical, psychological, or social dimension, which is intentional, repeated, and involves a disparity of power between the victim and the perpetrator with the aim of hurting the victim (Espelage and Swearer 2003; Wang, Iannotti and Nansel 2009). Olweus (1997) explained three criteria of bullying: (1) it is an aggressive behaviour, (2) carried out repeatedly over time, (3) in the context of an interpersonal relationship characterised by an imbalance of power.

Data presented by PIRLS 2016 International Results in Reading (Mullis, Martin, Foy and Hooper 2017) showed that 29% of students reported being bullied on a monthly basis and 14% on a weekly basis. Other studies focusing on school bullying are Espelage and Swearer (2003) and Hymel and Swearer (2015). A search for publications on children's bullying revealed that there are a limited number of studies on children's sibling bullying (Menesini, Camodeca and Nocentini 2010; Tanrikulu and Campbel 2015). In fact, children experience bullying not only at school but also at home. Several studies on sibling bullying focused mostly on youth (Goodwin and Roscoe 1990; Kienert and Walsh 2011; Wolke and Samara 2004) or asked parents and caregivers (Eriksen and Jensen 2009; Tucker, Finkelhor, Turner, and Shattuck 2013) about bullying incidents that their children have experienced rather than asking the children directly. Studies on bullying in relation to subjective well-being (SWB) are mostly focused on school bullying (Savahl et al., 2019; Tiliounine, 2015). The current study explores two types of bullying – sibling bullying and school bullying – from the children's perspective, as well as its association with children's SWB.

Sibling Bullying and School Bullying

Although researchers mostly focus on school bullying, in fact, children's experiences of bullying occur not only at school, but also in relationships with their siblings at home. Children are not able to choose their siblings: they must live with siblings in their family whether they like them or not. Some studies have reported a high frequency of bullying among siblings. Precise estimates are difficult since bullying is not always reported. One study shows that 32% of children reported experiencing sibling bullying in the past year (Tucker, Finkelhor, Turner and Shattuck 2013). Physical (hitting, kicking, pushing) and verbal bullying were the most frequent types of sibling bullying and victimisation (Eriksen and Jensen 2009; Wolke and Skew 2012). According to Wolke and Skew (2012), no age trend in sibling bullying or victimisation was identified.

In the present study, we focus on two types of bullying: sibling bullying, and school bullying. Menesini, Camodeca, and Nocentini (2010) and Wolke, Tippett, and Dantchev (2015) defined sibling bullying as repeated emotional, physical, or verbally aggressive behaviour involving an element of perceived or real power imbalance perpetrated by a sibling with the purposeful intent to dominate and cause harm. Smith and Sharp (1994) and Graham (2006) defined school bullying as a student being subjected to violent physical (e.g., hitting, kicking), verbal (e.g., calling unkind names or saying nasty and unpleasant things to another student), and/or psychological (e.g., social exclusion or spreading rumours) abuse by peers in the school context, particularly in spaces with little supervision from teachers or other adults.

With regard to research on sibling bullying, both the term and definition of ‘sibling bullying’ are controversial (Krienert and Walsh 2011; Goodwin and Roscoe 1990; Ensor, Marks, Jacobs and Hughes 2010). Some researchers prefer to use the term ‘antisocial siblings’ instead of ‘sibling bullying’ (Ensor, Marks, Jacob and Hughes 2010). And others use ‘sibling aggression’ (Tucker, Finkelhor, Turner and Shattuck 2013) or ‘sibling abuse’ (Goodwin and Roscoe, 1990) instead of ‘sibling bullying’. Terms and definitions aside, researchers do seem to agree that aggressive behaviours among siblings involve systematic abuses of power (Rigby 2002) – intentional aggressive actions that someone is exposed to repeatedly over time, and that they cannot defend themselves against (Olweus 1997). They also involve an imbalance of power among siblings (Menesini, Camodeca and Nocentini 2010). Thus, these aggressive behaviours fit the definition of bullying (Rigby 2002; Olweus 1997).

Relationships among siblings mutually contribute to development and adjustment (Wolke and Skew 2012). Brody (2004) stated that sibling relationships are often described as emotionally ambivalent. Siblings might have conflicts among themselves, but they can also be warm in their relationships, and these feelings are frequently mixed (Brody 2004). Studies found that positive sibling relationships help children adjust and develop their skills (Stormshak, Bellanti and Bierman 1996; Gass, Jenkins and Dunn 2007), but negative sibling relationships create adjustment problems. Bullying is one of the most frequent behaviours in negative sibling relationships (Duncan 1999; Wolke and Samara 2004).

Many studies revealed the effects of bullying on children’s lives, which can carry on into their lives as adolescents. Being a victim of bullying reduces the well-being of individuals (McFall and Garrington 2011), affecting children’s dignity, and this might result in serious problems in their development (Dombrowski and Gischlar 2006). Bullying might negatively affect children’s SWB (Savahl et al. 2019; Tiliouine 2015), increase suicidal ideation (Kim, Koh and Leventhal 2005), increase behavioural problems, decrease prosocial behaviour (Wolke, Woods, Bloomfield and Karstadt 2000), and decrease life satisfaction (Varela et al. 2017). These studies are in line with what Casas (2016a) stated, i.e., that three strong predictors of children’s SWB are (1) bullying, (2) perception of safety, and (3) respect for children and inclusion of their voices.

Subjective Well-being

SWB is defined as a person’s evaluation of their life, the degree to which their thoughtful appraisals and affective reactions indicate that their lives are desirable and proceeding well (Diener 1984; Diener, Oishi and Lucas 2015). SWB contains three components: (1) cognitive components (a person’s evaluation of overall life satisfaction), (2) positive affect (pleasant affect, feelings of happiness, joy, vitality), and (3) negative affect (unpleasant affect, feelings of sadness, anger) (Diener, Suh and Oishi 1997; Diener, Suh, Lucas and Smith 1999). Life satisfaction is one of the cognitive components of SWB and is defined as the evaluation of the overall quality of one’s life (Diener, Suh, Lucas and Smith 1999). Life satisfaction is a key predictor for positive adjustment (Casas 2011), while daily positive or negative interactions are the most powerful predictors of positive or negative affect scores (McCullough, Huebner and Laughlin 2000).

Studies on SWB have addressed not only adults, but children as well. One study on children’s SWB was conducted by Children’s Worlds, examining SWB through children’s own perceptions of their lives. Children’s SWB is a result of their cognitive and affective evaluations of their lives, the circumstances affecting their lives, and the social context in which they live (Savahl et al. 2019).

To understand how people manage their level of SWB, Cummins (1995, 2010) proposed the theory of SWB homeostasis. According to Cummins (2014), SWB is analogous to the homeostatic maintenance

of body temperature, as SWB is actively controlled and maintained by automatic neurological and psychological processes. SWB homeostasis maintains a normally positive sense of well-being that is generalised and rather abstract. When asked, 'How satisfied are you with your life as a whole?', people answer based not only on cognitive evaluation, but also on deep reflection and a stable positive mood that is the essence of SWB. Cummins (2014) also stated that the set points of SWB range from 60–90, with a mean of 75. Next, Cummins (2014) explained buffers, which protect SWB homeostatically. One buffer is composed of behaviours that people generally adopt to avoid strong challenges; they do this by establishing life routines that make daily experiences predictable and manageable. Another is an external buffer built from relationships that involve mutual sharing, intimacy, and support. Relationship as an external buffer is not always successful, and when it is not, it is proposed that the internal buffers are activated. These buffers protect SWB by altering the way people see themselves in relation to a homeostatic challenge. The internal buffers comprise protective cognitive devices designed to minimise the impact of personal failure on positive feelings about the self. Cummins (2014) explained ways of thinking that can minimise the impact of personal failure, for example, by finding meaning in the negative event, by not taking responsibility for the failure, or by regarding the failure as unimportant. In summary, Cummins (2014) stated that the combined external and internal buffers ensuring SWB are robustly defended, maintaining a range of 60–90.

Indonesian Contexts

Bullying among children has been a serious problem in Indonesia, where a large number of bullying cases have been reported. The Global School-Based Health Survey in 2015 revealed that 32% of Indonesian students aged 13 to 17 have experienced physical violence, and 20% have been bullied at school (Kementerian Perencanaan Pembangunan Nasional dan Unicef 2017). This result was one of the highest in Asia. In another report, it was stated that Indonesia showed a 84% rate of bullying, followed by Vietnam and Nepal (79%), then Cambodia (73%) and Pakistan (43%) (Sindo Weekly 2017). The National Child Protection Commission of Indonesia reported that they received 26,000 child protection cases during the period 2011–2017 and that 34% of these cases involved bullying (Novianto 2018). In 2018, the National Child Protection Commission of Indonesia reported that the level of bullying in schools continued to rise. The newest report in 2019 was released by the National Child Protection Commission of Indonesia and stated that during the period January to April 2019, the majority of child protection cases in Indonesia still involved bullying (Pradewo and Taufan 2019). Bullying mostly happened to elementary school students (age 7–12 years), accounting for 67% of bullying cases reported to the National Child Protection Commission of Indonesia (Rahayu 2019).

A study on bullying in middle schools in the Asian-Pacific region showed that the most common type of bullying in Indonesia consisted of being called unkind names or made fun of, followed by being hit by other children (Lai, Ye and Chang 2008). Male students more often experienced being called unkind names (38.4%) and being hit/hurt (35.4%) compared to female students (33.6% and 26.8%, respectively) (Lai, Ye and Chang 2008).

These reports show that statistics on bullying cases in Indonesia are confusing. More confident and reliable data collection is needed as bullying is a very serious problem for children, and its negative psychological consequences have been clearly demonstrated in the scientific literature. According to the Social Minister of Indonesia, 40% of children in Indonesia who committed suicide did so as a result of bullying (Harunsyah 2015). This statement is in line with research reporting that a relationship between bullying in schools and suicidal ideation among young people has been identified (Kim, Koh and Leventhal 2005; Hinduja and Patchin 2010). Students who are bullied might feel helpless against the students who bullied them. As a consequence, they experienced being bullied repeatedly.

To respond to the high number of school bullying cases, the Government of Indonesia implemented regulation number 82 through the Minister of Education and Culture in 2015 to help prevent and control acts of violence and bullying in schools (Kementerian Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan Indonesia 2015). Moreover, the football legend David Beckham showed his concern about bullying by visiting Indonesia in March 2018 to observe how his charity, the 7 Fund, is combating bullying (Pennington 2018).

The educational system in Indonesia is divided into three levels of education: primary, secondary, and higher education. Only elementary school (7-12) is compulsory, as explained in more detail by Borualogo and Casas (2019b). Nowadays, Indonesians are tending towards nuclear families (Shwalb et al. 2010). Additionally, they are having fewer children (Ananta and Muhidin 2005), enabling parents to invest more time in their children and have a better quality of life (Ananta and Muhidin 2005). The typical Indonesian family system is patriarchal (Koentjaraningrat 2005), where girls have less status and rights compared to boys, and females have important roles in housework and childrearing. But in affluent families, nannies or servants are often paid to help (Koentjaraningrat 2005).

This study uses Cummins' (2014) theory of homeostasis, since bullying is a daily negative experience that Indonesian children face (Borualogo and Gumilang, 2019). By using this theory, the study aims to analyse the relationship between bullying and SWB of Indonesian children in grades 2, 4, and 6, for both sibling bullying and school bullying, and to explain how children adapt to these negative experiences and how these bullying experiences can be manageable for children. The study will, therefore, fill a gap in the scientific literature by contributing to the understanding of how school bullying and sibling bullying impact on children's SWB.

2. Method

This study used data from the third wave of the Children's Worlds Survey conducted in Indonesia in 2017. The survey in Indonesia was conducted by the first author of the present article. Children's Worlds is an international survey that has collected data from more than 35 countries in the third wave using common SWB instruments.

2.1. Sample

Sampling was designed to obtain a representative sample of children in West Java Province (27 districts), Indonesia. West Java is the most populated province in Indonesia (49,316,712 inhabitants) and is located close to the capital of Indonesia (Badan Pusat Statistik Provinsi Jawa Barat 2020; West Java Incorporated 2020). Schools in 27 districts were chosen randomly, and 270 schools were contacted by the research team. Two chosen schools apparently had been merged into one school, and another school had been closed. Therefore, 267 schools participated in this study. Participants were elementary school students ($N = 22,616$) from grades 2nd, 4th, and 6th. After database cleaning and deputation as explained in the next section, the final pooled sample was $N = 21,002$. Details of the final sample are presented in Table 1. Children of the 8-year-old group (mean age 7.84; $SD = 9.79$) were in grade 2 (30.60%); the 10-year-old group (mean age 9.66; $SD = 9.79$) were in grade 4 (32.65%), and the 12-year-old group (mean age 11.53; $SD = 9.79$) were in grade 6 (36.75%). The sample was composed of 49.4% boys and 50.6% girls.

In order to have a sharp perspective on the differences in SWB between bullied and non-bullied children, scores of each bullying item were transformed into dichotomous variables, where 0 = 'was never bullied last month', and 1 = 'was bullied more than three times last month'. This study follows Olweus (1997) with regard to definition of bullying being repeated aggressive behaviour, as well as Coyne, Chong, Seigne, and Randall's (2003) conclusion that bullying is severe when it is experienced

at least every week, i.e., more than three times a month. The present article is devoted to the most frequent bullying situations where children experienced more than three instances of bullying per month. Other cases need more detailed analysis in a future publication.

Table 1 - Respondents by age group

	8-year-old group	10-year-old group	12-year-old group	Total
Boys	3,189	3,417	3,777	10,383
Girls	3,237	3,441	3,941	10,619
Total	6,426	6,858	7,718	21,002

Thus, only the children who reported experiencing bullying more than three times during the last month and those who reported never having experienced bullying during this period were included in our study. Therefore, the size of the subsample is different for each of the five bullying items analysed. The size of each subsample is given in Table 2 and is from N=11,774 to N=13,749, depending on the bullying type.

2.2. Procedure

Data Collection and Ethical Approval

Approval for the study was gained from the ethical committee at Universitas Padjadjaran. Permission to conduct the research in West Java Province was obtained from the Ministry of Education and Ministry of Religion at the provincial level. Written consent from parents was obtained on behalf of the children. The children were informed that they were free to not answer the questions and that their data would be treated confidentially. All schools and parents agreed with children's participation. Children were happy to participate in this study, and they cooperated during data collection.

Data Depuration

Depuration procedures on the three datasets (one for each age group) for this study were conducted in two steps. First, 179 cases with very incomplete questionnaires and missing gender, as well as a few children reported to be 6 years of age, were deleted. Second, following the recommendation of Casas (2016a), in order to increase the power of our data analysis and given that the sample was large enough, children with three or more missing values in the CW-SWBS items, as well as cases showing inconsistent answers on the CW-SWBS and Overall Life Satisfaction were excluded from data analysis. There were 1,435 cases deleted.

2.3. Instruments

Bullying items

The CW-SWBS include five items on measuring bullying, which were translated into Indonesian following the guidelines for translation and cultural adaptation of the instruments as described in Borualogo et al. (2019). These five items measure physical bullying, verbal bullying, and psychological bullying. Two items measure sibling bullying, and three items measure school bullying. Sibling bullying

is measured by frequency of physical and verbal bullying experiences. School bullying is measured by frequency of physical bullying experiences, verbal bullying, and psychological bullying. Physical bullying indicators are two items on being hit by siblings or by children at school, not including when children are fighting as a game. There are two items on verbal bullying, including being called unkind names by siblings or by children at school. Psychological bullying includes a single indicator, namely, being left out by other children in the same class. These items were scored on a four-point frequency scale using four response options: 0 = never, 1 = once, 2 = 2 or 3 times, and 3 = more than 3 times.

Subjective well-being psychometric scales

In the current study, two instruments are used for measuring SWB: Overall Life Satisfaction (OLS) and the Children's Subjective Well-Being Scale (CW-SWBS). The rationale for doing so is that different researchers recommended using more than one psychometric scale with different characteristics when measuring children's SWB because scales have been shown to have different sensitivities in diverse contexts (Casas et al. 2012; Casas 2016b).

Overall Life Satisfaction

OLS is a single-item psychometric scale used to measure how satisfied children are with their life as a whole. It uses a unipolar 11-point scale where 0 = 'not at all satisfied' and 10 = 'completely satisfied'. The OLS instrument was translated into the Indonesian language.

CW-SWBS

CW-SWBS is a multi-item, context-free psychometric scale, originally based on Student's Life Satisfaction (Huebner 1991), but modified in two successive survey waves in order to improve the scale's reliability and its multinational applicability (Rees and Main 2015). The final modified version was renamed 'CW-SWBS' by the Children's Worlds project (www.isciweb.org). The CW-SWBS was translated into the Indonesian language following the guidelines for translation of instruments (Borualogo et al. 2019).

There were five items used: (1) 'I enjoy my life', (2) 'My life is going well', (3) 'I have a good life', (4) 'The things that happen in my life are excellent', and (5) 'I am happy with my life'. The CW-SWBS version for 10 and 12-year-olds used an 11-point scale where 0 = 'not at all agree' and 10 = 'totally agree'. The version for the 8-year-old group used the same wording for each item but with five emoticons as the scale (Borualogo and Casas 2019a).

The CW-SWBS was tested using confirmatory factor analysis (CFA), which showed excellent fit (Borualogo and Casas 2019a). Fit indexes are as follows: for grade 2, chi-square (5) = 93.79; df= 5; p=.000; CFI = .99; SRMR = .018, and RMSEA = .047 (.039-.056); for grade 4, chi-square (5) = 75.16; df= 5; p=.000; CFI = .99; SRMR = .013, and RMSEA = .043 (.035-.052); and for grade 6, chi-square (5) = 94.58; df= 5; p=.000; CFI = .99; SRMR = .012 and RMSEA = .049 (.041-.058). Cronbach's α was .752 for grade 2, .840 for grade 4, and .875 for grade 6.

2.4. Data analysis

Children who reported having no siblings (n = 687) were not included in the sibling bullying analysis. The major implication is, therefore, that this analysis was done with a smaller sample for each bullying action (see Table 2).

We calculated descriptive statistics, including mean differences and F scores, with degrees of freedom for the two SWB indicators used here by considering significance level at $p < .01$. We regressed bullying items on each SWB indicator with gender, and age groups were entered as a covariate in the regression model. Results of this regression are displayed in Table 4. Finally, we regressed bullying items on each SWB indicator as dependent variables in order to identify significant associations of the bullying actions on SWB for each age group. All calculations were done with SPSS version 23.

3. Results

Older children tend to report experiencing bullying more often, with just two exceptions. Table 2 shows that in general, children in grade 6 (12-year-old group) report being bullied more frequently than those in grades 2 and 4 (8 and 10-year-old groups), except for being left out by other children in class. In the latter case, the highest frequency is observed to be in grade 4 (22.02%). The second exception is being called unkind names by siblings. In this case, a slight decrease is observed from grade 2 (13.22%) to grade 4 (13.00%).

Being hit by siblings is reported more often than being hit by children at school, while being called unkind names by siblings is reported much less frequently than being called unkind names by children at school.

Table 2 - Descriptive data of never bullied or bullied more than three times last month, by age groups and gender

		Grade 2	Grade 4	Grade 6			TOTAL
		(8 y.o.)	(10 y.o.)	(12 y.o.)	Girls	Boys	
How often being hit by siblings	Never	3,451	3,170	3,207	5,265	4,563	9,828
	%	80.52	72.87	72.41	78.25	72.00	75.22
	> 3 times	835	1,180	1,222	1,463	1,774	3,237
	%	19.48	27.13	27.59	21.75	28.00	24.78
	Total	4,286	4,350	4,429	6,728	6,337	13,065
How often being called unkind names by siblings	Never	3,471	3,940	4,407	6,174	5,644	11,818
	%	86.78	87	84.43	87.74	84.09	85.95
	> 3 times	529	589	813	863	1,068	1,931
	%	13.22	13.00	15.57	12.26	15.91	14.05

	Total	4,000	4,529	5,220	7,037	6,712	13,749
How often being hit by children at school	Never	3,411	2,787	3,123	5,408	3,913	9,321
	%	82.77	78.55	76.08	85.37	71.94	79.17
	> 3 times	710	761	982	927	1,526	2,453
	%	17.23	21.45	23.92	14.63	28.06	20.83
	Total	4,121	3,548	4,105	6335	5439	11,774
How often being called unkind names by children at school	Never	2,953	2,283	2,424	4,089	3,571	7,660
	%	80.51	61.72	54.82	67.34	62.46	64.98
	> 3 times	715	1416	1998	1,983	2,146	4129
	%	19.49	38.28	45.18	32.66	37.54	35.02
	Total	3,668	3,699	4,422	6072	5717	11,789
How often being left out by children in class	Never	3,197	2,876	3,599	4,849	4,823	9,672
	%	82.48	77.98	80.99	79.36	81.77	80.55
	> 3 times	679	812	845	1,261	1,075	2,336
	%	17.52	22.02	19.01	20.64	18.23	19.45
	Total	3,876	3,688	4,444	6110	5898	12,008

Table 2 also shows that boys reported being bullied by siblings at home and by children at school more frequently than did girls, with one exception: girls (20.6%) reported being left out by other children in class more frequently than did boys (18.2%). Both boys and girls reported being called unkind names more frequently by children at school (35.0% in total) than at home by siblings (14.05% in total). Both boys and girls, however, reported being hit by siblings at home (24.8% in total) more frequently than by children at school (20.8% in total).

Table 3 shows, first, that the mean scores of both SWB indicators (OLS and CW-SWBS) with the pooled sample increase from grade 2 to grade 4, and they decrease from grade 4 to grade 6, with one exception: the increase from grade 2 to grade 4 is much more noticeable when using CW-SWBS than when using OLS. The decreasing trend from grade 4 to grade 6 is observed for both boys and girls only

when using OLS. When using CW-SWBS, however, the girls' scores decrease, but the boys' scores increase insignificantly.

Table 3 - Mean scores of OLS and CW-SWBS by grade, gender, and type of bullying, if never bullied or bullied more than three times last month

		OLS				CW-SWBS					
		Grade 2	Grade 4	Grade 6	TOTAL	Grade 2	Grade 4	Grade 6	TOTAL		
		(8 y.o.)	(10 y.o.)	(12 y.o.)		(8 y.o.)	(10 y.o.)	(12 y.o.)			
POOLED SAMPLE	Girls	85.7	86.5	85.9	86.0	79.8	87.9	86.9	85.0		
	Boys	84.1	85.2	84.8	84.7	77.7	85.9	86.2	83.5		
	Total	84.9**	85.9**	85.4**	85.4**	78.8**	86.9**	86.5**	84.3**		
How often being hit by siblings	never	Girls	86.3	87.3	87.5	87.0	80.7	88.9	89.3	86.2	
		Boys	85.2	86.5	86.3	85.9	78.9	87.6	88.3	84.7	
		Total	85.8	86.9	86.9	86.5*	79.9	88.3	88.8	85.5*	
	more than 3 times	Girls	85.5	85.0	81.9	83.9	80.4	85.8	81.9	82.9	
		Boys	84.0	86.4	84.7	85.2	80.1	85.3	84.8	83.8	
		Total	84.7	85.8	83.4	84.6*	80.3	85.5	83.5	83.4*	
	Total	Girls	86.2	86.8	86.1	86.4	80.7	88.2	87.5	85.5	
		Boys	84.95	86.47	85.76	85.73	79.1	86.9	87.2	84.4	
		Total	85.6	86.6	85.9	86.0*	79.9	87.6	87.4	85.0*	
	How often being called unkind names by siblings	never	Girls	86.8	88.0	87.5	87.5	81.8	89.7	89.2	87.2
			Boys	86.4	86.8	86.6	86.6	80.84	88.1	88.1	86.0
			Total	86.6	87.4	87.1	87.1*	81.3	88.9	88.6	86.6*
more than 3 times		Girls	85.2	83.8	82.5	83.6	79.5	85.3	80.9	81.9	
		Boys	81.7	82.9	81.8	82.1	77.7	82.3	82.8	81.1	
		Total	83.1	83.3	82.1	82.8*	78.4	83.7	81.9	81.5*	
		<i>SD = 17.0</i>				<i>SD = 14.8</i>					
		<i>SD = 17.9</i>				<i>SD = 16.0</i>					
		<i>SD = 18.5</i>				<i>SD = 16.6</i>					
		<i>SD = 20.3</i>				<i>SD = 17.7</i>					

	Total	Girls	86.7	87.6	86.8	87.0	81.6	89.2	88.0	86.5	
		Boys	85.6	86.2	85.8	85.9	80.3	87.3	87.2	85.2	
		Total	86.1	86.9	86.3	86.5*	80.9	88.3	87.6	85.9*	
					<i>SD = 17.6</i>					<i>SD = 15.4</i>	
How often being hit by children at school	never	Girls	86.8	88.3	87.6	87.5	81.4	89.6	89.0	86.4	
		Boys	85.9	88.09	86.59	86.79	79.49	88.6	88.6	85.2	
		Total	86.4	88.2	87.1	87.2*	80.6	89.2	88.8	85.9*	
						<i>SD = 16.8</i>					<i>SD = 15.4</i>
	more than 3 times	Girls	85.2	84.8	83.1	84.2	77.9	86.5	84.4	83.4	
		Boys	82.8	83.5	83.3	83.2	78.6	84.1	84.8	82.6	
		Total	83.6	84.0	83.2	83.6*	78.4	84.9	84.6	82.9*	
						<i>SD = 19.9</i>					<i>SD = 17.0</i>
	Total	Girls	86.6	87.8	86.7	87.0	81.0	89.1	88.2	85.9	
Boys		85.1	86.7	85.5	85.7	79.2	87.3	87.4	84.5		
Total		85.9	87.3	86.2	86.4*	80.2	88.3	87.8	85.29*		
					<i>SD = 17.5</i>					<i>SD = 15.8</i>	
How often being called unkind names by children at school	never	Girls	87.3	88.6	87.6	87.8	82.7	90.1	89.4	86.9	
		Boys	86.4	87.3	86.8	86.8	80.9	88.4	89.2	85.8	
		Total	86.9	88.0	87.2	87.3*	81.9	89.3	89.3	86.5*	
						<i>SD = 16.9</i>					<i>SD = 15.0</i>
	more than 3 times	Girls	84.2	86.7	84.6	85.2	79.5	86.6	84.5	84.5	
		Boys	84.4	84.2	84.4	84.3	79.4	83.9	84.9	83.5	
		Total	84.3	85.4	84.5	84.8	79.44	85.3	84.7	84.0*	
						<i>SD = 18.3</i>					<i>SD = 16.7</i>
	Total	Girls	86.8	87.9	86.3	86.9	82.2	88.8	87.2	86.2	
Boys		85.9	86.1	85.7	85.9	80.6	86.6	87.3	84.9		
Total		86.4	87.0	85.9	86.4*	81.4	87.8	87.2	85.6*		
					<i>SD = 17.5</i>					<i>SD = 15.7</i>	
never	Girls	87.7	88.4	87.7	87.9	82.6	90.3	89.4	87.2		

How often being left out by other children in class		Boys	86.7	88.0	86.9	87.2	81.3	89.0	88.7	86.6
		Total	87.2	88.2	87.3	87.5*	82.0	89.6	89.0	86.9*
						<i>SD = 16.4</i>				<i>SD = 14.6</i>
	more than 3 times	Girls	84.9	84.9	82.8	84.1	77.9	85.1	82.7	82.5
		Boys	82.6	81.5	81.7	81.9	76.4	82.1	82.5	80.2
	Total		83.6	83.5	82.3	83.*	77.1	83.8	82.6	81.4*
						<i>SD = 20.7</i>				<i>SD = 18.2</i>
	Total	Girls	87.3	87.6	86.5	87.1	81.9	89.0	87.9	86.2
		Boys	85.8	86.8	86.1	86.2	80.3	87.7	87.7	85.4
	Total		86.6	87.2	86.3	86.7*	81.2	88.3	87.8	85.8*
					<i>SD = 17.4</i>				<i>SD = 15.6</i>	

** mean significant difference between grades at $p < .01$

* mean significant difference between frequency of being bullied at $p < .01$

In Table 3, we can also observe that children who reported having suffered any of the five kinds of bullying more than three times display significantly lower SWB in both indicators (OLS and CW-SWBS) than children reporting they had not suffered that kind of bullying in the last month.

Table 3 also shows gender differences in SWB for each of the sub-samples used to analyse each kind of bullying. Non-bullied girls display higher scores than non-bullied boys in absolutely all cases, both with OLS and CW-SWBS, although sometimes differences do not reach statistical significance. Bullied girls, however, display lower SWB scores than do bullied boys on some occasions, depending on the SWB indicator and the kinds of bullying. For grade 2, the kinds of bullying experienced by children

Table 4 - Pearson correlations between bullying items

Bullying items	n	1	2	3	4	5
1. Hit by siblings	20,221	--				
2. Called unkind names by siblings	18,740	.385**	--			
3. Hit by children at school	19,059	.298**	.227**	--		
4. Called unkind names by children at school	18,916	.261**	.272**	.438**	--	
5. Left out by other children in class	18,559	.207**	.222**	.386**	.410**	--

** $p < .01$

were being called unkind names by children at school (only when using OLS) and being hit by children at school (only when using CW-SWBS). Students in grade 4 experienced being hit by siblings (only with the OLS). And in grade 6 they experienced being hit by siblings (both with OLS and CW-SWBS), being called unkind names by siblings (only with CW-SWBS), being hit by children at school (only with OLS), and being called unkind names by children at school (only with CW-SWBS).

Table 4 shows the correlation between the bullying items used here. All correlations are significant at $p < .01$.

Table 5 - Regression of bullying actions on CW-SWBS with gender and age groups entered as control variables

Predictor Variables	b	SE	β	t	Sig
Gender	-.406	.473	-.014	-.859	.390
School grade	2.837	.280	.167	10.119*	.000
Hit by siblings	-.820	.819	-.020	-1.002	.316
Called unkind names by siblings	-3.310	.980	-.067	-3.378*	.001
Hit by children in school	-1.120	.963	-.027	-1.163	.245
Called unkind names by children in school	-1.257	.854	-.034	-1.472	.141
Left out by other children in class	-1.799	.953	-.041	-1.887	.059

n = 3,598. Adjusted $R^2 = .041$; F = 23.236; df = 7

* $p < .01$

Table 6 - Regression of bullying actions on Overall Life Satisfaction with gender and age groups entered as control variables

Predictor Variables	b	SE	β	t	Sig
Gender	.099	.524	.003	.189	.850
School grade	-.098	.311	-.005	-.315	.753
Hit by siblings	-.989	.908	-.023	-1.089	.276
Called unkind names by siblings	-2.514	1.087	-.047	-2.313*	.021
Hit by children in school	-3.159	1.068	-.069	-2.959	.003
Called unkind names by children in school	-.433	.947	-.011	-.457	.648
Left out by other children in class	-.221	1.057	-.005	-.210	.834

n = 3,598. Adjusted $R^2 = .012$; F = 7.502; df = 7

* $p < .01$

Table 5 shows that age groups displayed a significant contribution to CW-SWBS, while Table 6 shows that age groups did not apply to OLS. For both SWB scales (CW-SWBS and OLS), there were no significant gender differences. Based on these results, we regressed a model for each age group to analyse relevant differences.

Tables 7 to 10 show the regression model results for each age groups and each SWB scale. For grade 2, none of the bullying items analysed showed a significant contribution to SWB. For grade 4 (Tables 7 and 8), being bullied physically at school by other children displayed a significant negative contribution to SWB (with both OLS and CW-SWBS). None of the bullying actions by siblings showed a contribution to SWB for grade 4.

For grade 6 (Tables 9 and 10), both bullying actions at home and at school displayed negative contributions to SWB. Being hit by siblings and being called unkind names by children at school displayed a negative contribution to OLS, while being called unkind names by siblings, being left out by other children in class, and being hit by siblings showed a negative contribution to CW-SWBS.

Table 7 - Regression of bullying actions on CW-SWBS for grade 4 (10-year-old group)

Predictor Variables	b	SE	β	t	Sig
Hit by siblings	-.155	1.451	-.004	-.107	.915
Called unkind names by siblings	-2.282	1.825	-.047	-1.250	.212
Hit by children in school	-6.312	1.216	-.159	-5.192*	.000
Called unkind names by children in school	-1.133	1.516	-.033	-.747	.455
Left out by other children in class	.645	1.705	.016	.378	.705

n = 1,068. Adjusted R² = .028; F = 16.446; df = 2; Sig = .000

* p < .01

Table 8 - Regression of bullying actions on OLS for grade 4 (10-year-old group)

Predictor Variables	b	SE	β	t	Sig
Hit by siblings	.467	1.719	.010	.271	.786
Called unkind names by siblings	-2.747	2.163	-.048	-1.270	.204
Hit by children in school	-6.731	1.441	-.143	-4.670*	.000
Called unkind names by children in school	.750	1.796	.018	.418	.676
Left out by other children in class	-.032	2.020	-.001	-.016	.987

n = 1,068. Adjusted R² = -.019; F = 11.573; df = 2; Sig = .000

* p < .01

Table 9 - Regression of bullying actions on CW-SWBS for grade 6 (12-year-old group)

Predictor Variables	b	SE	β	t	Sig
Hit by siblings	-3.262	1.244	-.092	-2.623*	.009
Called unkind names by siblings	-6.357	1.463	-.147	-4.346*	.000
Hit by children in school	2.342	1.313	.066	1.784	.075
Called unkind names by children in school	-2.192	1.198	-.068	-1.830	.068
Left out by other children in class	-4.159	1.196	-.104	-3.477*	.001

n = 1,224. Adjusted $R^2 = .069$; $F = 23.786$; $df = 4$; $Sig = .000$

* $p < .01$

Table 10 - Regression of bullying actions on OLS for grade 6 (12-year-old group)

Predictor Variables	b	SE	β	t	Sig
Hit by siblings	-4.654	1.348	-.109	-3.453*	.001
Called unkind names by siblings	-3.481	1.819	-.067	-1.913	.056
Hit by children in school	-.744	1.610	-.017	-.462	.644
Called unkind names by children in school	-3.154	1.209	-.082	-2.609*	.009
Left out by other children in class	.008	1.704	.000	.005	.996

n = 1,224

Full model statistics: $R^2 = .027$; Adjusted $R^2 = .025$; $F = 11.280$; $df = 3$; $Sig = .000$

* $p < .01$

4. Discussion

Results of this study show that the frequency of children being bullied more than three times in the last month by siblings is quite high, particularly being hit by siblings, which is reported in a much higher percentage (24.8%) than being hit by children at school (20.8%) (Table 2). This shows that sibling bullying is a serious problem in Indonesia as the cases are more frequent than school bullying. Although not many bullying cases at home have been reported in Indonesia, this does not mean they are non-existent. Eriksen and Jensen (2009) stated that physical aggression between siblings has been reported to be the most common form of family violence. Up to now, however, there has been relatively little research on sibling bullying.

Another study in Indonesia revealed that 61.9% of Indonesian students aged 11 to 16 reported being bullied by their peers at school (Skrzypiec et al. 2018). This is in line with results in this current study that displayed a high frequency of students being bullied at school. About 79.4% of students reported that they experienced at least one harmful bullying incident at school (Skrzypiec et al. 2018). The current study did not ask the children about harmful acts of bullying as perceived by them, but instead

considered cases of being bullied more than three times in the past month, following Olweus' (1979) definition of bullying as repeated aggressive behaviour.

Being hit at school is reported to be twice as frequent among boys (28.06%) as girls (14.63%). Being left out by other children at school seems to be more frequent among children aged 10 compared to 8 and 12-year-old groups. In our research, this happens slightly more frequently among girls (20.64%) than boys (18.23%).

These results are in line with other studies on school bullying which showed that boys tend to be more overt in expressing their aggressive behaviour towards other boys. Crick and Grotpeter (1995) and Björkqvist, Lagerspetz, and Kaukiainen (1992) stated that boys tend to engage in more overt and direct aggression. In contrast, girls engage in more relational (Crick and Grotpeter 1995) and indirect (Björkqvist, Lagerspetz and Kaukiainen 1992) aggression. These results explain why girls experienced more frequent psychological bullying, while boys experienced more frequent physical bullying at school.

Other studies revealed opposite findings in gender differences regarding frequency of being bullied. Hemphill et al. (2015) found no gender differences in increased rates of traditional bullying or in decreased relational aggression over time between boys and girls.

In fact, according to our results using a representative sample from a West Java province, the most frequent kind of bullying in Indonesia of the measured kinds of bullying is being called unkind names by children at school – a problem reported by more than one third (35%) of children in the studied age groups, most frequently among older students (45.2% of the 12-year-olds reported being bullied more than three times last month). And it seems to be only slightly more frequent among boys (37.5%) than among girls (32.7%). Being called unkind names by siblings is also more frequent among boys (15.9%) than girls (12.3%). These results are in line with previous studies (Smith and Sharp 1994; Smith and Madsen 1999; Wolke, Woods, Bloomfield and Karstadt 2000) that found the most commonly identified type of bullying to be verbal or name calling, followed by physical bullying.

Gender and age have been suggested to be associated with sibling bullying (Tanrikulu and Campbell 2015). In this study, both boys and girls reported experiencing physical bullying by siblings, but girls reported experiencing physical bullying by siblings at home much more frequently (21.8%) than being bullied physically at school (14.6%) (Table 2), while boys reported being bullied by siblings at home and by children at school with the same frequency (28% and 28.1%). Some researchers have pointed out that, in relation to gender in family relationships, sisters are more affectionate, less conflictual, and less antagonistic compared to brothers (Dunn 2002). In contrast, brothers are involved in more conflicts with siblings and demonstrate more hostility and physical violence (Brody 2004). This, in addition to the imbalance of power among siblings due to differences in physical strength, may explain why girls reported more frequent physical bullying by siblings at home.

In general, in this Indonesian sample, the older the children, the more they reported being bullied. This result is in line with O'Connell, Pepler, and Craig (1999), who observed that older boys (grades 4–6) were more likely to participate in bullying than younger boys (grades 1–3) and girls. Children at age 12 are in transition to becoming teenagers. In Indonesia, they are in the last grade of elementary school, in transition to middle school. It is a critical period when children explore their new social roles and identities, and they need to be accepted by peers, which might result in aggressive behaviour (Hong and Espelage 2012; Pellegrini 2002).

Although bullying has been widely studied (Olweus 1978, 1994, 1997; Smith and Sharp 1994; Smith and Brain 2000; Espelage and Swearer 2003; Lai, Ye and Chang 2008; Wolke and Skew 2012; Smith, Pepler and Rigby 2004), not much research exists investigating the association between bullying and SWB (see Savahl et al. 2019; and Tiliouine 2015).

SWB is understood to be a psychosocial aspect of quality of life and consists of positive and negative affect and a cognitive aspect called 'life satisfaction' (Diener 2012). Diener (2012) found that one of the major factors affecting well-being is the quality of an individual's social interactions, while Casas (2016a) stated that a strong predictor of children's SWB is bullying. These two findings demonstrate how important it is for children to have good social interactions (both with siblings and children at school) and to not experience bullying (physical, verbal, or psychological). Due to a rising number of cases of bullying in Indonesia, it is important to know how bullying – physical, verbal, and psychological, both at home and at school – affects children's SWB across three age groups (8, 10, and 12-year-olds). If we do not understand how bullying affects children's SWB, we cannot help them improve their SWB.

Indonesian girls usually display higher mean scores of SWB compared to boys. These results are in line with studies by Crick and Grotpeter (1995), Björkqvist, Lagerspetz, and Kaukiainen (1992), Craig et al. (2009), and Monks et al. (2009). In the Indonesian context, this is because girls are protected more by parents than are boys. Therefore, when girls express unhappiness, parents are usually aware of it. Indonesian girls are allowed to express their emotions, and it is socially acceptable to seek help, which is not the case for boys. These factors allow girls to maintain higher SWB than boys. Cummins' theory of homeostasis (2014) sees this as one of the buffers that help individuals maintain their level of SWB.

Studies on gender differences in bullying victimisation display inconsistent findings. Although results from this current study showed gender differences in frequency of being bullied and scores of SWB, other studies revealed contrary results. Kokkinos (2013) found no gender differences in bullying, victimisation, or perceived parenting. Tokunaga (2010) reported the same findings in cyberbullying victimisation, where girls and boys reported similar frequencies of being cyberbullied.

Further studies on gender differences, both in traditional bullying and cyberbullying, are needed to obtain a better understanding of the effects of gender on bullying.

Overall results show that children who are not involved in bullying display higher scores in both of the two SWB indicators used here (OLS and CW-SWBS). Both indicators showed increasing scores from age 8 to age 10, which then decreased from 10 to 12 years of age. In line with this result, data from the Children's Worlds Second Wave International Survey showed that SWB tends to decrease with age in all countries from 10 years of age onward (Casas 2016b).

Bullying showed a significant negative contribution to SWB in Indonesian children in the 10 and 12-year-old groups (Table 3). Children who experienced being bullied more than three times in the past month frequently displayed lower SWB compared to children who were not bullied in last month. Both sibling bullying and school bullying displayed negative contributions to children's SWB. These results show how seriously bullying affects children's SWB, and they are in line with results obtained by Tiliouine (2015) and Savahl et al. (2019).

However, results show different contributions of bullying to SWB across the three age groups (8, 10, 12 years) studied here.

In the 8-year-old group, no significant differences were observed between children who were bullied and those who were not. Regression models showed that none of the bullying types had a significant association to the SWB of this age group (Table 4). It seems that 8-year-old children become used to being victims of bullying, and apparently their SWB does not change significantly as a consequence of being bullied by siblings or by children at school. However, children aged 8 display the lowest SWB mean (both for OLS and CW-SWBS) compared to 10 and 12-year-olds (Table 3). Although the bullying seems to be manageable, adults still need to be aware that these children might be having serious problems.

The lowest SWB means for the three age groups were observed for verbal bullying and psychological bullying as opposed to physical bullying, particularly for being called unkind names by siblings and left out by other children at school. OLS displays the lowest mean scores for being called unkind names by siblings for all grades, while CW-SWBS displays the lowest scores for this item for grade 6 and for being left out by other children for grades 2 and 4. Therefore, these two instruments seem to have different sensibilities to dissimilar events and contexts in children's lives.

For 10-year-old children, being physically bullied at school shows significant negative association with SWB (Table 4), while being verbally or psychologically bullied does not display any significant association. It seems that children at age 10 are able to adapt to the situations in which they are bullied verbally at home, and bullied both verbally and psychologically at school, and for that reason these situations do not show a significant impact on their level of SWB.

According to our regression models, the SWB of children aged 12 appears to be more affected by different bullying experiences than that of younger children. In fact, different significant contributions are identified depending on the SWB indicator used as the dependent variable when all the bullying actions are included as independent variables in the regression model. However, the bullying actions with the highest negative significant contribution to SWB for this age group are being bullied by siblings (being hit and called unkind names by siblings). These negative associations are differently captured depending on whether the model uses OLS or CW-SWBS as the dependent variable. The lowest mean SWB scores for this age group are displayed for children bullied by siblings, suggesting that being bullied by siblings has the highest impact on children's SWB for the 12-year-old group among all bullying situation here analysed.

Using Cummins' theory of SWB homeostasis (2014) for Indonesian children who participated in this study, bullying seems to be a challenge they have to face in their daily lives. Indonesian children seem to adapt to these negative challenges (particularly 8-year-olds, according to our results), including being bullied at home and at school, and the situation apparently does not significantly disrupt the homeostatic controlled set-point of SWB in most cases. These results appear to be consistent across age groups. Results of this study show that the level of well-being of Indonesian children who experienced bullying is lower than children who had never been bullied. According to Cummins (2014), if the level of SWB moves towards the margins of the homeostatic system, the system then functions to revert the SWB level back to the normal range of around 60–90. This explains the adaptation process Indonesian children went through every time they experienced bullying at home or at school. Children maintained their well-being even though they experienced bullying, shown by their scores being around 81.4–84.8. Despite this, they remained relatively high in the normal range; in general, SWB scores for bullied children were significantly lower than those of non-bullied children (except for the 8-year-old group), and such high scores may hide the problem and make it invisible to many adults. This is a serious problem for children, and it needs to be taken into account by parents and teachers in order to help the children, whose mental health might be at serious risk.

5. Conclusion

Bullying in Indonesia is at very high levels of prevalence compared to other Asian countries (Sindo Weekly 2017). The prevalence of verbal and psychological bullying both at school and at home is very worrying, and physical bullying also presents excessively high percentages, particularly at home and among boys at school. The findings of this study indicate that being bullied significantly contributes to a lower level of SWB in Indonesian children. According to the homeostasis theory of well-being (Cummins 2014), most children are able to adapt to bullying and maintain their life satisfaction at a pretty high level. However, their level of SWB is significantly lower than for non-bullied children, and we should take into account that these children may be at risk for mental health problems. Therefore, parents and teachers need to be aware that these children may need support because of the negative outcomes associated with bullying. Parents and teachers also need to understand that a high frequency of bullying (more than three times in the past month) becomes a serious problem for children, and those who bully these children need to be stopped.

This study has some limitations. It only focused on the contribution of bullying to children's SWB. It also focused on children from three age groups (8, 10, and 12-year-olds) and could not explain bullying and SWB for children younger than 8 years of age and older than 12. Samples in this study were children who go to school. Therefore, results could not explain bullying and SWB for children who do not go to school but might still experience bullying in their daily lives, e.g., children who live on the street and away from family. This study did not explore whether children who were bullied at home might also be more vulnerable to being bullied at school.

It is recommended that future research will focus on ways of preventing children from being bullied. More research is needed on preventative action. Prevention programmes are crucial, and they are mostly focused on school bullying, for example, the KIVA programme (www.kivaprogram.net) was developed in Europe and provides KIVA curricula for students through lessons and online games. Since bullying happens not only at school, prevention programmes for both school bullying and sibling bullying need to be developed in Indonesia. It is also crucial to conduct evaluative research of ongoing preventive and intervention programmes in order to contribute with evidence-based data of their achievements.

Acknowledgements

Children's Worlds Survey in Indonesia was supported by UNISBA (Universitas Islam Bandung), UNICEF Indonesia, and Statistics Indonesia (BPS). This survey was funded by UNICEF Indonesia and supported by BAPPENAS (Indonesian Ministry of National Development Planning). Thanks to all enumerators who have helped with data collection and to all participating schools and children.

References

- Ananta, Aris and Salahudin Muhidin (2005). "Completion of Vital Transition and Changing Migration in Indonesia: Empirical Results and Projection Scenarios." *Population Review* 44 (1): 36-55.
- Badan Pusat Statistik Provinsi Jawa Barat [Central Bureau of Statistics of West Java Province]. (online database). Jumlah Penduduk di Provinsi Jawa Barat [Number of Inhabitants in West Java Province]. [<https://jabar.bps.go.id/dynamictable/2020/02/11/212/-jumlah-penduduk-dan-jenis-kelamin-menurut-kabupaten-kota-di-provinsi-jawa-barat-2019.html>, accessed May 27, 2020]
- Björkqvist, Kaj, Kristi M. J. Lagerspetz, and Ari Kaukiainen (1992). "Do Girls Manipulate and Boys Fight? Developmental Trends in Regard to Direct and Indirect Aggression." *Aggressive Behaviour* 18 (2): 117-127.
- Borualogo, Ihsana Sabriani and Ferran Casas (2019a). "Adaptation and Validation of The Children's World Subjective Well-Being Scale (CW-SWBS) in Indonesia." *Jurnal Psikologi* 46 (2): 102-116.
- Borualogo, Ihsana Sabriani and Ferran Casas (2019b). "Subjective Well-Being of Bullied Children in Indonesia." *Applied Research in Quality of Life* 1-21. [<https://doi.org/10.1007/s11482-019-09778-1>, accessed November 4, 2019]
- Borualogo, Ihsana Sabriani and Erlang Gumilang. (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] *Psymphatic* 6 (1): 15-30.
- Borualogo, Ihsana Sabriani et al. (2019). "Process of Translation of The Children's Worlds Subjective Well-Being Scale in Indonesia." *Social and Humaniora Research Symposium (SoRes 2018)* 307: 180-183 [<https://www.atlantis-press.com/proceedings/sores-18/55915312>, accessed November 4, 2019].
- Brody, Gene H. (2004). "Siblings' Direct and Indirect Contributions to Child Development." *Current Directions in Psychological Science* 13: 124-126.
- Casas, Ferran (2011). "Subjective Social Indicators and Child and Adolescent Well-Being." *Child Indicators Research* 4 (4): 555-575.
- Casas, Ferran (2016a). "Children, Adolescents and Quality of Life: The Social Sciences Perspective Over Two Decades," (pp. 3-21) in *A Life Devoted to Quality of Life. Festschrift in Honor of Alex C. Michalos*, edited by Filomena Maggino. Dordrecht : Springer Publisher.
- Casas, Ferran (2016b). "The Decreasing with Age Subjective Well-Being Trend: New Data and New Challenges for Research and Education." Paper presented at the Global Summit on Childhood, March 31 to April 3, 2016.
- Casas, Ferran et al. (2012). "Subjective Indicators of Personal Well-Being Among Adolescents. Performance and Results for Different Scales in Latin-language Speaking Countries: A Contribution to the International Debate." *Child Indicators Research* 5: 1-28.
- Coyne, Iain, Penelope Smith-Lee Chong, Elizabeth Seigne, and Peter Randall (2003). "Self and Peer Nominations of Bullying: An Analysis of Incidents Rates, Individual Differences, and

- Perceptions of the Working Environment.” *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology* 12 (3): 209-228.
- Craig, Wendy et al. (2009). “A Cross-National Profile of Bullying and Victimization Among Adolescents in 40 Countries.” *International Journal of Public Health* 54: 216–224.
- Crick, Nicki R., and Jennifer K. Grotpeter (1995). “Relational Aggression, Gender, and Social-Psychological Adjustment.” *Child Development* 66: 710-722.
- Cummins, Robert A (1995). *The Comprehensive Quality of Life Scale: Theory and Development: Health Outcomes and Quality of Life Measurement*. Canberra, ACT: Institute of Health and Welfare.
- Cummins, Robert A. (2010). “Subjective Well-Being, Homeostatically Protected Mood and Depression: A synthesis.” *Journal of Happiness Studies* 11 (1): 1–17.
- Cummins, Robert A. (2014). “Understanding the Well-Being of Children and Adolescents Through Homeostatic Theory,” (pp. 635-662) in *Handbook of Child Well-Being: Theories, Methods and Policies in Global Perspective*, edited by A. Ben Arieh, F. Casas, I. Frønes, and J.E. Korbin. Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Springer.
- Diener, Ed (1984). “Subjective Well-Being.” *Psychological Bulletin* 95 (3): 542-575.
- Diener, Ed (2012). “New Findings and Future Directions for Subjective Well-Being Research.” *The American Psychologist* 67 (8): 590-597.
- Diener, Ed, Shigehiro Oishi, and Richard E. Lucas (2015). “National Accounts of Subjective Well-Being.” *American Psychological Association* 70 (3): 234-242.
- Diener, Ed, Eunkook Suh, and Shigehiro Oishi (1997). “Recent Findings on Subjective Well-Being.” *Indian Journal of Clinical Psychology* 24 (1): 25-41.
- Diener, Ed, Eunkook Suh, Richard E. Lucas, and Heidi L. Smith (1999). “Subjective Well-being: Three Decades on Progress.” *Psychological Bulletin* 125 (2): 276-302.
- Dombrowski, Stefan C., and Karen L. Gischlar (2006). “Supporting School Professionals Through the Establishment of a School District Policy on Child Maltreatment.” *Education* 127 (2): 234-243.
- Duncan, Renae D. (1999). “Peer and Sibling Aggression: An Investigation of Intra-and Extra-Familial Bullying.” *Journal of Interpersonal Violence* 14: 871-886.
- Dunn, Judy. (2002). “Sibling Relationships,” (pp. 223-237) in *Childhood Social Development*, edited by P. K. Smith and C. H. Hart. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Ensor, Rosie, Alex Marks, Lorna Jacobs, and Claire Hughes (2010). “Trajectories of Antisocial Behaviour Towards Siblings Predict Antisocial Behaviour Towards Peers.” *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry* 51 (11): 1208-1216.
- Eriksen, Shelley, and Vickie Jensen (2009). “A Push Or A Punch: Distinguishing the Severity of Sibling Violence.” *Journal of Interpersonal Violence* 24: 183-208.

- Espelage, Dorothy L., and Susan M. Swearer (2003). "Research on School Bullying and Victimization: What Have We Learned and Where Do We Go From Here?." *School Psychology Review* 32 (3): 365-383.
- Gass, Krista, Jennifer Jenkins, and Judy Dunn (2007). "Are Sibling Relationships Protective? A Longitudinal Study." *Journal of Child Psychology Psychiatry* 48: 75-167.
- Goodwin, Megan P., and Bruce Roscoe (1990). "Sibling Violence and Antagonistic Interactions Among Middle Adolescents". *Adolescence* 25: 451-467.
- Graham, Sandra (2006). "Peer Victimization in School: Exploring the Ethnic Context." *Current Directions in Psychological Science* 15: 317-321.
- Harunsiyah, Moch (online database). Mensos: Bunuh Diri Anak Indonesia 40 persen Karena Bullying.[Ministry of Social: 40% of Suicidal Cases Among Indonesian Children were Because of Bullying] [<https://www.liputan6.com/news/read/2361551/mensos-bunuh-diri-anak-indonesia-40-persen-karena-bullying>, accessed November 4, 2019]
- Hemphill, Sheryl A. et al. (2015). "Bullying in Schools: Rates, Correlates, and Impact on Mental Health" (pp. 185-205) in *Violence and Mental Health*, edited by Lindert J. and Levav I. Dordrecht: Springer.
- Hinduja, Sameer and Justin W. Patchin (2010). "Bullying, Cyberbullying, and Suicide." *Archive of Suicide Research* 14 (3): 206-221.
- Hong, Jun Sung and Dorothy L. Espelage (2012). "A Review Research on Bullying and Peer Victimization in School: An Ecological System Analysis." *Aggression and Violent Behavior* 17: 311-322.
- Huebner, E. Scott (1991). "Initial Development of The Student's Life Satisfaction Scale." *School Psychology International* 12: 231-240.
- Hymel, Shelley and Susan M. Swearer (2015). "Four Decades of Research on School Bullying: An Introduction." *American Psychologist* 70 (4): 293-299.
- Kementerian Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan Indonesia. (2015). Peraturan Menteri Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan Indonesia Nomor 82 Tahun 2015 Tentang Pencegahan dan Penanggulangan Tindak Kekerasan di Lingkungan Satuan Pendidikan [Regulation of the Ministry of Education and Culture of the Republic of Indonesia Number 82 Year 2015 regarding prevention and management of violence in the education unit environment].
- Kementerian Perencanaan Pembangunan Nasional (Bappenas) dan United Nations Children's Fund. (2017). Laporan Baseline SDG tentang Anak-Anak di Indonesia [SDG Baseline Report on Children in Indonesia], Jakarta: BAPPENAS and UNICEF.
- Kim, Young Shin, Yun-Joo Koh, and Bennett Leventhal (2005) "School Bullying and Suicidal Risk in Korean Middle School Students." *Pediatrics* 115: 357-363.
- Krienert, Jessie L., and Jeffrey A. Walsh (2011). "My Brother's Keeper: A Contemporary Examination of Reported Sibling Violence Using National Level Data 2000-2005." *Journal of Family Violence* 26 (5): 331-342.

- Koentjaraningrat (2005). *Pengantar Antropologi II: Pokok-pokok Etnografi [Introduction to Anthropology: Ethnography Highlights]*. Jakarta: Rineka Cipta.
- Kokkinos, Constantinos M. (2013). "Bullying and Victimization in Early Adolescence: Associations With Attachment Style and Perceived Parenting." *Journal of School Violence* 12: 174-192.
- Lai, Shu-Ling, Renmin Ye, and Kuo-Pao Chang (2008). "Bullying in Middle schools: An Asian Pacific Regional Study." *Asia Pacific Education Review* 9 (4): 503-515.
- McCullough, Gable, E. Scott Huebner, and James E. Laughlin (2000). "Life Events, Self-Concept, and Adolescents' Positive Subjective Well-Being." *Psychology in the Schools* 37 (3): 281-290.
- McFall, Stephanie L. and Chris Garrington, Eds. (2011). *Understanding Society: Early Findings From the First Wave of the UK's Household Longitudinal Study*. Colchester: Institute for Social and Economic Research. University of Essex.
- Menesini, Ersilia, Marina Camodeca, and Annalaura Nocentini (2010). "Bullying Among Siblings: The Role of Personality and Relational Variables." *British Journal of Developmental Psychology* 28: 921-939.
- Monks, Claire et al. (2009). "Bullying in Different Contexts: Commonalities, Differences and the Role of Theory." *Aggression and Violent Behaviour* 14: 146-156.
- Mullis, Ina V.S., Michael O. Martin, Pierre Foy, and Martin Hooper (2017). *ePIRLS 2016 International Results in Online Informational Reading*. Boston: International Study Center Lynch School of Education
- Novianto, Raka Dwi (online database). *Catatan KPAI Bidang Pendidikan: Kasus Bullying Paling Banyak*. [KPAI Notes in Educational Sector: Bullying Cases are the Most Frequent] [<https://nasional.sindonews.com/read/1324346/15/catatan-kpai-bidang-pendidikan-kasus-bullying-paling-banyak-1532346331>, accessed November 4, 2000]
- O'Connell, Pat, Debra J. Pepler, and Wendy Craig (1999). "Peer Involvement in Bullying: Insights and Challenges for Intervention." *Journal of Adolescence* 22: 437-452.
- Olweus, Dan (1978). *Aggression in the Schools: Bullies and Whipping Boys*. Washington, D.C.: Hemisphere Press (John Wiley).
- Olweus, Dan (1994). "Annotation: Bullying at School: Basic Facts and Effects of School Based Intervention Program." *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry* 35 (7): 1171-1190.
- Olweus, Dan (1997). "Bully/Victim Problems in School: Facts and Intervention." *European Journal of Psychology of Education* 12 (4): 495-510.
- Pellegrini, A.D. (2002). "Bullying, Victimization, and Sexual Harassment During the Transition to Middle School." *Educational Psychologist* 37: 151-163.
- Pennington, Katherine (online database). *David Beckham Tackles Bullying and Violence in Indonesian Schools*. [<https://www.reuters.com/article/us-indonesia-education-celebrities/david-beckham-tackles-bullying-and-violence-in-indonesian-schools-idUSKBN1H4235>, accessed November 4, 2019]

- Pradewo, Bintang and Sabik Aji Taufan (online database). Angka Perundungan Anak Tinggi, Simak Pesan KPAI Untuk Para Orang Tua. [Higher Bullying Cases, Listen To KPAI Messages To Parents] JawaPos.com. [<https://www.jawapos.com/nasional/23/07/2019/angka-perundungan-anak-tinggi-simak-pesan-kpai-untuk-para-orang-tua/>, accessed November 4, 2019].
- Rahayu, Lisye Sri (online database). KPAI: Angka Kekerasan Pada Anak Januari-April 2019 Masih Tinggi. [KPAI: The Rate of Violence in Children from Januari-April 2019 is Still High] detikNews. [<https://news.detik.com/berita/d-4532984/kpai-angka-kekerasan-pada-anak-januari-april-2019-masih-tinggi>, accessed November 4, 2019].
- Rees, Gwyther and Gill Main (2015). Children's Views on Their Lives and Well-Being in 15 Countries: A Report on the Children's Worlds survey, 2013-14. Children's Worlds Project (ISCWeB). [http://www.isciweb.org/_Uploads/dbsAttachedFiles/ChildrensWorlds2015-FullReport-Final.pdf, accessed November 4, 2019]
- Rigby, Ken (2002). *New Perspectives on Bullying*. London & Philadelphia: Jessica Kingsley.
- Savahl, Shazly et al. (2019). "Children's Experiences of Bullying Victimization and the Influence on Subjective Well-Being: A Multinational Comparison." *Child Development* 20 (2): 1-18.
- Shwalb, David W. et al. (2010). "East and Southeast Asia: Japan, South Korea, Vietnam, and Indonesia," (pp. 445-464) in *Handbook of Cultural Developmental Science*, edited by M. H. Bornstein New York: Psychology Press Taylor & Francis Group.
- Sindo Weekly (online database). Indonesia Tempati Posisi Tertinggi Perundungan di ASEAN. [Indonesia is in the Highest Position on Bullying Rate in ASEAN] [<https://nasional.sindonews.com/read/1223442/15/indonesia-tempati-posisi-tertinggi-perundungan-di-asean-1500880739>, accessed November 4, 2019]
- Skrzypiec, G. et al. (2018). "Self-Reported Harm of Adolescent Peer Aggression in Three World Regions." *Child Abuse and Neglect* 85: 101-117.
- Smith, Peter K. and Paul Brain (2000). "Bullying in Schools: Lessons From Two Decades of Research." *Aggressive Behaviour* 26: 1-9
- Smith, Peter K., Kirsten C. Madsen, and Janet C. Moody (1999). "What Causes the Decline in Reports of Being Bullied at School?" *Educational Research* 41 (3): 1-19.
- Smith, Peter K., Debra Pepler, and Ken Rigby (2004). *Bullying in School: How Successful Can Interventions Be?* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Smith, Peter K., and Sonia Sharp (1994). *School Bullying: Insights and Perspectives*. London: Routledge.
- Stormshak, Elizabeth A., Christina J. Bellanti, and Karen L. Bierman. (1996). "The Quality of Sibling Relationships and the Development of Social Competence and Behavioural Control in Aggressive Children." *Developmental Psychology* 32: 79-89.
- Tanrikulu, Ibrahim and Marilyn A. Campbell (2015). "Sibling Bullying Perpetration: Associations with Gender, Grade, Peer Perpetration, Train Anger, and Moral Disengagement." *Journal of Interpersonal Violence* 30 (6): 1010-1024.

- Tiliouine, Habib (2015). "School Bullying Victimization and Subjective Well-Being in Algeria." *Child Indicators Research* 8 (1): 133-150.
- Tokunaga, Robert S. (2010). "Following You Home From School: A Critical Review and Synthesis of Research on Cyberbullying Victimization" *Computers in Human Behavior* 26: 277-287.
- Tucker, Corinna Jenkins, David Finkelhor, Heather Turner, and Anne Shattuck (2013). "Association of Sibling Aggression with Child and Adolescent Mental Health." *Pediatric* 132: 79-84.
- Varela, Jorge J. et al. (2017). "Life Satisfaction, School Satisfaction, and School Violence: A Mediation Analysis for Chilean Adolescent Victims and Perpetrators." *Child Indicators Research* 11 (2): 487-505.
- Wang, Jing, Ronald J. Iannotti, and Tonja R. Nansel (2009). "School Bullying Among Adolescents in the United States : Physical, Verbal, Relational, and Cyber." *Journal of Adolescent Health* 45: 368-375.
- West Java Incorporated. (online database). West Java Overview. [<https://westjavainc.org/west-java/overview/>, accessed May 27, 2020]
- Wolke, Dieter, and Muthanna M. Samara (2004). "Bullied by Siblings: Association With Peer Victimization and Behaviour Problems in Israeli Lower Secondary School Children." *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry* 45: 1015-1029.
- Wolke, Dieter, and Alexandra Skew (2012). "Bullying Among Siblings." *International Journal of Adolescence Medical Health* 24 (1): 17-25.
- Wolke, Dieter, Neil Tippet, and Slava Dantchev (2015). "Bullying in the family: sibling bullying." *The Lancet Psychiatry* 2: 917-929.
- Wolke, Dieter, Sarah Woods, Linda Bloomfield and Lyn Karstadt (2000). "The association between direct and relational bullying and behaviour problems among primary school children." *Journal of Child Psychology* 41 (8): 989-1002.