

A NEW TOOL CONTRIBUTING TO THE MANAGEMENT OF BULLYING AND HARASSMENT IN HIGHER EDUCATION INSTITUTIONS

Vveinhardt J., Fominiene V.B., Streimikiene D.*

Abstract: Bullying and harassment in higher education sector impacts negatively on wellbeing of those who participating in these episodes and also gives wide-ranging negative consequences for every institution and for whole sector. It is necessary to develop an instrument that can reliably identify incidents of bullying and harassment and would contribute to setting targets for intervention and provide a basis for effective management of this phenomenon. The purpose of this research was to verify the dimensions and the methodological characteristics of the new tool. The survey employed a specially constructed questionnaire, which covers the following dimensions: communication, personal reputation, student's reputation, experienced harm, intervention measures at higher education institution.

Psychometric properties of the questionnaire were assessed in a sample of 623 students. Verification of the methodological and psychometric characteristics of the questionnaire Bullying and Single Cases of Harassment in Higher Education Institutions (B-SCH-St) confirmed its validity and reliability. Also study revealed that in Lithuanian higher education institutions effective bullying and harassment management activities are not carried out.

Key words: Questionnaire; Verification of dimensions; Higher education sector; Management strategy; Bullying; Single cases of harassment; Europe

DOI: 10.17512/pjms.2020.21.2.31

Article history:

Received January 19, 2020; *Revised* April 16, 2020; *Accepted* April 26, 2020.

Introduction

Among adults, bullying and single cases of harassment is not limited to organizations from different sectors (Feijó et al., 2019), but also are fixed in institutions of higher education. However, having become a universal problem, phenomena in the relations of students in higher education still does not receive enough attention (Lund and Ross, 2017; Vaill et al., 2019; Vveinhardt et al., 2019; Pörhölä et al., 2020). This situation can be attributed to prevailing opinion that bullying peaks at 11-14 years of age (Acosta et al., 2019), and in the later years

***Jolita Vveinhardt** Prof. (PhD), Institute of Sport Science and Innovations; Lithuanian Sports University; **Vilija Bite Fominiene** Assoc. prof. (PhD), Department of Sport and Tourism Management, Lithuanian Sports University, **Dalia Streimikiene** Prof. (PhD), Institute of Sport Science and Innovations; Lithuanian Sports University

✉ corresponding author: dalia.streimikiene@lsu.lt

✉ jolita.vveinhardt@lsu.lt; vilija.fominiene@lsu.lt

bullying declines. However, quite abundant studies on workplace bullying, revealing prevalence of the phenomenon across sectors (Lange et al., 2019), casts doubt on such findings and confirm the statement that the likelihood of encountering bullying later in life remains high (Curwen et al., 2011). In such case, there also appears a need to go deep into bullying and harassment problems in the higher education sector. This is also reinforced by scanty findings of studies carried out in different countries, which reveal that some students, which we can name customers based on the student-as-consumer approach (Bunce et al., 2017), experience harassment and bullying in one and the other form (Sinkkonen et al., 2014; Budden et al., 2015; Lund and Ross, 2016; Pearson, 2016). Such a situation impacts negatively on psychological or health wellbeing of those who participating in bullying episodes (Birks et al., 2017; Jantzer and Cashel, 2017; Alavi et al., 2015) and also gives rise wide-ranging negative consequences for the organisations (Vartia and Leka, 2011).

However, research carried out, revealing a variety of sources of bullying and harassment, types of bullying or roles of persons involved, is quite often determined by the chosen research methodology (Shaw et al., 2013) Research literature shows that researchers most often use self-report assessment, but applying different research instruments. Psychometric characteristics of some of the questionnaires are not provided at all in many scientific publications. This partly complicates the work of other researchers dealing with the same research problem. There is also the absence of a questionnaire covering not only single cases of harassment and bullying, but also the dimensions revealing the current situation (in higher education institutions) and the situation in the past (in secondary schools). It is also equally important to highlight that in most cases the intervention means applied at the moment are under investigation as well (American Educational Research Association, 2013; Reid et al., 2016), but students' approach to it is particularly important, what kind of measures they consider truly paying off, and what measures should be taken that have not been used so far.

In order to fill a gap in this area it is necessary to develop an instrument that can reliably diagnose single cases of harassment and bullying of students in their interrelations. Such instrument would not only enable to identify incidents of bullying and harassment and state their prevalence, but it would also contribute to setting targets for intervention and provide a basis for effective management of this phenomenon in higher education sector. Also the development of an effective prevention strategy contributing to quality of higher education services both in other organizations and in higher education institutions requires an approach encompassing both the individual and the organizational level (Ishchenko-Padukova et al., 2017; Varia and Leka, 2011; Volchik et al., 2017).

The purpose of this research was to verify the dimensions and the methodological characteristics of the questionnaire diagnosing bullying and single cases of harassment in relationships of students in higher education institutions.

Theoretical review

Scientists analyzing social aggression turned their attention to one of its subsets - bullying and harassment - only 30-40 years ago. In particular, these phenomena received interest from Scandinavian researchers, and the last 20 years, of the number of researchers analyzing bullying and harassment processes has dramatically increased. These studies are carried out both in different continents of the world, as well as in a variety of contexts, and the results obtained on their basis show that bullying is everywhere and at any time in life (Twemlow and Sacco, 2013). However, even with the abundance of research analyzing these forms of social aggression, their unified concept is absent. It is associated both with the use of the concepts in different cultures and languages, as well as the research context. Most often the concept of bullying and the term of harassment, which often is used interchangeably with bullying, are defined as “unwanted aggressive behaviour” that “inflict harm or distress,” and are “repeated multiple times or are highly likely to be repeated” in the context of an “observed or perceived power differential” (Patchin and Hinduja, 2015). The identification of bullying behaviour refers to such characteristics as intentional aggression, repetition of aggression, a power imbalance between aggressor and victim (Cornel and Limber, 2015; Olweus, 2013) and harm (Patchin and Hinduja, 2015).

In the abundance of research, such topics as workplace or school bullying and harassment remain one of the most popular and growing research areas (Chan et al., 2019; Hart Barnett et al., 2019). However, according to the “bullying schema”, bullying most often occurs in primary and secondary schools and continue to occur elsewhere (Gentry and Pickel, 2014). In the aforementioned contexts, such negative behaviour is most common and most frequently investigated (Patton et al., 2017). Studies reveal that the likelihood for victims to suffer bullying behavior in the future life is quite high (Curwen et al., 2011) and prove that the status of being a bully or a victim from the elementary school persists in the future (Chapell et al., 2006), thus, it suggests that such situations occur in higher education institutions. This is concluded in research, though Lund and Ross (2017) believe it is still sparse. Though it is argued that in the environment of a higher education institution the bully, not having a support from the group, no longer has an advantage as in a secondary school (Curwen et al., 2011), students claim they still face some forms of bullying problems in their university lives (Pörhölä et al., 2020; Lund and Ross, 2017; Pearson, 2016). Research shows different levels of bullying in universities. This may be related to the cultural context, but it is also necessary to pay attention to the variety of research instruments used in each individual study.

A survey of 2805 Finnish university students showed that 5% of them experienced bullying (Sinkkonen et al., 2014). Peer bullying was experienced by 15% of Chinese college and university students, and the number of such students increased significantly if they suffered from acne. In this case, 26% of students suffered from bullying (Cao et al., 2017). A survey of 221 USA students showed that 27.15% of respondents reported being victims of bullying since coming to college, and even 63.35% reported witnessing bullying (Perry and Blincoe, 2015). No exception is bullying in the university environments in other countries. A survey of 543 southeast of Spain college students revealed that 62.2% of college students reported bullying victimization (Sánchez et al., 2017). Research in Turkish Pamukkale University revealed that 74.4% of students reported not having experienced psychological violence – harassment. However, even 11% claimed they witnessed such a negative phenomenon quite often (Serinkan et al., 2013), and Palaz (2013), who analyzed the experience of undergraduate nursing students from four different Turkish Nursing Schools, revealed that 60% of the respondents indicated that they had experienced bullying. Meanwhile survey of 112 Mexican agrarian university students showed that out of all the interviewees, 99.1% claimed there was bullying in the agrarian higher school (Ruiz-Ramirez et al., 2016). However, research conducted in other countries finds less student exposure to bullying. A study conducted at Pakistan universities revealed that 45.9 % of men and 33.2 % of women having experienced bullying (Bibi et al., 2019), and in Australian higher education institutions bullying rates range from 11.8% to 20.8% (Budden et al., 2017; Wensley and Campbell, 2012). A survey of 5086 undergraduate students from 47 academic universities across Finland revealed that some students have been confronted with bullying behavior – 4.9% of partisipans were classified as victims, 1.1% as bullies and 0.6% as bully-victim (Pörhölä et al., 2019). Research identifies various sources of bullying and harassment. They can be not only other students, but also teachers (Pörhölä et al., 2020; Perry and Blincoe, 2015). Studies show that approximately half of students reported witnessing professor/instructor bullying (Marracciniet al., 2015; Serinkanet et al., 2013). Research at Pamukkale University showed that such bullying behaviour also depended on the position of the academic staff– the higher the position, the more often the negative behaviour was observed (Serinkanet al., 2013). Research on bullying and harassment also focuses on different roles of students (Pörhölä et al., 2019; Pontzer, 2010). However, most frequently the victim’s role is distinguished. Research analyses the characteristics of victims, focusing on their gender (Chapell et al., 2004; Glass and Fireman, 2016; Vveinhardt et al., 2019) sexual orientation (Wensley and Campbell, 2012), social status (Skinner et al., 2015), experience and qualities (Pontzer, 2010). Psychosocial and negative outcomes are considered a result of bullying and harassment. Such research contains evidence that the victims of bullying reported

suicidal ideation, difficulties in maintaining friendships, lower levels of trust, feeling of anxiety, panic attacks, shyness, physical symptoms of distress and loss of confidence and self-esteem (Alavi et al., 2015; Birks et al., 2017; Jantzer and Cashel, 2017; Bao et al., 2020; Lazányi et al., 2017, etc.). It can also be related with increased alcohol use and abuse in college freshmen (Rospenda et al., 2013). Still very little is known about various type of bullying among students at the university level. In recent years, most of the research in the context of higher education institution has been oriented not to the traditional bullying, which usually includes physical (e.g. hitting or pushing), verbal (e.g. teasing and hurtful name calling), relational (e.g. social exclusion and rumour spreading) and sexual forms, but to such growing bullying subcategory as cyberbullying (Watts et al., 2017). However, face-to-face bullying has been established to be more prevalent than cyberbullying (Zychet et al., 2015), which presupposes their research. Analysis of traditional bullying types at universities provides controversial results. Some authors consider verbal bullying as the most common subtype of traditional bullying, whereas physical bullying can be distinguished as the least common type among students (Perry and Blincoe, 2015). Other studies reveal jog bullying behaviours can take such forms as verbal, racial, physical and sexual abuse (Birks et al., 2017).

The reason for that may be the difficulties encountered in assessing bullying. As Shaw et al. (2013) assert, the approach to measurement of bullying is still widely discussed and researchers find it difficult to decide on the appropriate research instrument. The majority of studies assessing bullying at universities, though they use different methods, are still self-report assessment studies. These are generally directed to bullying repeatability, identification and analysis of its sources and roles of persons involved (Doğruer and Yaratan, 2014) as well as examining attitudes toward bullying (Garland et al., 2017).

Having identified bullying and harassment in university it is important not only to declare about such negative behaviour pattern, but also look for effective ways to solve this problem. This is particularly important because only a very small percentage of victims dare to report about violence and aggression (Allan, 2009), also research contains evidence that school management, policy and the rules sometimes infuse bullying over the students (Serinkan et al., 2013). For this reason, a responsive community should be formed to guard against bullying. In students; opinion, this could be achieved by social support, elucidating both as material, informational or emotional support, and punishment of aggressors. This should be a concern of student association, police, university priest, university teachers, other students or administration (Meriläinen et al., 2015). As Serinkan et al. (2013) suggest, this requires an appropriate substructure, the duty definitions should be clear, responsibilities should be determined, and communication should be ethical.

Therefore, we believe that all studies carried out on the topic of bullying are significant and contribute to managing behaviour and dealing with bullying at universities and colleges.

Methodology of the research

The study was carried out using a Lithuanian version of the new questionnaire. The new questionnaire *Bullying and Single Cases of Harassment in Higher Education Institutions* (B-SCH-St) involves the following dimensions: communication, personal reputation, student's reputation, experienced harm, and intervention measures in higher education institution (see the detailed structure of the instrument in Table 1).

Table 1: Structure of the instrument

Dimensions	Number of items, questions			Items / questions	Type
Communication	4			4 items, covering the character of student's inter-communication in higher education institution: harassing, ignoring, threatening, etc.	Likert scale
Personal reputation	4			4 items, covering critics of personal features, values, etc.	Likert scale
Student's reputation	4			4 items, covering the person's reputation of a student by hiding important information, criticizing performed work, etc.	Likert scale
Experienced harm	5			5 items, covering worsening health, worsening work results, stolen ideas and works, etc.	Likert scale
Intervention measures (possible)	8			8 items revealing students' opinion what measures would help to avoid abusive inter-relation among students	Likert scale
		1		1 question, aimed at students' proposals what could be done so that such abusive relationship would be avoided at the institution of higher education	Open question
Intervention measures (existing)			12	Covers rating of 12 responsible persons at the higher education institution, i.e. which person students are addressing/would address first	One answer possibility
			12		Ranking
Experiences at school	4			4 items that aim at determining current students' experiences brought from school in the aspect of pupil's destructive inter-relationship.	Likert scale

Dimensions	Number of items, questions				Items / questions	Type
Reaction and behaviour	7				7 items, describing students' personal reaction and behaviour regarding students' destructive inter-relationship	Items with the option choose one answer
Actions (of persons who were appealed for help)	6				6 items revealing how the higher education institution reacted to destructive relationships between the students, when the higher school employees have been informed.	Items with the option choose several answers
Single cases of harassment and bullying		1			1 question, intended to identify if there was a destructive behaviour with the student during the last six months at the higher education institution, according to which it was possible to distinguish between single cases of harassment and bullying.	Questions with the option choose one answer
Information about student				4	The name of the institution of higher education where the student studies; the study programme; the year of studies; the cycle of studies; the form of studies (4 questions); 2 demographic questions identifying student's age and gender.	Open questions and questions with the option choose one answer
				2		
Totally:	42	2	12	6		

Thus, the questionnaire consists of 10 dimensions covering 42 items and 2 questions, directly related to the topic being analysed. The questionnaire contains a list of 12 persons potentially responsible for the prevention of the phenomenon and intervention, and 6 questions related to information about the student. The questionnaire items are meant to determine the character of experienced harassment, reactions of victims, support for victims, prevention and intervention measures applied by the institution. In addition, the questions designed to identify the solutions proposed by the respondents and also the experience of bullying in general education schools as well.

The difference between bullying and single cases of harassment is based on the description by Leymann (1990; 1996) when bullying is considered to be systemic (not less than once a week) and long term (not less than 6 months) terrorizing of a victim.

Data analysis were performed using SPSS version 23.0. Reliability of methodological and psychometric characteristics of the questionnaire was estimated via Cronbach alpha, Factor loading (L), Total item correlation (r/itt).

Research results

This study is a continuation of the previous study by the authors when 403 students from 16 higher education institutions acting in Lithuania (8 universities and 8 colleges) were surveyed (Vveinhardt et al., 2017). In 2014-2015, when the first survey was conducted, there were 98872 students studying in universities and 41485 in colleges in Lithuania (i.e. 140357 –total number of students studying at higher education institutions). According to the data of the Ministry of Education and Science of the Republic of Lithuania, Research and Higher Education Monitoring and Analysis Centre, in 2015-2016, when the survey was continued, there were 133296 students (93524 at universities, 39772 at colleges) in Lithuanian institutions of higher education. The necessary size of the sample for such (i.e. 133296) population is 598, with margin of error 5% (Cohen et al., 2011). The study employed the stratified random sampling strategy.

The survey employed a specially constructed questionnaire, which covers the following dimensions: communication, personal reputation, student's reputation, experienced harm, intervention measures at higher education institution. The research involved 623 students from 18 Lithuanian higher education institutions (9 universities and 9 colleges).

Before presenting the questionnaire verification results, coefficients values should be briefly discussed. Cronbach alpha coefficient: the closer the Cronbach alpha coefficient values to 1, the stronger the internal consistency of the questionnaire dimensions. However, different authors have varying opinions about the coefficients of a reliable scale. According to Nunnally (1988), DeVellis (1991), Nunnally and Bernstein (1994), Cronbach alpha values are classified as follows according to the strength of statistical correlations: minimum acceptable 0.65, acceptable 0.70 and optimal 0.80. Churchill and Peter (1984) argue that unacceptable value is below 0.60. However, this indicator should be interpreted with caution because its value depends not only on the strength of the correlation between variables, but also on the number of items on the scale (Netemeyer et al. 2003). Values lower than 0.60 are acceptable when the scale has only a few items (Hair et al. 2010) or when the instrument is newly constructed (Nunnally, 1988). George and Mallery (2003) claim that in testing theory, the acceptable coefficient of variation interval is $0.5 \leq \alpha < 1$, but if the Cronbach alpha value is lower than 0.5, it indicates that the questionnaire scale/subscale is unreliable because it involves items which do not meet the basic eligibility (validity) conditions. However, there are reservations, e.g. if constructs are psychological in nature, even their lower values may be acceptable (Field, 2009; cited from Vveinhardt and Gulbovaite, 2018). Spearman-Brown coefficient is calculated applying the split-half methodology. Items are divided into two parts and internal consistency is calculated for each part, and then the internal consistency is calculated between the two parts. Thus Spearman-Brown coefficient shows internal consistency, internal coherence, reliability of the category, though it is calculated applying other than

Cronbach alpha method. Spearman-Brown coefficient (as Cronbach alpha coefficient) is not affected by the efficacy of the number of items. Explained dispersion of a factor must be greater than the lowest allowable limit of 10%, i.e. if explained dispersion of a factor in the dimension is below 10%, it shows that there are items in the dimension under analysis which reduce dispersion. Minimum factor loading (L) cannot be lower than 0.3. If it is lower than 0.3, it shows that the dimension contains an improper item. The mean of whole unit correlation (r / itt) should not be less than 0.2. The recorded value below the 0.2 again indicates a wrong statement on the dimension being checked (Vveinhardt, 2012). Table 2 presents the psychometric characteristics of dimensions of the questionnaire.

Table 2: Psychometric characteristics of the questionnaire dimensions

Dimension	N of items	Explained dispersion %	Cronbach alpha	Factor loading (L)			Whole unit correlation (r/itt)		
				mean	min	max	mean	min	max
Communication	4	61.22	0.79	0.78	0.71	0.83	0.60	0.37	0.84
Personal reputation	4	63.41	0.81	0.80	0.75	0.85	0.62	0.39	0.85
Student's reputation	4	59.41	0.77	0.77	0.73	0.85	0.58	0.37	0.85
Experienced harm	5	52.94	0.78	0.73	0.68	0.75	0.52	0.31	0.81
Intervention measures (possible)	8	54.61	0.88	0.74	0.69	0.77	0.54	0.39	0.76
Experiences at school	4	54.30	0.71	0.73	0.61	0.84	0.52	0.28	0.81
Reaction and behaviour	7	46.54	0.69	0.60	0.39	0.78	0.33	0.04	0.74

As shown in the survey results in Table 2, explained dispersion of a factor in the dimensions being analysed is high, e.g. from 46.54 (the lowest) to 63.41 (the highest), i.e. about 5 times higher than the allowable minimum, indicating that there are no statements in the dimension reducing dispersion. Cronbach alpha coefficient for all dimensions satisfy the major validity conditions raised for questionnaires because the lowest value is 0.69, the highest - 0.88. Minimum factor loading (L) is higher than 0.3, i.e. the lowest value found in only one dimension is 0.39, (the highest value of this coefficient 0.75), indicating that the dimension does not contain inappropriate statements. The mean of whole unit correlation (r/itt) is not lower than 0.2, the lowest value with respect to all analysed dimensions is 0.33, and the highest - 0.62. To sum up, we suggest that B-SCH-St questionnaire is valid and appropriate for diagnostics.

Although the key aim of this study was to present a new diagnostic instrument and its suitability to measure single cases of harassment and bullying, it would be appropriate to concisely discuss the obtained results not only in the aspect of the instrument validation. In Lithuanian higher education institutions, 1.6% of students experienced bullying in the period under analysis (offensive attacks were carried out daily or almost daily), and single cases of harassment were experienced by 16.9% of students (less than once a week); 71.11% of students maintained that in higher education institutions where they currently studied no actions were taken to address the problem.

Conclusions

Analysis of scientific literature revealed the prevailing provision that bullying peaks at 11-14 years of age, but in higher education institutions, there are also cases of destructive relationships, appearing between different groups and recorded in various forms. Some studies find relatively low percentage of student, clients of these organizations, bullying, while others show a very high level of student participation in destructive relationships. It is likely that such differences are determined by a number of reasons - the current cultural context, different evaluation methodologies often tailored for school-age children or adolescents, various social demographic characteristics of persons involved in studies, study areas and branches, or even the accepted roles in such destructive relationships. Compared to school or organizational research, little attention is paid to the development of research - based intervention programs and the assessment of the effectiveness of their measures after diagnosing the phenomenon of bullying in higher education institution. In particular, there is a lack of participants' own approach to management strategy and interventions, their nature and the effectiveness of specific intervention components. All this not only ignores the identified problem, but also complicates the prognosis of the consequences of aggressive behaviour and student involvement in destructive relationships.

After checking the methodological quality characteristics of B-SCH-St questionnaire dimensions it has been established that the questionnaire content quality meets the reliability and validity requirements set for questionnaires. Coefficients used in the analysis showed that all loadings of the questionnaire dimensions were high. This confirms that the instrument is suitable for measuring the chosen characteristics as a whole. Respondents' approval of the distinguished criteria is established on the basis of explained dispersion. Even the smallest explained factor dispersion of all the dimensions is much higher than the allowable dispersion and it proves that the respondents very strongly support the distinguished criteria. Verification of methodological and psychometric characteristics of the questionnaire confirmed the reliability of the instrument, so we can reasonably suggest that the questionnaire is a valid and reliable. It has been established that in Lithuanian higher education institutions, in the case of our

research sample, single cases of harassment and bullying are experienced by one fifth of all students. This shows that the problem is urgent, and a bullying and violence prevention programme is needed to solve it.

Also, the study revealed that in Lithuanian higher education institutions, 1.6% of students experienced bullying and 16.9% of students experienced single cases of harassment, and as many as 71.11% of students reported that there is no effective bullying and harassment management activities at the institutional level.

Limitations. The survey included only Lithuanian students from universities and colleges, but the overall view could be obtained carrying out more research with a focus on both different cultural aspects and social demographic characteristics of students as well the areas, branches and forms of their studies, which is envisaged in our further research.

After the completion of the study, further research directions are provided: the questionnaire is intended to be used in a survey of higher education students in other countries aiming at comparing the prevalence and intervention feasibility of single cases of harassment and bullying evaluating the cultural environment, field of study and various socio-demographic characteristics of students.

References

- Acosta, J., Chinman, M., Ebener, P., Malone, P. S., Phillips, A., & Wilks, A. (2019). Understanding the relationship between perceived school climate and bullying: A mediator analysis. *Journal of school violence, 18*(2), 200-215.
- Alavi, N., Roberts, N., Sutton, C., Axas, N., & Repetti, L. (2015). Bullying victimization (being bullied) among adolescents referred for urgent psychiatric consultation: prevalence and association with suicidality. *The Canadian Journal of Psychiatry, 60*(10), 427-431.
- Allan, E. J. (2009). *Hazing in view: college students at risk: initial findings from the National Study of Student Hazing*. Collingdale, PA: DIANE Publishing.
- American Educational Research Association. (2013). *Prevention of bullying in schools, colleges, and universities: Research report and recommendations*. Washington, DC: AERA.
- Bao, J., Li, H., Song, W., & Jiang, S. (2020). Being bullied, psychological pain and suicidal ideation among Chinese adolescents: A moderated mediation model. *Children and Youth Services Review, 104*744.
- Bibi, A., Blackwell, S. E., & Margraf, J. (2019). Mental health, suicidal ideation, and experience of bullying among university students in Pakistan. *Journal of Health Psychology*.
- Birks, M., Budden, L. M., Biedermann, N., Park, T., & Chapman, Y. (2017). A 'rite of passage?': Bullying experiences of nursing students in Australia. *Collegian*. Advance online publication
- Budden, L. M., Birks, M., Cant, R., Bagley, T., & Park, T. (2017). Australian nursing students' experience of bullying and/or harassment during clinical placement. *Collegian, 24*(2), 125-133.

- Bunce, L., Baird, A. & Jones, S. E. (2017) The student-as-consumer approach in higher education and its effects on academic performance. *Studies in Higher Education*, 42(11), 1958-1978.
- Cao, J., Wei, S., & Cai, M. (2017). Investigation of influential factors of academic and psychological distress in university students. *Biomedical Research*, 28(5), 2174-2179.
- Chan, C. M. H., Wong, J. E., Yeap, L. L. L., Wee, L. H., Jamil, N. A., & Nantha, Y. S. (2019). Workplace bullying and psychological distress of employees across socioeconomic strata: a cross-sectional study. *BMC public health*, 19(4), 608.
- Chapell, M. S., Hasselman, S. L., Kitchin, T., & Lomon, S. N. (2006). Bullying in elementary school, high school, and college. *Adolescence*, 41(164), 633-648.
- Chapell, M., Casey, D., De la Cruz, C., & Ferrell, J. (2004). Bullying in college by students and teachers. *Adolescence*, 39(153), 53-64.
- Churchill, Jr. G. A., & Peter, J. P. (1984). Research design effects on the reliability of rating scales: a meta-analysis. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 21(4), 360-375.
- Cohen, L., Manion, L., & Morrison, K. (2011). *Research Methods in Education. 7th Edition*. Abingdon, OX: Routledge.
- Cornell, D., & Limber, S. P. (2015). Law and policy on the concept of bullying at school. *American Psychologist*, 70(4), 333-343.
- Curwen, T., McNichol, J. S., & Sharpe, G. W. (2011). The progression of bullying from elementary school to university. *International Journal of Humanities and Social Science*, 1(13), 47-54.
- DeVellis, R. (1991). *Scale Development: Theory and Applications*. London: SAGE Publications.
- Doğruer, N., & Yaratan, H. (2014). Developing a bullying scale for use with university students. *Social Behavior and Personality: an International Journal*, 42(1), 81S-92S.
- Espelage, D. L., & Hong, J. S. (2019). School climate, bullying, and school violence. In M. J. Mayer & S. R. Jimerson (Eds.), *School safety and violence prevention: Science, practice, policy* (p. 45–69). American Psychological Association.
- Feijó, F. R., Gräf, D. D., Pearce, N., & Fassa, A. G. (2019). Risk factors for workplace bullying: a systematic review. *International journal of environmental research and public health*, 16(11), 1945.
- Field, A. (2009). *Discovering Statistics Using SPSS. 3rd Edition*. London: SAGE Publications.
- Garland, T. S., Policastro, C., Richards, T. N., & Miller, K. S. (2017). Blaming the Victim: University Student Attitudes Toward Bullying. *Journal of Aggression, Maltreatment & Trauma*, 26(1), 69-87.
- Gentry, R. H., & Pickel, K. L. (2014). Male and female observers' evaluations of a bullying case as a function of degree of harm, type of bullying, and academic level. *Journal of Aggression, Maltreatment & Trauma*, 23(10), 1038-1056.
- George, D., & Mallery, P. (2003). *SPSS for Windows Step by Step: A Simple Guide and Reference. 11.0 update (4th ed.)*. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
- Glass, D. J., & Fireman, G. D. (2016). College Aggression and Prosociality as Social Strategies. Retrieved from http://evostudies.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/08/Glass_NEEPSIX.pdf.
- Hair, J., Black, W., Babin, B., & Anderson, R. (2010). *Multivariate Data Analysis Seventh Edition*. USA: Prentice Hal.

- Hart Barnett, J. E., Fisher, K. W., O'Connell, N., & Franco, K. (2019). Promoting upstander behavior to address bullying in schools. *Middle School Journal*, 50(1), 6-11.
- Jantzer, A. M., & Cashel, M. L. (2017). "Bullying victimization, college adjustment, and the role of coping." *Journal of College Student Development*, 58(2), 283-289.
- Ishchenko-Padukova, O., Kazachanskaya, E., Movchan, I., & Nawrot, L. (2017). Economy of education: National and global aspects. *Journal of International Studies*, 10(4), 246-258.
- Lange, S., Burr, H., Conway, P. M., & Rose, U. (2019). Workplace bullying among employees in Germany: prevalence estimates and the role of the perpetrator. *International archives of occupational and environmental health*, 92(2), 237-247.
- Lazányi, K., Čepel, M., Bilan, S. (2017). Comparison of Trust and Social Relations among Students in Russian and Hungarian Higher Education. *Economics and Sociology*, 10(4), 162-174.
- Leymann, H. (1990). Bullying and psychological terror at workplaces. *Violence and Victims*, 5(2), 119-126.
- Leymann, H. (1996). The content and development of bullying at work. *European Journal of Work and Organisational Psychology*, 5, 165-184.
- Lund, E. M., & Ross, S. W. (2017). Bullying Perpetration, Victimization, and Demographic Differences in College Students A Review of the Literature. *Trauma, Violence, & Abuse*. Advance online publication
- Marraccini, M. E., Weyandt, L. L., & Rossi, J. S. (2015). College students' perceptions of professor/instructor bullying: questionnaire development and psychometric properties. *Journal of American college health*, 63(8), 563-572.
- Meriläinen, M., Puhakka, H., & Sinkkonen, H. M. (2015). Students' suggestions for eliminating bullying at a university. *British Journal of Guidance & Counselling*, 43(2), 202-215.
- Netemeyer, R. G., Bearden, W. O., & Sharma, S. (2003). *Scaling Procedures: Issues and Applications*. California: Sage Publications, Thousand Oaks.
- Nunnally, J. C. (1988). *Psychometric Theory*. New Jersey: McGraw-Hill, Englewood Cliffs.
- Nunnally, J. C., & Bernstein, I. R. (1994). *Psychometric theory (3rd ed.)*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Olweus, D. (2013). School bullying: development and some important challenges. *Annual Review of Clinical Psychology*, 9, 751-780.
- Palaz, S. (2013). Turkish nursing students' perceptions and experiences of bullying behavior in nursing education. *Journal of Nursing Education and Practice*, 3(1), 23-30.
- Patchin, J. W., & Hinduja, S. (2015). Measuring cyberbullying: implications for research. *Aggression and Violent Behavior*, 23, 69-74.
- Patton, D. U., Hong, J. S., Patel, S., & Kral, M. J. (2017). A systematic review of research strategies used in qualitative studies on school bullying and victimization. *Trauma, Violence, & Abuse*, 18(1), 3-16.
- Pearson, S. (2016). *Building brands directly: creating business value from customer relationships*. UK: Palgrave Macmillan.

- Perry, A. D., & Blincoe, S. (2015). Bullies and victims in higher education: a mixed-methods approach. Retrieved from <http://sites.tamuc.edu/bullyingjournal/article/bullies-and-victims-in-higher-education/>.
- Pontzer, D. (2010). A theoretical test of bullying behavior: parenting, personality, and the bully/victim relationship. *Journal of Family Violence*, 25(3), 259-273.
- Pörhölä, M., Almonkari, M., & Kunttu, K. (2019). Bullying and social anxiety experiences in university learning situations. *Social Psychology of Education*, 22, 723-742.
- Pörhölä, M., Cvancara, K., Kaal, E., Kunttu, K., Tampere, K., & Torres, M. B. (2020). Bullying in university between peers and by personnel: cultural variation in prevalence, forms, and gender differences in four countries. *Social Psychology of Education*, 23, 143-169.
- Reid, G. M., Holt, M. K., Bowman, C. E., Espelage, D. L., & Green, J. G. (2016). Perceived social support and mental health among first-year college students with histories of bullying victimization. *Journal of Child and Family Studies*, 25(11), 3331-3341.
- Rospenda, K. M., Richman, J. A., Wolff, J. M., & Burke, L. A. (2013). Bullying victimization among college students: negative consequences for alcohol use. *Journal of Addictive Diseases*, 32(4), 325-342.
- Ruiz-Ramírez, R., Zapata-Martelo, E., García-Cué, J. L., Pérez-Olvera, A., Martínez-Corona, B., & Rojo-Martínez, G. (2016). Bullying en una universidad agrícola del estado de México. *Ra Ximhai*, 12(1), 105-126.
- Sánchez, F. C., Navarro-Zaragoza, J., Ruiz-Cabello, A. L., Romero, M. F., & Maldonado, A. L. (2017). Association between bullying victimization and substance use among college students in Spain. *Adicciones*, 29(1), 22-32.
- Serinkan, C., Akşit, İ., Avcik, C., Arat, G., & Alacaoğlu, D. (2013). The Study of Students' Perceptions of Bullying at Pamukkale University. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*. Advance online publication
- Shaw, T., Dooley, J. J., Cross, D., Zubrick, S. R., & Waters, S. (2013). The Forms of Bullying Scale (FBS): Validity and reliability estimates for a measure of bullying victimization and perpetration in adolescence. *Psychological assessment*, 25(4), 1045-1057.
- Sinkkonen, H. M., Puhakka, H., & Meriläinen, M. (2014). Bullying at a university: students' experiences of bullying. *Studies in Higher Education*, 39(1), 153-165.
- Skinner, T. C., Peetz, D., Strachan, G., Whitehouse, G., Bailey, J., & Broadbent, K. (2015). Self-reported harassment and bullying in Australian universities: explaining differences between regional, metropolitan and elite institutions. *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management*, 37(5), 558-571.
- Smith, P. K. (2016). Bullying: Definition, Types, Causes, Consequences and Intervention. *Social and Personality Psychology Compass*, 10(9), 519-532.
- Twemlow, S. W., & Sacco, F. C. (2013). Bullying is everywhere: Ten universal truths about bullying as a social process in schools & communities. *Psychoanalytic Inquiry*, 33(2), 73-89.
- Vaill, Z., Campbell, M., & Whiteford, C. (2020). Analysing the quality of Australian universities' student anti-bullying policies. *Higher Education Research & Development*, 1-14.

- Vartia, M., & Leka, S. (2011). *Interventions for the prevention and management of bullying at work*. In S. Einarsen, H. Hoel, D. Zapf, & C. L. Cooper (Eds.), *Bullying and harassment in the workplace: Developments in theory, research, and practice* (2nd ed.). (pp. 359 - 379) Boca Raton, FL: CRC Press
- Volchik, V., Oganessian, A., & Olejarz, T. (2018). Higher education as a factor of socio-economic performance and development. *Journal of International Studies*, 11(4), 326-340.
- Vveinhardt, J. (2012). Identification of the reliability of methodological characteristics of quality in the diagnostic instrument for bullying as discrimination in employee relations on purpose to improve the climate in Lithuanian organizations, *Transformations in Business & Economics*, 11(2:26), 218-232.
- Vveinhardt, J., Fominiene, V. B., Andriukaitiene, & R. Streimikiene, D. (2019). Harassment and Bullying among Students in Higher Education Institutions: Manifestation of Single Cases of Harassment and Bullying in Aspects of Demographic Variables. *Amfiteatru Economic*, 21(51), pp. 409-426.
- Vveinhardt, J., Fominiene, V. B., Svagzdiene, B., & Andriukaitiene, R. (2017). Diagnostics of single cases of harassment and bullying in relationships between students of higher education institutions: intervention measures for the timely identification of the phenomena. *Transformations in Business & Economics*, 16(3), 240-257.
- Vveinhardt, J., & Gulbovaite, E. (2018). Reliability of methodological and psychometric characteristics of the questionnaire of congruence of personal and organizational values. *Oeconomia Copernicana*, 9(3), 545-571.
- Watts, L. K., Wagner, J., Velasquez, B., & Behrens, P. I. (2017). Cyberbullying in higher education: a literature review. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 69, 268-274.
- Wensley, K., & Campbell, M. (2012). Heterosexual and nonheterosexual young university students' involvement in traditional and cyber forms of bullying. *Cyberpsychology, Behavior, and Social Networking*, 15(12), 649-654.
- Zych, I., Ortega-Ruiz, R., & Del Rey, R. (2015). Systematic review of theoretical studies on bullying and cyberbullying: facts, knowledge, prevention, and intervention. *Aggression and Violent Behavior: A Review Journal*, 23, 1-21.

NOWE NARZĘDZIE MAJĄCE ZASTOSOWANIE DO ZARZĄDZANIA NARUSZENIEM I NĘKANIEM W WYŻSZYCH INSTYTUCJACH EDUKACJI

Streszczenie: Zastraszenie i nękanie w sektorze szkolnictwa wyższego negatywnie wpływa na samopoczucie osób uczestniczących w tych odcinkach, a także ma daleko idące negatywne konsekwencje dla każdej instytucji i dla całego sektora. Konieczne jest opracowanie instrumentu, który będzie w stanie wiarygodnie identyfikować przypadki prześladowania i nękania oraz przyczyniłby się do ustalenia celów interwencji i stanowiłby podstawę skutecznego zarządzania tym zjawiskiem. Celem tych badań była weryfikacja wymiarów i cech metodologicznych nowego narzędzia. W ankiecie wykorzystano specjalnie skonstruowany kwestionariusz, który obejmuje następujące wymiary: komunikacja, reputacja osobista, reputacja studenta, doznana krzywda, działania interwencyjne w szkole wyższej. Właściwości psychometryczne kwestionariusza oceniono na próbie 623 studentów.

Weryfikacja metodologicznych i psychometrycznych cech kwestionariusza Zastraszanie i pojedyncze przypadki nękania w szkołach wyższych (B-SCH-St) potwierdziła jego ważność i wiarygodność. Badanie wykazało również, że w litewskich szkołach wyższych nie prowadzi się skutecznych działań związanych z nękaniami i prześladowaniem.

Słowa kluczowe: kwestionariusz; Weryfikacja wymiarów; Sektor szkolnictwa wyższego; Strategia zarządzania; Znęcanie się; Pojedyncze przypadki molestowania; Europa.

种有助于高校欺凌与骚扰管理的新工具

摘要: 高等教育部门的欺凌和骚扰对参与这些事件的人们的幸福产生了负面影响, 并对每个机构和整个部门都产生了广泛的负面影响。有必要开发一种能够可靠地识别出欺凌和骚扰事件并有助于设定干预目标并为有效管理这一现象提供基础的工具。这项研究的目的是验证新工具的尺寸和方法学特征。该调查采用了专门设计的问卷, 涵盖以下方面: 交流, 个人声誉, 学生声誉, 经历的伤害, 高等教育机构的干预措施。在623个小学生的样本中评估了问卷的心理测量特性。对高校欺凌和骚扰单例问卷(B-SCH-St)的方法和心理计量学特征的验证, 证实了其有效性和可靠性。研究还表明, 在立陶宛的高等教育机构中, 没有开展有效的欺凌和骚扰管理活动。

关键词: 问卷; 问卷调查尺寸验证; 高等教育部门; 管理策略; 欺负; 单例骚扰; 欧洲