CYBERBULLYING AND CYBER VICTIMISATION: A LITERATURE REVIEW OF ASSESSMENT INSTRUMENTS

Milena MILIĆEVIĆ, PhD[1]

The knowledge regarding cyberbullying and its consequences has increased during the past two decades. A more detailed insight into the characteristics of cyberbullying and cyber victimisation requires a significant diversity of measures. However, no agreement on the best measurement method has been reached. The present literature review aimed to identify and present the instruments and measures constructed and utilised to assess cyberbullying and/or cyber victimisation. A systematic search identified 2031 publications. The selection process resulted in 11 assessment instruments, which were analysed. According to the findings, the starting point in the construction or adaptation of assessment instruments specific to our context should be a consistent, enhanced and standardised definition of cyberbullying comparable to the ones used worldwide, followed by the precise criteria for the representativeness of the target population and carefully considered both socio-cultural factors and the time frame. Finally, it is necessary to conduct comprehensive statistical analyzes in order to develop and verify the psychometric properties of the cyberbullying assessment tool that would be adequate for the assessment of this phenomenon in Serbia.

KEY WORDS: cyberbullying / measurement / assessment / cyber harassment

[1] Senior Research Fellow, Institute of Criminological and Sociological Research in Belgrade, mileninaadresa@gmail.com

1. INTRODUCTION

In the past two decades, there has been a noticeable expansion of the research interest in cyberbullying phenomenon (Antoniadou & Kokkinos, 2015; Baltezarevic et al., 2016). Cyberbullying is typically defined as a form of bullying others by using electronic communication technologies or information and communications technologies (ICTs) to carry out psychological peer harassment (Kowalski et al., 2014). The experience of cyberbullying has been linked to "an aggressive, intentional act carried out by a group or individual, using electronic forms of contact, repeatedly and over time against a victim who cannot easily defend himself or herself" (Smith et al., 2008, p. 376).

Research on cyberbullying is no longer at an early stage. To gain a context-appropriate understanding of the cyberbullying phenomenon, its diverse features should be captured. Therefore, the research focus has extended and now involves different context and disparate populations and various online communication media and ICTs. However, a measurement problem is still prevalent in recent literature (Chun et al., 2020; Kowalski et al., 2014). Nature of items capturing the full conceptual domain of cyberbullying phenomenon and their pooling method, differences in sample characteristics (e.g., age, gender, socio-cultural context), bullying or cyberbullying definition provision, theoretical basis or background that provides a comprehensive framework for different person and situational factors included, are some of the challenges listed (Chun et al., 2020; Kowalski et al., 2014). Even though the knowledge base regarding the nature of the cyberbullying problem has increased, no agreement on the best method of measuring these experiences has been reached.

Cyberbullying continues to be a serious issue, associated with many psychosocial and physical problems, including diverse mental health outcomes and various problems of a psychosomatic nature (Annerback et al., 2014; Bonanno & Hymel, 2013; Chang et al., 2013; Edwards et al., 2016; Fridh et al., 2015; Kowalski & Limber, 2013; Mitchell et al., 2007; Olenik-Shemesh et al., 2012; Schneider et al., 2012; Shapka & Maghsoudi, 2017; Sourander et al., 2010). Given the adverse outcomes of cyberbullying and/or cyber victimisation, the research question arises about the possibilities of assessing the characteristics, aspects and components of this phenomenon in society. This paper aims to identify and present the instruments and measures utilised to assess cyberbullying and/or cyber victimisation by conducting an extensive literature review and synthesising the findings in this field.

2. METHODS

An extensive literature search was performed to identify relevant studies conducted to develop, validate and/or investigate the psychometric properties of different measures of cyberbullying. The comprehensive search was performed by using Google Scholar – Advanced Scholar Search. Scholarly manuscripts published in English since January 1, 2000, were included. The following keywords were used with multiple combinations: "measure", "survey", "inventory", "questionnaire", "scale", "test" (with all of the words) combined with "cyberbullying", "cyber bullying", "cyber victimisation" and "cyber victimisation" (with the exact phrase). Next, studies citing selected measures were further explored at the level of titles and abstracts. The following studies were considered eligible: studies that developed the cyberbullying scale or used a scale in modified or revised version; published in English; focused on cyberbullying perpetration, victimisation, or both; studies including a sample of children, adolescents, or adults; and original, peer-reviewed articles or doctoral dissertations. The literature search resulted in a total of 1353 citations, and an additional 678 were screened at the title and abstract level. Using the above criteria, and after excluding the duplicates, 11 different measures utilised to assess cyberbullying and/or cyber victimisation are included in this literature review. The search was completed in April 2022.

3. REVIEW OF MEASURES UTILISED TO ASSESS CYBERBULLYING AND/OR CYBER VICTIMISATION

3.1. Cyberbullying Experiences Survey

The Cyberbullying Experiences Survey (CES) is a reliable and valid multifactor survey developed to assess cyberbullying victimisation and perpetration in the emerging adult population (Doane et al., 2013). The main strength of this survey is that it covers different forms of cyberbullying. According to the authors, the frequency and variability of cyberbullying among a college student population needed more closely examination (Doane et al., 2013).

The CES consists of a 21-item victimisation subscale and a 20-item perpetration subscale. Each subscale covers four factors: unwanted contact, malice, deception, and public humiliation. These four factors were previously identified as the most frequent types of incidents reported by cyber victims (Doane et al., 2009, as cited in (Doane et al., 2013). All items are given in a form of questions and

rated on a 6-point Likert-type scale in terms of frequency of experience ranging from *Never* to *Every day/Almost every day*. Instead of providing an operational definition of cyberbullying, questions are focused on cyberbullying behaviours. A total of 29 different cyberbullying behaviours are included, with 12 behaviours overlapping between the two subscales and 17 behaviours not overlapping: unwanted contact (nine items), malice (six items), deception (three items), and public humiliation (11 items). Two examples of survey items include, "Has someone changed a picture of you in a negative way and posted it electronically?" and "Have you lied about yourself to someone electronically?"

The CES was confirmed as a useful tool for understanding demographic differences and predictors of cyberbullying perpetration among college students (Bauman & Baldasare, 2015; Doane et al., 2013). Moreover, the CES was used for the evaluation of the effectiveness of cyberbullying prevention and intervention programs (Doane et al., 2016, 2020) and the role of optimism as a protective factor against the negative impact of cyberbullying at work (Snyman & Loh, 2015). Later results have demonstrated its utility in both explorative and applied research, in different socio-cultural settings (Bauman & Baldasare, 2015; Ndiege & Kanyi, 2018; Somma et al., 2022), for studying cross-cultural differences in cyberbullying perpetration frequency and process (Barlett, Seyfert, et al., 2021), but also during the COVID-19 era (Barlett, Simmers, et al., 2021; Doane et al., 2020).

3.2. Workplace Cyberbullying Measure

The first workplace-specific cyberbullying instrument is the Workplace Cyberbullying Measure (WCM), designed and developed to assess cyberbullying across a broad spectrum of ICTs and diverse working populations (Farley et al., 2016). The tool is composed of a total of 17 items capturing employees' exposure to cyberbullying through technology in relation to their work context over the previous six months: 10 items on work-related cyberbullying and seven items on person-related cyberbullying. The response options are *Never*, *Now and then*, *At least monthly*, *At least weekly* and *Daily*, with the latter two options being merged after a statistical analysis. According to the authors, the WCM captures exposure to negative work-related acts experienced through ICTs, including one item that evaluates the power disparity criterion between perpetrator(s) and victim and allows self-labelling as victims. Respondents answer this one question after completing the cyberbullying items and after being presented with the refined workplace cyberbullying definition. The response options are *No*, *Yes, now and then*, *Yes, monthly*, *Yes, weekly* and *Yes, almost daily*. Two examples of measure items include, "Received messages that contain abusive language aimed at you" and "Received aggressive-

ly worded messages (e.g. using all capital letters, bold font or multiple exclamation marks)".

The results confirmed that respondents experiencing more behaviours more frequently tended to perceive themselves as being less capable of defending themselves (Farley et al., 2016). The main advantage of the WCM is its validity as a single-factor model and as a two-factor model comprising work-related cyberbullying and person-related cyberbullying. Furthermore, practical implications include using this measure as a list of indicators that employees find unacceptable in their work settings (Farley et al., 2016).

Overall usability of the WCM was confirmed in different socio-cultural and working contexts, including the Covid-19 pandemic (K. Y. Kim & Choi, 2021; Nikolić et al., 2017; Park & Choi, 2019; Z. Zhang et al., 2021). Recently, the WCM was used to investigate the roles of psychological distress between workplace cyberbullying and creativity (Kalyar et al., 2021) and the daily influence of workplace cyberbullying on interpersonal deviance (Z. Zhang et al., 2021). Moreover, it was used to determine individual and organizational factors influencing workplace cyberbullying (Y. Kim & Choi, 2021) and the antecedents of workplace cyberbullying, such as the perpetrator traits and unique occurrence environment in the context of workplace cyberbullying (S. Zhang et al., 2022).

3.3 Inventory of Cyberbullying Acts at Work

The Inventory of Cyberbullying Acts at Work (ICA-W) is a reliable and valid tool for a quick and easy evaluation of cyberbullying occurrence in the workplace (Vranjes, Baillien, et al., 2018a). This 10-item psychometrically sound and compact measurement instrument has three-factor structure – work-related acts, person-related acts and intrusion. The ICA-W is both general and specific instrument, which is its main strength. More precisely, it can be used to determine the occurrence of cyberbullying behaviour at work or to explore different types of cyberbullying behaviours (work related, person related, intrusive). Similar to the WCM, the ICA-W assesses the cyberbullying phenomenon in the work environment. However, the ICA-W has fewer items (10 vs. 17) and covers more than a single-factor structure. Overall, there are four work related items (e.g. "Your emails are forwarded to third parties in order to harm you"), three person related items (e.g. "Constant remarks are being made about you and your private life by means of ICTs"), and three intrusive items (e.g. "Somebody takes over your identity"). All items were answered on a 5-point Likert scale with the following options: *Never*, *One time*, *Monthly*, *Weekly*, and *Daily*.

The ICA-W was used as a measure of workplace cyberbullying in different socio-cultural and working settings (Anwar et al., 2020), but also for studying cross-sectional differences between patterns of cyber victimisation and emotion regulation in subgroups of individuals based on their cyberbullying victimisation experience (Vranjes, Erreygers, et al., 2018). As recently presented, the ICA-W contributed in testing the role of stressor related emotions on exposure cyberbullying at work, further confirming its utility (Vranjes, Baillien, et al., 2018b).

3.4. Positive Attitudes toward Cyberbullying Measure

The Positive Attitudes toward Cyberbullying Measure (Barlett et al., 2016) is a self-report assessment that assesses the degree to which a person endorses positive cyberbullying attitudes. It consists of nine items and two distinct factors: Harmful Cyberbullying Attitudes (HCA; five items) and General Cyberbullying Characteristics (GCC; four items). This measure is described as brief and easy-to-administer, face valid, concurrently valid, predictively valid, with good internal consistency (Barlett et al., 2016). Moreover, its items are general and are not limited to any specific website, device, or environment. Items are given in a form of statement and responders indicate their level of agreement on a 5-point rating scale (ranging from *Strongly disagree* to *Strongly agree*). All items were summed and higher scores indicate higher pro-cyberbullying attitudes. Two examples of measure items include, "Teasing or making fun of others with harmful comments online is fun to me" and "Sending mean electronic messages to others is less harmful than face-to face communication".

Recent results confirmed the utility of the Positive Attitudes toward Cyberbullying Measure in different cultural settings (Barlett, Seyfert, et al., 2021; Cavalcanti et al., 2021; Kumar & Sadeeq, 2020; H. Zhang et al., 2020) and longitudinal research as it was applied to analyse the longitudinal relationship between early social media use and later cyberbullying perpetration via positive cyberbullying attitudes (Barlett et al., 2018). Furthermore, this scale was used to evaluate the implementation of a theory-based video intervention program, which was designed to challenge college students' anonymity perceptions to reduce subsequent cyberbullying (Barlett et al., 2020). Also, this measure was used to investigate a mediating model of relationship between childhood psychological abuse and cyberbullying perpetration attitudes (H. Zhang et al., 2020).

3.5. Cyberbullying Inventory for College Students

One of the most used measures to assess cyberbullying is the Cyberbullying Inventory for College Students (CICS) (Francisco et al., 2015; Jenaro et al.,

2018). The CICS evaluates the type and degree of involvement in cyberbullying or, more precisely, how university students perceive their involvement in acts of cyberbullying. The final version of the CICS consists of 42 close-ended questions organized into four scales: for victims (nine items, e.g. "They spread rumors about my life"), for aggressors (eight items, e.g. "I made fun of someone"), for observers of the victim (nine items, e.g. "Someone made fun of them"), and for observers of the aggressor (nine items, e.g. "They made fun of someone"). The response options are *Never*, *Sometimes* and *Many times*. A special characteristic of this inventory is that it collects information about the technologies used in victimisation/aggression acts (e.g. computer, cell phone; Facebook, Messenger, Myspace, YouTube, SMS). Coping strategies used by victims (e.g. "I deleted my Facebook page") and motives aggressors mentioned for cyberbullying others (e.g. "Because I don't like the person's attitudes") are noted, as well (Francisco et al., 2015). The CICS was later used to investigate whether student bystander interventions can affect the relationship between being a bystander of a cyberbullying incident and being the victim or the aggressor (Ferreira et al., 2016). Another study that included the CICS as a measure to assess cyberbullying explored cultural issues influencing students' involvement in cyberbullying situations (Souza et al., 2018).

3.6. Cyberbullying Inventory for University Students revised

The revised version of the Cyberbullying Inventory (CBI) for University Students (Topcu & Erdur-Baker, 2018) has two sections that measure cyberbullying perpetration and cyberbullying victimisation (Tanrikulu & Erdur-Baker, 2021). Respondents are asked to report the frequency of listed behaviours, with the answer for the cyberbullying perpetration items given as "I did", while the answer for cyberbullying victimisation are given as "It happened to me". The frequency of their cyberbullying experiences as a cyber bully or a cyber victim in the last six months was rated on a 4-point Likert scale in each section: *Never*, *Once*, *Twice-three times*, and *More than three times*, with higher scores indicating a higher frequency of cyberbullying perpetration or cyber victimisation. Two examples of measure items include, "Spreading gossips and rumours online" and "Blocking someone's access to an online account by stealing their password". Additionally, several participants' cyberbullying involvement categories can be created, including categories of cyberbullies, cyber victims, cyber bully-victims and non-involvers (Tanrikulu & Erdur-Baker, 2021). The CBI for University Students was recently used as the criterion validity of the new Online Trolling Scale (Hamarta et al., 2021).

3.7. Cyberbullying Scale

A different approach was noted in a study conducted by Walker, Sockman, and Koehn (Walker et al., 2011). The previous versions of their 27-item Cyberbullying Scale can be found in work by (Li, 2006) and (Spitzberg & Hoobler, 2002). This scale is focused on 13 different situations received or experienced in an electronic form of communication. Example situations include the following: exaggerated messages of affection, excessively explicit messages, threatening written messages, pictures or images, sabotaging' private or work/school reputation, pornographic/obscene images or message, etc. Additionally, frequency of experiencing cyberbullying is recorded (response options: *Less than 4 times*, *4 to 10 times*, and *More than 10 times*), as well as technologies used to cyberbully (i.e., email, text or video message via cell phone, social media like Facebook or Twitter, instant messaging). Lastly, the sources of the undesirable communication is indicated, e.g. classmate, former classmate, former boyfriend/girlfriend, someone dated once or twice, roommate, family member, and do not know the person, etc. Since the scale distinguishes between the ICTs used, later application was noted in a study on the impact of risky social network site practices and individual differences in personality on the likelihood of cyberbullying victimisation among young adult Facebook users (Peluchette et al., 2015).

3.8. Cyberbullying Scale updated

The Cyberbullying Scale (CBS), developed by Stewart et al. (Stewart et al., 2014), is a broad self-report measure of cyberbullying victimisation designed to overcome limitations of the previously used scales. According to the authors, the CBS advances the field by providing greater operationalization and including a more diverse base of electronic mediums or ICTs used (Stewart et al., 2014). As a screening tool, the CBS can be used to identify students aged 11 to 18 who are being cyberbullied. On the other hand, as an outcome measure, it can be utilised for determining different cyberbullying intervention efforts.

Generally, the CBS has a single-factor structure. It consists of 14 items on frequency of experiencing different forms of cyber victimisation rated on a 5-point Likert-type scale ranging from *Never* to *All the time*. Two examples of measure items include, "How often do you get text or online messages that make you afraid for your safety?" and "How often do you get in online fights?" All items were summed and higher scores indicate more frequent experiences of being a victim of cyberbullying (Stewart et al., 2014). The final version also includes two general questions about electronic mediums through which the responders were bullied

and which they used to bully others. Overall utility of the CBS was confirmed in different cultural settings (Saman et al., 2021).

3.9. Cyberbullying Test

The Cyberbullying Test is a three-factors screening instrument design to measure cyber victimisation, cyber aggression, and cyber observation (Garaigordobil, 2017). It includes 15 behavioural categories. The focus is on three types of behaviours: respondent's own experiences of cyber victimisation, their own cyber aggressive behaviours, and the cyberbullying behaviours they observe in others, regardless of the means used. The frequency with which these behaviours were suffered, performed, or observed during the past year is recorded on a 4-point scale ranging from *Never* to *Always*. The main advantage of the Cyberbullying Test is its triangular perspective, as it rates the level of cyber victimisation, cyber aggression, and cyber observation. The Cyberbullying Test was used to explore prevalence of cyberbullying in gifted students, its prevalence and relationship with other psychological variables (González-Cabrera et al., 2019). Recently, its reliability was confirmed when the cyberbullying experience and coping manners of adolescents in urban Vietnam were explored, including the associations between cyberbullying and mental health issues (Ngo et al., 2021). The research results also confirmed that the Cyberbullying Test could be used to analyse differences in sexual orientation in relation to the position of victims or aggressors of bullying/cyberbullying, and compare the mental health of adolescent heterosexual and non-heterosexual victims, aggressors, cyber victims, and cyber aggressors (Garaigordobil & Larrain, 2020).

3.10. Electronic Bullying Questionnaire

The Electronic Bullying Questionnaire (EBQ) was first presented as a 23-item self-report measure by Kowalski and Limber (Kowalski & Limber, 2007), and later revised by Moore, Huebner and Hills (Moore et al., 2012), to evaluate cyberbullying among middle school students. The EBQ consists of cyberbullying perpetration and cyberbullying victimisation scales, each scored separately as a mean, with higher scores reflecting higher frequencies of cyberbullying (perpetration or victimisation). The revised EBQ has nine core questions that assess bullying (four items), victimisation (four items), and fear of being bullied (one items), excluding questions about the medium used (Moore et al., 2012). Prevalence questions were answered using a 5-point response format ranging from *It hasn't happened in the past couple of months* to *Several times a week*. Two examples of items include, "Has

anyone used your computer username or screen-name to spread rumours or lies about another person?" and "Have you used someone else's computer username or screen-name to spread rumours or lies about another person?" In a recent study, the EBQ was used to examine the longitudinal associations between neuroticism and cyberbullying (perpetration and victimisation) among Chinese early adolescents (D. Zhang et al., 2020). Earlier, the EBQ was used to determine the differential mediational roles of perceived peer relationship stress in the association between cyberbullying and cyber victimisation and mental health among early adolescents in both cross-sectional data and longitudinal data (Tian et al., 2018).

3.11. Internet Experiences Questionnaire

The 47-item Internet Experiences Questionnaire (IEQ) is one of the earliest measures specifically designed to assess cyberbullying, with separate subsections focusing on perpetrators of cyberbullying, traditional bullying experiences, cyberbully victimisation separated by different forms of cyberbullying (text messaging, Internet, picture/video messaging), general cyberbullying experiences, and impact and coping methods (Schenk & Fremouw, 2012). The main challenge in applying this measure is a variety of different types of questions asked. The largest group are open-ended questions, followed by the multiple-choice and yes/no questions. Two examples of items include, "If you were a victim of cyberbullying, how did you get the harassment to stop?" and "If you have been cyberbullied in any way, what sorts of comments/ remarks were made? Please check all that apply: appearance, race, sexual orientation, etc." The IEQ was used in a study of the impact of social relationships on bullies, victims, bully/victims, and uninvolved participants (Keelan et al., 2014), to comprehensively describe the characteristics of college cyberbullies (Schenk et al., 2013) and in a study on the psychological experience of cyberbullying among transgender adults (Macpherson, 2022).

4. CONCLUDING REMARKS

The present literature review aimed to identify and present the instruments or measures constructed and used to assess cyberbullying and/or cyber victimisation. A total of 11 assessment instruments were analysed. Aiming to characterise the phenomenon of cyberbullying accurately, many researchers opted for different approaches. A more detailed insight into the characteristics of cyberbullying and cyber victimisation requires a significant diversity of measures. At the same time, significant diversity of measures makes comparing the findings among studies difficult.

First, it should be noted that the authors conceptualised cyberbullying by using various definitional criteria. For example, the WCM relies on the same definitional criteria as traditional bullying (D'Souza et al., 2017), whereas the CBI does not provide a definition of cyberbullying (Tanrikulu & Erdur-Baker, 2021). Other authors relied solely on characteristics that differentiated traditional from electronic bullying (Moore et al., 2012).

Second, the medium used to channel an act was considered outdated or irrelevant for research purposes in a number of studies. Therefore, instruments should be considered concerning whether they assess cyber-related behaviour regardless of the medium or ICTs used. Namely, the CES contains a number of cyber-specific items without referencing the medium used (Doane et al., 2013). A similar strategy was used for the Positive Attitudes toward Cyberbullying Measure (Barlett et al., 2016) and the EBQ (Moore et al., 2012). The WCM considers various ICTs that individuals use in their work rather than through a specific medium (Farley et al., 2016). On the other hand, the CICS asks about the digital media used (Francisco et al., 2015), as the Cyberbullying Scale (Walker et al., 2011) and the CBS (Stewart et al., 2014).

Next, some instruments are context-specific or designed for a specific population. Most of the measures are focused on college students. For example, the CES was developed to assess cyber-bullying among college students (Doane et al., 2013), while the WCM has addressed work-related cyber harassment (Farley et al., 2016). Concerning the context-specificity, some measures that assess the cyber-bullying phenomenon can be used as complementary since they allow different types of negative online acts to be differentiated. Examples include the WCM (Farley et al., 2016) and the ICA-W (Vranjes, Baillien, et al., 2018a).

Regardless of the complexity of cyberbullying, some instruments allow different forms of analysis. The WCM combines behavioural items that evaluate exposure to bullying behaviour with a self-labelling definition question (Farley et al., 2016). The CICS is, on the other hand, a more comprehensive instrument as it combines perception of involvement in cyberbullying and information about the digital media used with questions inquiring about the coping strategies used by victims and bystanders about the emotions involved and the motives of the aggressor (Francisco et al., 2015). The IEQ offers a variety of types of questions allowing more comprehensive insight into different forms of cyberbullying experiences (Schenk & Fremouw, 2012).

When it comes to the time frame used to assess cyberbullying and cyber victimisation, there are some inconsistent across the presented measures. Even in those measures with a specific time frame, the authors used different time periods. For example, the previous year was covered in the CES (Doane et al., 2013)

and the Cyberbullying Test (Garaigordobil, 2017), whereas the ICA-W (Vranjes, Baillien, et al., 2018a) was focused on the previous six months. In contrast, some measures did not provide a specific time period, including the CBS (Stewart et al., 2014) and the EBQ (Moore et al., 2012) that cover the past few months and the past couple of months, respectively. Consequently, data collected using different instruments may lead to different findings on the prevalence rates of this phenomenon, further complicating interpretation and comparison of the results in the international context.

The findings of this literature review also revealed that most of the cyberbullying instruments are multifactorial or consist of several subscales. In other words, some measures utilised to assess cyberbullying are unifactorial, whereas others explore various factors. The CBS (Stewart et al., 2014) is unifactorial, whereas the WCM is both a single- and a two-factor model (Farley et al., 2016). Among the multifactorial instruments are the Positive Attitudes toward Cyberbullying Measure (Barlett et al., 2016), CES (Doane et al., 2013), ICA-W (Vranjes, Baillien, et al., 2018a), CICS (Francisco et al., 2015), CBI (Tanrikulu & Erdur-Baker, 2021), EBQ (Moore et al., 2012) and the Cyberbullying Test (Garaigordobil, 2017).

This literature review has some limitations to be considered. First, the study only included original, empirical peer-reviewed articles and doctoral dissertations, and hence, other types of manuscripts (e.g., unpublished dissertations, systematic reviews, meta-analytic studies, or government reports) were excluded. Second, the cyberbullying measurement studies published in languages other than English were also excluded, thus reducing the variance in the socio-cultural context. In addition, a quality assessment process was not conducted and studies were characterised only based on their design. These omissions may lead to selection bias in this literature review. Further studies could gather additional evidence from excluded sources.

Despite these limitations, the information obtained in the present literature review could be used to initiate the construction or adaptation of assessment instruments specific to our context. The starting point should be a consistent, enhanced and standardised definition of cyberbullying comparable to the ones used worldwide, further underlining the prominent implications for measuring cyberbullying behaviours. Clear criteria for the representativeness of the target population sample are required. Next, the socio-cultural factors need to be carefully considered to gain a context-appropriate understanding of the cyberbullying or cyber victimisation phenomenon. As stated previously, the importance of the time frame should not be overlooked. Finally, to ensure construct validity, reliability, and factor stability, comprehensive statistical analyses should be carefully conducted, thus resulting in verified psychometric properties of cyberbullying measurements.

REFERENCES

1. Annerback, E. M., Sahlqvist, L., & Wingren, G. (2014). A cross-sectional study of victimisation of bullying among schoolchildren in Sweden: Background factors and self-reported health complaints. *Scandinavian Journal of Public Health*, *42*(3), 270–277. https://doi.org/10.1177/1403494813514142
2. Antoniadou, N., & Kokkinos, C. M. (2015). Cyber and school bullying: Same or different phenomena? *Aggression and Violent Behavior*, *25*, 363–372. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.avb.2015.09.013
3. Anwar, A., Kee, D. M. H., & Ahmed, A. (2020). Workplace Cyberbullying and Interpersonal Deviance: Understanding the Mediating Effect of Silence and Emotional Exhaustion. *Cyberpsychology, Behavior, and Social Networking*, *23*(5), 290–296. https://doi.org/10.1089/cyber.2019.0407
4. Baltezarevic, V., Baltezarevic, R., & Baltezarevic, B. (2016). The prevalence of victimization and the internet abuse in student population. *Temida*, *19*(3–4), 373–387. https://doi.org/10.2298/TEM1604373B
5. Barlett, C. P., Gentile, D. A., Chng, G., Li, D., & Chamberlin, K. (2018). Social Media Use and Cyberbullying Perpetration: A Longitudinal Analysis. *Violence and Gender*, *5*(3), 191–197. https://doi.org/10.1089/vio.2017.0047
6. Barlett, C. P., Heath, J. B., Madison, C. S., DeWitt, C. C., & Kirkpatrick, S. M. (2020). You're not anonymous online: The development and validation of a new cyberbullying intervention curriculum. *Psychology of Popular Media*, *9*(2), 135–144. https://doi.org/10.1037/ppm0000226
7. Barlett, C. P., Helmstetter, K., & Gentile, D. A. (2016). The development of a new cyberbullying attitude measure. *Computers in Human Behavior*, *64*, 906–913. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2016.08.013
8. Barlett, C. P., Seyfert, L. W., Simmers, M. M., Hsueh Hua Chen, V., Cavalcanti, J. G., Krahé, B., Suzuki, K., Warburton, W. A., Wong, R. Y. M., Pimentel, C. E., & Skowronski, M. (2021). Cross-cultural similarities and differences in the theoretical predictors of cyberbullying perpetration: Results from a seven-country study. *Aggressive Behavior*, *47*(1), 111–119. https://doi.org/10.1002/ab.21923
9. Barlett, C. P., Simmers, M. M., Roth, B., & Gentile, D. (2021). Comparing cyberbullying prevalence and process before and during the COVID-19 pandemic. *The Journal of Social Psychology*, *161*(4), 408–418. https://doi.org/10.1080/00224545.2021.1918619
10. Bauman, S., & Baldasare, A. (2015). Cyber Aggression Among College Students: Demographic Differences, Predictors of Distress, and the Role of the

University. *Journal of College Student Development*, *56*(4), 317–330. https://doi.org/10.1353/csd.2015.0039

11. Bonanno, R. A., & Hymel, S. (2013). Cyber Bullying and Internalizing Difficulties: Above and Beyond the Impact of Traditional Forms of Bullying. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, *42*(5), 685–697. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10964-013-9937-1
12. Cavalcanti, J. G., de Lima Pinto, A. V., Pimentel, C. E., & de Melo, L. M. F. (2021). Psychometric Parameters of the Cyberbullying Attitude Scale in Brazil. *Current Psychology*, *40*(8), 3897–3907. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12144-019-00326-6
13. Chang, F. C., Lee, C. M., Chiu, C. H., Hsi, W. Y., Huang, T. F., & Pan, Y. C. (2013). Relationships Among Cyberbullying, School Bullying, and Mental Health in Taiwanese Adolescents. *Journal of School Health*, *83*(6), 454–462. https://doi.org/10.1111/josh.12050
14. Chun, J. S., Lee, J., Kim, J., & Lee, S. (2020). An international systematic review of cyberbullying measurements. *Computers in Human Behavior*, *113*(June), 106485. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2020.106485
15. D'Souza, N., Forsyth, D., Tappin, D., & Catley, B. (2017). Engaging industry specialists on the issue of workplace cyberbullying–a New Zealand study. *Journal of Health Safety and Environment*, *33*(2), 105–124.
16. Doane, A. N., Ehlke, S., & Kelley, M. L. (2020). Bystanders Against Cyberbullying: a Video Program for College Students. *International Journal of Bullying Prevention*, *2*(1), 41–52. https://doi.org/10.1007/s42380-019-00051-5
17. Doane, A. N., Kelley, M. L., Chiang, E. S., & Padilla, M. A. (2013). Development of the Cyberbullying Experiences Survey. *Emerging Adulthood*, *1*(3), 207–218. https://doi.org/10.1177/2167696813479584
18. Doane, A. N., Kelley, M. L., & Pearson, M. R. (2016). Reducing cyberbullying: A theory of reasoned action-based video prevention program for college students. *Aggressive Behavior*, *42*(2), 136–146. https://doi.org/10.1002/ab.21610
19. Edwards, L., Kontostathis, A. E., & Fisher, C. (2016). Cyberbullying, Race/Ethnicity and Mental Health Outcomes: A Review of the Literature. *Media and Communication*, *4*(3), 71. https://doi.org/10.17645/mac.v4i3.525
20. Farley, S., Coyne, I., Axtell, C., & Sprigg, C. (2016). Design, development and validation of a workplace cyberbullying measure, the WCM. *Work and Stress*, *30*(4), 293–317. https://doi.org/10.1080/02678373.2016.1255998
21. Ferreira, P. C., Simão, A. M. V., Ferreira, A., Souza, S., & Francisco, S. (2016). Student bystander behavior and cultural issues in cyberbullying: When ac-

tions speak louder than words. *Computers in Human Behavior*, *60*, 301–311. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2016.02.059

22. Francisco, S. M., Veiga Simão, A. M., Ferreira, P. C., & Martins, M. J. D. D. (2015). Cyberbullying: The hidden side of college students. *Computers in Human Behavior*, *43*, 167–182. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2014.10.045
23. Fridh, M., Lindström, M., & Rosvall, M. (2015). Subjective health complaints in adolescent victims of cyber harassment: Moderation through support from parents/friends - A Swedish population-based study. *BMC Public Health*, *15*(1), 1–12. https://doi.org/10.1186/s12889-015-2239-7
24. Garaigordobil, M. (2017). Psychometric Properties of the Cyberbullying Test, a Screening Instrument to Measure Cybervictimization, Cyberaggression, and Cyberobservation. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, *32*(23), 3556–3576. https://doi.org/10.1177/0886260515600165
25. Garaigordobil, M., & Larrain, E. (2020). Bullying and cyberbullying in LGBT adolescents: Prevalence and effects on mental health. *Comunicar*, *28*(62), 79–90. https://doi.org/10.3916/C62-2020-07
26. González-Cabrera, Tourón, Machimbarrena, Gutiérrez-Ortega, Álvarez-Bardón, & Garaigordobil. (2019). Cyberbullying in Gifted Students: Prevalence and Psychological Well-Being in a Spanish Sample. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, *16*(12), 2173. https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph16122173
27. Hamarta, E., Akat, M., & Deniz, M. (2021). Development of Online Trolling Scale: Validity and Reliability Study. *Türk Psikolojik Danışma ve Rehberlik Dergisi*, *11*(63), 457–470. https://doi.org/10.17066/tpdrd.1050742
28. Jenaro, C., Flores, N., & Frías, C. P. (2018). Systematic review of empirical studies on cyberbullying in adults: What we know and what we should investigate. *Aggression and Violent Behavior*, *38*, 113–122. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.avb.2017.12.003
29. Kalyar, M. N., Saeed, M., Usta, A., & Shafique, I. (2021). Workplace cyberbullying and creativity: examining the roles of psychological distress and psychological capital. *Management Research Review*, *44*(4), 607–624. https://doi.org/10.1108/MRR-03-2020-0130
30. Keelan, C. M., Schenk, A. M., McNally, M. R., & Fremouw, W. J. (2014). The Interpersonal Worlds of Bullies. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, *29*(7), 1338–1353. https://doi.org/10.1177/0886260513506278
31. Kim, K. Y., & Choi, J. S. (2021). Cyberbullying, student nurses' ethical awareness and the Covid-19 pandemic. *Nursing Ethics*, *28*(7–8), 1258–1268. https://doi.org/10.1177/09697330211010280

32. Kim, Y., & Choi, J. S. (2021). Individual and organizational factors influencing workplace cyberbullying of nurses: A cross-sectional study. *Nursing & Health Sciences*, *23*(3), 715–722. https://doi.org/10.1111/nhs.12858

33. Kowalski, R. M., Giumetti, G. W., Schroeder, A. N., & Lattanner, M. R. (2014). Bullying in the digital age: A critical review and meta-analysis of cyberbullying research among youth. *Psychological Bulletin*, *140*(4), 1073–1137. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0035618

34. Kowalski, R. M., & Limber, S. P. (2007). Electronic Bullying Among Middle School Students. *Journal of Adolescent Health*, *41*(6 SUPPL.), 22–30. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jadohealth.2007.08.017

35. Kowalski, R. M., & Limber, S. P. (2013). Psychological, Physical, and Academic Correlates of Cyberbullying and Traditional Bullying. *Journal of Adolescent Health*, *53*(1), S13–S20. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jadohealth.2012.09.018

36. Kumar, V., & Sadeeq, M. (2020). Estimation Of Psychometrics Of Cyber Bullying Attitude Measure In Indian Context. *European Journal of Molecular & Clinical Medicine*, *7*(6), 2880–2887.

37. Li, Q. (2006). Cyberbullying in Schools. *School Psychology International*, *27*(2), 157–170. https://doi.org/10.1177/0143034306064547

38. Macpherson, L. (2022). *The Psychological Experience of Cyberbullying Among Transgender Adults*. Walden University.

39. Mitchell, K. J., Ybarra, M., & Finkelhor, D. (2007). The relative importance of online victimization in understanding depression, delinquency, and substance use. *Child Maltreatment*, *12*(4), 314–324. https://doi.org/10.1177/1077559507305996

40. Moore, P. M., Huebner, E. S., & Hills, K. J. (2012). Electronic Bullying and Victimization and Life Satisfaction in Middle School Students. *Social Indicators Research*, *107*(3), 429–447. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11205-011-9856-z

41. Ndiege, J. R. A., & Kanyi, P. W. (2018). Cyberbullying in institutions of higher learning in developing countries: Evidence from Kenya. *2018 IEEE International Symposium on Technology and Society (ISTAS)*, 108–112. https://doi.org/10.1109/ISTAS.2018.8638267

42. Ngo, A. T., Tran, A. Q., Tran, B. X., Nguyen, L. H., Hoang, M. T., Nguyen, T. H. T., Doan, L. P., Vu, G. T., Nguyen, T. H., Do, H. T., Latkin, C. A., Ho, R. C. M., & Ho, C. S. H. (2021). Cyberbullying Among School Adolescents in an Urban Setting of a Developing Country: Experience, Coping Strategies, and Mediating Effects of Different Support on Psychological Well-Being. *Frontiers in Psychology*, *12*. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2021.661919

43. Nikolić, D., Čizmić, S., Vukelić, M., Tošković, O., Damnjanović, K., & Lazarević, L. (2017). Workplace cyberbullying and employee emotional well-being: The moderating effect of perceived organisational support. In O. Tošković, K. Damnjanović, & L. Lazarević (Eds.), *Zbornik radova sa XXII naučnog skupa Empirijska istraživanja u psihologiji, 24-26. mart 2017.* (pp. 133–137). Filozofski fakultet, Univerzitet u Beogradu.

44. Olenik-Shemesh, D., Heiman, T., & Eden, S. (2012). Cyberbullying victimisation in adolescence: Relationships with loneliness and depressive mood. *Emotional and Behavioural Difficulties*, *17*(3–4), 361–374. https://www.learntechlib.org/p/88471/

45. Park, M., & Choi, J. S. (2019). Effects of workplace cyberbullying on nurses' symptom experience and turnover intention. *Journal of Nursing Management*, *27*(6), 1108–1115. https://doi.org/10.1111/jonm.12779

46. Peluchette, J. V., Karl, K., Wood, C., & Williams, J. (2015). Cyberbullying victimization: Do victims' personality and risky social network behaviors contribute to the problem? *Computers in Human Behavior*, *52*, 424–435. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2015.06.028

47. Saman, Z. M., Siti-Azrin, A. H., Othman, A., & Kueh, Y. C. (2021). The Validity and Reliability of the Malay Version of the Cyberbullying Scale among Secondary School Adolescents in Malaysia. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, *18*(21), 11669. https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph182111669

48. Schenk, A. M., & Fremouw, W. J. (2012). Prevalence, Psychological Impact, and Coping of Cyberbully Victims Among College Students. *Journal of School Violence*, *11*(1), 21–37. https://doi.org/10.1080/15388220.2011.630310

49. Schenk, A. M., Fremouw, W. J., & Keelan, C. M. (2013). Characteristics of college cyberbullies. *Computers in Human Behavior*, *29*(6), 2320–2327. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2013.05.013

50. Schneider, S. K., O'donnell, L., Stueve, A., & Coulter, R. W. S. (2012). Cyberbullying, school bullying, and psychological distress: A regional census of high school students. *American Journal of Public Health*, *102*(1), 171–177. https://doi.org/10.2105/AJPH.2011.300308

51. Shapka, J. D., & Maghsoudi, R. (2017). Examining the validity and reliability of the cyber-aggression and cyber-victimization scale. *Computers in Human Behavior*, *69*, 10–17. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2016.12.015

52. Smith, P. K., Mahdavi, J., Carvalho, M., Fisher, S., Russell, S., & Tippett, N. (2008). Cyberbullying: Its nature and impact in secondary school pupils. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry and Allied Disciplines*, *49*(4), 376–385. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1469-7610.2007.01846.x

53. Snyman, R., & Loh, J. (2015). Cyberbullying at work: The mediating role of optimism between cyberbullying and job outcomes. *Computers in Human Behavior*, *53*, 161–168. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2015.06.050

54. Somma, A., Gialdi, G., Arioli, C., De Ciechi, A., Mariani, V., & Fossati, A. (2022). Assessing cyberbullying in adolescence: Psychometric properties and external correlates of the Cyberbullying Experience Scale in Italian community-dwelling adolescents. *Behaviour & Information Technology*, 1–13. https://doi.org/10.1080/0144929X.2022.2045360

55. Sourander, A., Brunstein Klomek, A., Ikonen, M., Lindroos, J., Luntamo, T., Koskelainen, M., Ristkari, T., & Helenius, H. (2010). Psychosocial Risk Factors Associated With Cyberbullying Among Adolescents. *Archives of General Psychiatry*, *67*(7), 720–728. https://doi.org/10.1001/archgenpsychiatry.2010.79

56. Souza, S. B., Veiga Simão, A. M., Ferreira, A. I., & Ferreira, P. C. (2018). University students' perceptions of campus climate, cyberbullying and cultural issues: implications for theory and practice. *Studies in Higher Education*, *43*(11), 2072–2087. https://doi.org/10.1080/03075079.2017.1307818

57. Spitzberg, B. H., & Hoobler, G. (2002). Cyberstalking and the technologies of interpersonal terrorism. *New Media & Society*, *4*(1), 71–92. https://doi.org/10.1177/14614440222226271

58. Stewart, R. W., Drescher, C. F., Maack, D. J., Ebesutani, C., & Young, J. (2014). The development and psychometric investigation of the cyberbullying scale. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, *29*(12), 2218–2238. https://doi.org/10.1177/0886260513517552

59. Tanrikulu, I., & Erdur-Baker, Ö. (2021). Psychometric properties of a Cyberbullying Inventory for university students. *British Journal of Guidance & Counselling*, *49*(3), 494–507. https://doi.org/10.1080/03069885.2020.1775174

60. Tian, L., Yan, Y., & Huebner, E. S. (2018). Effects of Cyberbullying and Cybervictimization on Early Adolescents' Mental Health: Differential Mediating Roles of Perceived Peer Relationship Stress. *Cyberpsychology, Behavior, and Social Networking*, *21*(7), 429–436. https://doi.org/10.1089/cyber.2017.0735

61. Topcu, Ç., & Erdur-Baker, Ö. (2018). RCBI-II: The Second Revision of the Revised Cyber Bullying Inventory. *Measurement and Evaluation in Counseling and Development*, *51*(1), 32–41. https://doi.org/10.1080/07481756.2017.1395705

62. Vranjes, I., Baillien, E., Vandebosch, H., Erreygers, S., & De Witte, H. (2018a). When workplace bullying goes online: construction and valida-

tion of the Inventory of Cyberbullying Acts at Work (ICA-W). *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, *27*(1), 28–39. https://doi.org/10.1080/1359432X.2017.1363185

63. Vranjes, I., Baillien, E., Vandebosch, H., Erreygers, S., & De Witte, H. (2018b). Kicking someone in cyberspace when they are down: Testing the role of stressor evoked emotions on exposure to workplace cyberbullying. *Work & Stress*, *32*(4), 379–399. https://doi.org/10.1080/02678373.2018.1437233
64. Vranjes, I., Erreygers, S., Vandebosch, H., Baillien, E., & De Witte, H. (2018). Patterns of cybervictimization and emotion regulation in adolescents and adults. *Aggressive Behavior*, *44*(6), 647–657. https://doi.org/10.1002/ab.21790
65. Walker, C. M., Sockman, B. R., & Koehn, S. (2011). An Exploratory Study of Cyberbullying with Undergraduate University Students. *TechTrends*, *55*(2), 31–38. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11528-011-0481-0
66. Zhang, D., Huebner, E. S., & Tian, L. (2020). Longitudinal associations among neuroticism, depression, and cyberbullying in early adolescents. *Computers in Human Behavior*, *112*, 106475. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2020.106475
67. Zhang, H., Sun, X., Chen, L., Yang, H., & Wang, Y. (2020). The Mediation Role of Moral Personality Between Childhood Psychological Abuse and Cyberbullying Perpetration Attitudes of College Students. *Frontiers in Psychology*, *11*. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2020.01215
68. Zhang, S., Leidner, D., Cao, X., & Liu, N. (2022). Workplace cyberbullying: A criminological and routine activity perspective. *Journal of Information Technology*, *37*(1), 51–79. https://doi.org/10.1177/02683962211027888
69. Zhang, Z., Wang, H., Zhang, L., & Zheng, J. (2021). Workplace cyberbullying and interpersonal deviance: roles of depletion and perceived supervisor support. *Asia Pacific Journal of Human Resources*. https://doi.org/10.1111/1744-7941.12303

Dr Milena Milićević
Viši naučni saradnik, Institut za kriminološka i sociološka istraživanja u Beogradu

SAJBERBULING I SAJBER VIKTIMIZACIJA: PREGLED LITERATURE O INSTRUMENTIMA ZA PROCENU[2]

Tokom poslednje dve decenije, naše znanje o sajber nasilju i njegovim posledicama je povećano. Detaljniji uvid u karakteristike sajberbulinga i sajber viktimizacije je moguć uz značajno raznovrsne mere procene. Međutim, ne postoji usaglašenost o najboljoj metodi merenja. Ovaj pregled literature je imao za cilj da identifikuje i predstavi instrumente i mere procene koje su konstruisane i korišćene za procenu sajberbulinga i/ili sajber viktimizacije. Ukupno 2031 publikacija je identifikovano sistematskom pretragom. Proces selekcije je rezultirao sa 11 instrumenata procene koji su dalje analizirani. Prema nalazima, polazna tačka u sastavljanju ili adaptiranju instrumenata za procenu specifičnih za naš kontekst treba da bude konzistentna, poboljšana i standardizovana definicija sajberbulinga uporediva sa definicijama koji se koriste širom sveta, praćena preciznim kriterijumima za reprezentativnost ciljne populacije i pažljivo razmotrenim socio-kulturalnim faktorima i utvrđenim vremenskim okvirom.

KLJUČNE REČI: sajberbuling / merenje / procena / sajber uznemiravanje

[2] Ovaj rad nastao je kao rezultat istraživačkog angažovanja prema Planu i programu rada Instituta za kriminološka i sociološka istraživanja za 2022. godinu (na osnovu Ugovora broj 451-03-68/2022-14 od 17. 01. 2022 god.)