

## AN ABSTRACT OF THE THESIS OF

Jeffrey M. Flesch for the degree of Master of Science in Human Development and Family Studies presented on October 8, 2015.

Title: School Bullying Intervention Programs and the Eight Positive Youth Development Indicators of High-Quality Youth Programs: A Systematic Review and Analysis

Abstract approved:

---

Mary E. Arnold

During the past two decades a wide range of intervention programs have emerged in response to escalating concerns over school bullying. The advent of such programs seems justified as 70 percent of school-aged children and youth identify bullying as a problem in their school (Polanin, et al., 2012; Renshaw & Jimerson, 2011) and almost one-in-three report being bullied (Swearer & Espelage, 2003). Yet there is some ambiguity as to whether such programming is sufficiently rooted in a youth development perspective where the emphasis lies in positive approaches to building youth's capacities (termed Positive Youth Development or PYD) rather than more deficit-based approaches that focus on controlling or extinguishing negative behaviors. School bullying intervention programs often obtain mixed results, thus integrating PYD strategies proven effective in other youth programs into school bullying interventions may be a useful way to obtain beneficial outcomes by promoting positive behaviors alongside the reduction of negative behaviors. Yet previous published systematic reviews of school bullying

intervention programs and PYD programs have not explored the possibility of this integration. Within PYD, eight explicit indicators distinguish high performing programs (Eccles & Gootman, 2002). This systematic review drew on a set of evaluation studies spanning the past decade to find out whether school bullying interventions were employing program strategies that aligned with the eight PYD indicators. To make this determination, the school bullying intervention program models were reconstructed from information gleaned from the evaluation studies. Each program model was examined for program objectives and activities designed to reach specific goals that aligned with the eight PYD indicators of high-quality youth programs. Thus, the aim of this study was to determine the extent to which school bullying intervention programs aligned with the eight PYD indicators; and, to determine whether the programs were using strategies that aligned with the indicators explicitly or implicitly. Understanding how school bullying intervention programming aligns with a PYD program quality approach is a first necessary step to charting a course toward the development of new intervention strategies that may help mitigate future rates of school bullying.

©Copyright by Jeffrey M. Flesch  
October 8, 2015  
All Rights Reserved

School Bullying Intervention Programs and the Eight Positive Youth Development  
Indicators of High-Quality Youth Programs: A Systematic Review and Analysis

by  
Jeffrey M. Flesch

A THESIS

submitted to

Oregon State University

in partial fulfillment of  
the requirements for the  
degree of

Master of Science

Presented October 8, 2015  
Commencement June, 2016

Master of Science thesis of Jeffrey M. Flesch presented on October 8, 2015

APPROVED:

---

Major Professor, representing Human Development and Family Studies

---

Co-Director of the School of Social and Behavioral Health Sciences

---

Dean of the Graduate School

I understand that my thesis will become part of the permanent collection of Oregon State University libraries. My signature below authorizes release of my thesis to any reader upon request.

---

Jeffrey M. Flesch, Author

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The author expresses sincere appreciation to his committee members, Mary Arnold, Kate MacTavish, Megan McClelland, Alan Acock, and Molly Engle. Each of the committee members contributed uniquely to my thesis process and for that I am forever grateful. I would also like to express my sincerest gratitude toward my adviser, Mary Arnold, for committing long hours to helping me see my thesis to its completion.

My family, Jennifer, Justin, and Jason, have been on this journey with me for more than 7 years, and I would like to thank them collectively and individually for their support and devotion to me as a father, spouse, and friend. Without their support this thesis would never have been completed.

To David, Sharon, Leanne, Melissa, Cory, Tim, and Sandy, thank you for all your support over the years. Your guidance is very important to me, and helped me in times of doubt.

Finally, to the Human Development and Family Studies 2012 cohort, thanks for your help over the past 3 years. You are a second family to me, and I greatly appreciate having you in my life.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter 1: Introduction.....	1
School Bullying Intervention Programs.....	2
Positive Youth Development Programs.....	5
School Bullying and Positive Youth Development .....	7
Chapter 2: Review of the Literature .....	9
School Bullying Research History and Definitions .....	9
School Bullying Intervention Programs.....	11
PYD Research History and Definitions .....	15
Positive Youth Development Programs.....	16
The Eight PYD Indicators of High-quality Programs.....	17
School Bullying Interventions and the PYD Indicators: A Possible Integration? .....	20
Chapter 3: Methods.....	23
Design .....	23
Selecting the Evaluation Study Sample .....	23
Analysis .....	27
Chapter 4: Results.....	37
Alignment with the Eight PYD Indicators.....	37
Explicit and Implicit use of the PYD Indicators .....	43
Chapter 5: Discussion.....	45
Program Alignment with Specific PYD Indicators.....	46
Explicit and Implicit Use of the PYD Indicators .....	51
A Textual Analysis .....	51

## TABLE OF CONTENTS (Continued)

Implications .....	53
Limitations .....	56
Chapter 6: Conclusion .....	57
Bibliography .....	60
Appendices.....	73
Appendix A.....	74
Appendix B: Sample Selection .....	75
Appendix C: Program Model Alignment with PYD.....	76
Appendix D: Evaluation Study Information .....	82
Appendix E: Reconstructed Program Models.....	86

## LIST OF TABLES

<u>Table</u>		<u>Page</u>
1	Reconstructed Program Model Excerpt .....	34
2	Descriptive Alignment with the Eight PYD Indicators Excerpt.....	37
3	Count Alignment with the Eight PYD Indicators Excerpt.....	40
4	Count Alignment with the Eight PYD Indicators .....	41

## GLOSSARY

There are various technical terms utilized throughout this study. Many of these terms seem similar; yet have meanings that are subtly different. This glossary was created with the intent of providing the reader with definitions of the terms commonly utilized in this study in order to differentiate among them and make the language used in this study clearer.

SCHOOL BULLYING INTERVENTION PROGRAM	A program created to reduce school bullying.
PROGRAM EVALUATION OR EVALUATION STUDIES	Published peer-reviewed studies utilized as a source of data to reconstruct each program model.
RECONSTRUCTED PROGRAM MODEL	The goals, objectives, and activities extracted from each evaluation study and utilized as the unit of analysis.
THEORY OF CHANGE	A specific approach a program plans to utilize to create the change necessary among youth participants to achieve the program goals.
THEORY OF ACTION	A process of utilizing specific activities to achieve the programs objectives and goals.
INTERVENTION CURRICULUM	Lessons the program uses to deliver the intervention.
SYSTEMATIC REVIEW	A systematic process of searching for, collecting, and analyzing evaluation studies.
THE EIGHT POSITIVE YOUTH DEVELOPMENT (PYD) INDICATORS OF HIGH-QUALITY YOUTH PROGRAMS	Eight program strategies found to foster and promote positive youth development.
ECOLOGICAL SYSTEMS; ECOLOGICAL HOLISM; HOLISITC MODELS	A theory that posits that in order to understand human behavior, each level of a person's ecology (from micro-level individual variables to macro-level community variables) must be examined.

## Chapter 1: Introduction

This study explored whether school bullying interventions utilize program strategies that align with the eight Positive Youth Development (PYD) indicators<sup>1</sup> of high-quality youth programs (Eccles & Gootman, 2002). These eight indicators have been proven effective in other types of youth programs, such as after-school programs and community programs, and are linked to building an intervention context that supports the development of youth skills and competencies (Eccles & Gootman, 2002).

Developing youth skills and competencies through other intervention programming (Durlak et al., 2007; Lerner et al., 2005; Phelps et al., 2009; Roth et al., 1998; Shek & Sun, 2009; Smith et al., 2013) has also been linked to reductions in youths' negative behaviors and actions (Catalano et al., 2004). As such, this study questioned whether school bullying intervention programs are moving away from deficit-centered approaches<sup>2</sup> and toward more positive approaches that focus on building youth skills and competencies.

No systematic review<sup>3</sup> to date has explored the possibility that school bullying intervention programs may be moving toward more positive approaches during a time frame when these programs are on the rise and are achieving mixed results. This study does not attempt to answer whether utilizing strategies that align with the eight PYD indicators *will* result in lower rates of bullying, but, rather, whether school bullying

---

<sup>1</sup> The PYD indicators will be elaborated on later in the introduction as well as in the literature review.

<sup>2</sup> Deficit-centered approaches take as their primary concern the elimination of negative behaviors and actions (such as bullying). While the primary concern of PYD approaches focus on building youth skills and competencies.

<sup>3</sup> Systematic reviews utilize systematic procedures for reviewing and analyzing the literature on a given topic. For example, systematic reviews are commonly used to compare the effectiveness of school bullying intervention programs, but are not commonly used to examine program models or strategies. Detailed information about this study's systematic review approach is included in the methods section.

intervention programs are even using strategies that are in alignment with the PYD indicators to begin with.

Understanding whether school bullying interventions are utilizing strategies that align with the PYD indicators may provide researchers and practitioners with theoretically important and practically useful information. Theoretically important because this study may create new areas of inquiry and the base for future research if alignment between school bullying intervention programs and the PYD indicators is found; and, practically useful because this study will provide information about the PYD indicators that are used most, which may prove useful for integrating new strategies into school bullying intervention programs. Thus, this systematic review aims to uncover the potential that exists between school bullying intervention programs and the eight PYD indicators of high-quality youth programs.

### **School Bullying Intervention Programs**

During the past two decades school bullying has emerged as a pervasive problem, the effects of which are pernicious, resulting in widespread negative outcomes for youth involved in school bullying. Well over two-thirds of school-age children and youth in the U.S. identify bullying as a problem in their school (Polanin, et al., 2012; Renshaw & Jimerson, 2011) and close to one-in-three report having been bullied themselves (Swearer & Espelage, 2003). School bullying by definition includes an imbalance of power, where acts are committed against someone repeatedly over time. Being bullied at school is associated with a host of negative outcomes including lower academic performance and increased risk for anxiety and depression (Mishna, 2012; Swearer, Espelage, & Napolitano, 2009) Not only victims, but everyone involved (bully, victim, bystander,

teacher, parent, etc.) are at risk for negative effects that include psychological difficulties and relationships issues (Bowlan, 2011; Fonagy et al., 2005; Kaltiala-Heino et al., 2000; Kumpulainen et al., 1998; Swearer et al., 2001). Further, the negative effects of school bullying can last for years (Hawker & Boulton, 2000). For instance, studies show that being bullied in school can increase the risk of substance abuse, anxiety, and depression in early adulthood (McDougall, Vaillancourt, & Hymel, 2009; Sourander et al., 2007).

The pervasive incidence of school bullying and the potential for long lasting and widespread effects speaks to the need for effective intervention programming. Yet, while numerous intervention programs have emerged in recent decades and have increased dramatically in the past ten years, school bullying rates are still very high. That school bullying intervention programs have increased in the past ten years during a time frame when bullying incidents continue to rise begs the question as to whether these programs are utilizing strategies that are effective from a PYD program quality approach.<sup>4</sup>

While a PYD program quality approach is tailored to address youth (5-12 grade), younger children need access to effective school bullying programs as well. In fact, more school bullying intervention programs today are created and delivered to younger children because research in developmental science shows that intervening in the early stages of a child's life is beneficial for their overall development (Phillips & Shonkoff, 2000). However, more recent research in developmental science shows that youth have much to gain from interventions created specifically to the adolescence developmental period (Lerner & Steinberg, 2009; Steinberg, 2010). For instance, research on adolescent

---

<sup>4</sup> The phrase PYD program quality approach (termed PYD approach going forward) is used in this study to differentiate a PYD focus on programming, such as the PYD indicators, from a broader PYD perspective on youth development.

brain plasticity reveals that the adolescent brain has much more flexibility than was previously understood (Steinberg, 2010). Increased brain plasticity during adolescence means that youth can create new developmental trajectories by learning new cognitive processes for making decisions, or for handling stressful situations. Coupling increased brain plasticity with the developmental changes youth go through during adolescence makes the adolescent developmental period also an appropriate time for school bullying intervention programs (Steinberg, 2010).

In addition, many developmental processes (both personal and relational) are just beginning to take shape for youth in middle-school, which is one reason why school-bullying can be so damaging to this age group (Mishna, 2012; Swearer, Espelage & Napolitano, 2009; Ttofi & Farrington, 2011 ). Thus, intervention programs should employ approaches that recognize that during adolescence youth are working on forming independent identities, making bids for greater autonomy (Erikson, 1968; Kiang & Fulgini, 2009; Steinberg & Morris, 2001), and negotiating a range of relationships, all of which are critical to a youths' development (Brown & Larson, 2010; Mahoney et al., 2009; Way & Green, 2006).

School bullying intervention programs that are informed by a PYD approach would also employ strategies that create spaces where identities are fostered, opportunities to belong are available, and supportive relationships are scaffolded. Youth identity, autonomy, diversity, and relationships are important to school bullying interventions because bullying hampers development in these areas. As such, understanding how school bullying interventions incorporate strategies into their programs that *promote* youth development across these areas is important.

Some school bullying intervention programs employ ecological models<sup>5</sup> (Mishna, 2012; Swearer, Espelage & Napolitano, 2009); yet even many of these programs are often written generally with strategies that are conceptualized as appropriate regardless of developmental stage. Though this is a common approach among school bullying interventions, theory suggests that programs should employ holistic models that *include* developmentally appropriate strategies that are specific to adolescence (Eccles & Gootman, 2002). In fact, many school bullying researchers agree and are today calling for more holistic theories that can address the various ways in which youth are affected, as well as affect the contexts in which they interact on a daily basis (Swearer et al., 2010).

### **Positive Youth Development Programs**

Positive Youth Development (PYD) programs have increased over the past ten years and have been successful at promoting positive youth behaviors (Durlak et al., 2007; Lerner et al., 2005; Phelps et al., 2009; Roth et al., 1998; Shek & Sun, 2009; Smith et al., 2013) while also limiting negative behaviors (Catalano, et al., 2004). Thus, a PYD approach represents a paradigm shift away from intervention models solely concerned with the elimination of negative behaviors to an approach that recognizes the utility in promoting and building youth capacities.

Strength-based approaches, like PYD, work towards creating inclusive spaces for all youth to realize their full potential. Further, these approaches recognize that children and youth need access to program strategies that are congruous to their developmental stage (Eccles & Gootman, 2002). For instance, youth are striving to feel unique and

---

<sup>5</sup> Ecological theory posits that in order to understand human behavior each level of an individual's system (the individual, peers, family, school, and community) must be considered (Bronfenbrenner, 1992).

belong at the same time, which creates a tension that can be addressed by employing a PYD approach that recognizes the need to provide youth the opportunity to develop leadership skills alongside team building.

PYD is a holistic approach that recognizes the utility in harnessing the entire ecology of a young person's life. For example, recognizing the utility in including the individual, peer, family, school, and community contexts into the intervention process (Eccles & Gootman, 2002). Including each context of a young person's life into the intervention process ensures that the interactions between these contexts are being accounted for. Therefore, involving parents and siblings in the intervention process can increase their awareness about behavioral changes and potentially help mitigate negative outcomes of being bullied from manifesting at home.

### **The Eight PYD Indicators of High-quality Youth Programs**

In a comprehensive analysis of youth development programs that promote positive outcomes, Eccles & Gootman (2002) determined that high-quality youth programs contain eight specific indicators: *Physical and Psychological Safety*, *Appropriate Structure*, *Supportive Relationships*, *Opportunities to Belong*, *Positive Social Norms*, *Support for Efficacy and Mattering*, *Opportunities for Skill Building*, and *Integration of Family, School, and Community*. These eight indicators are not only tailored to youth, but also promote positive youth development through capacity building.<sup>6</sup>

---

<sup>6</sup> The term capacity building refers to a process of developing a youth's skill set in a given area. For instance, using program activities, such as group discussions or role modeling on leadership, can increase a youth's capacity to lead other youth.

The *Opportunities to Belong* indicator, for instance, recognizes the need to create spaces for all youth identities, regardless of a youths' gender, sexual orientation, race, class, ability or culture. Creating spaces that embrace diversity promotes a youth's desire to be unique and belong at the same time; celebrating diversity is prominent within the eight PYD indicators of high-quality youth programs. Providing spaces for youth to thrive is critical to ensure that all youth are able to participate in any intervention program in ways meaningful to them.

The *Supportive Relationships* and *Support for Efficacy and Mattering* indicators support youth autonomy and the development of positive relationships by including opportunities for youth to actively participate in the intervention process both individually and collectively. Providing space for youth to make a difference in their school, while expanding their social networks is beneficial for a youth's positive development. The development of youth relationships and autonomy combined with allocating space to celebrate diversity illustrates the focus that the PYD indicators have on promoting positive outcomes for all youth.

### **School Bullying and Positive Youth Development**

Although PYD is used in a wide array of youth programs (Eccles & Gootman, 2002), none of the previously published systematic reviews of school bullying intervention programs refer to PYD explicitly (Ferguson et al., 2007; Jiminez-Barbero et al., 2012; Merrell et al., 2008; Polanin et al., 2012; Ryan & Smith, 2009; Smith et al., 2004; Ttofi & Farrington, 2011; Vreeman & Carrol, 2007). Further, although other youth programs have been analyzed from a PYD perspective, school bullying intervention programs are not typically included in these types of reviews. Consequently, the degree

to which school bullying intervention programs align with a PYD approach remains unclear.

This study employed a systematic review approach that used a sample of school bullying intervention program evaluations to reconstruct each intervention's program model (goals, objectives, and activities), and to analyze how each of the programs' objectives and activities aligned with the eight PYD indicators of high-quality youth programs (Eccles & Gootman, 2002). The evaluation studies were utilized as the source of data in this study because they contained the information needed for the analysis. And, the reconstructed program models served as the unit of analysis because they highlight how the programs intended to create the change necessary in the youth participants to reach the long-term program goals.

The purpose of this study was to reveal the extent to which school bullying intervention program strategies were informed by the eight PYD indicators of high-quality youth programs. As such, this study focused on the processes that school bullying intervention programs intended to utilize to create the change necessary in the youth participants to reach their short- and long-term goals. While the outcomes of these processes are important, understanding first how school bullying intervention programs intend to create change is a necessary step, which may lead to future research on the implications of program processes in relation to outcomes. The result of this study will fill a gap in the literature by providing researchers and practitioners with descriptive information about the potential alignment between school bullying intervention programs and the eight PYD indicators of high-quality youth programs.

## **Chapter 2: Review of the Literature**

Analyzing school bullying intervention programs from a PYD approach requires attention to these two distinct bodies of literature. School bullying research and intervention programs draw mainly from psychological theory, the primary aim being to curb behavior and limit negative actions (Mishna, 2102; Swearer, Espelage, & Napolitano, 2009). PYD draws heavily from psychological theory also, yet the emphasis is on promoting positive behaviors and actions (Eccles & Gootman, 2002). Research in both areas has been ongoing for more than 25 years, so the next two sections cover each area separately. The final section explores the potential for utilizing the PYD indicators as a possible strategy for school bullying intervention programs.

### **School Bullying Research History and Definitions**

School bullying has been studied for over forty years, beginning with Dan Olweus<sup>7</sup> in Norway in the early 1970's. These first studies focused on describing causes of school bullying and determining the negative outcomes for victims and the mechanisms that lead youth to bully, such as higher levels of aggression and other behavioral issues (Olweus, 1993). Subsequent studies have also described some of the negative outcomes of being bullied, such as decreased academic performance, increased levels of anxiety, and in extreme cases increased risk of suicide (Bowllan, 2011; Fonagy et al., 2005; Kaltiala-Heino et al., 2000; Kumpulainen et al., 1998; Swearer et al., 2001). However, being a perpetrator and a victim are not mutually exclusive. In fact, recent studies show that youth who bully other youth and who are/were also bullied are at the

---

<sup>7</sup> Dan Olweus is often cited as the first scholar to study bullying scientifically. Thus, much of the research conducted today is built around Olweus's early work in school bullying research and program evaluation.

highest risk for negative outcomes (Swearer et al., 2010), some of which, last well into adulthood, such as increased risk of substance abuse, anxiety, and depression.<sup>8</sup> Because school bullying is a complex issue with a range of antecedents and negative outcomes for youth, defining the factors that should be included into school bullying definitions is often disagreed upon.

Although there is disagreement in the field about the factors that should be included in school bullying definitions, most scholars agree that these definitions should include an imbalance of power and repeated negative acts over time (Mishna, 2012; Swearer, Espelage & Napolitano, 2009). Olweus's definition includes these factors and has been used across the world: "A person is bullied when he or she is exposed, repeatedly and over time, to negative actions on the part of one or more other persons, and he or she has difficulty defending himself or herself" (Olweus, 1993).

Because new forms of school bullying have emerged over the past twenty years, such as relational aggression and cyberbullying (Mishna, 2012), Olweus's definition is more inclusive than others as it does not include a rigid definition based on physical aggression alone. Thus, it is not only physical aggression that needs to be studied but all types of bullying that include power imbalances over time. Furthermore, aggression is not always synonymous with bullying (Totfi & Farrington, 2011).<sup>9</sup> Thus, the complexity of deciding which factors should be included into school bullying definitions *is*

---

<sup>8</sup> School bullying is also harmful to individuals on the periphery of bullying incidents, such as youth bystanders (Bowllan, 2011; Fonagy et al., 2005; Kaltiala-Heino et al., 2000; Kumpulainen et al., 1998; Swearer et al., 2001).

<sup>9</sup> Because a youth is aggressive, for instance, does not mean that they are a bully; and, because a youth is a bully does not mean that they are aggressive. The distinction between aggression and bullying is more profound in Europe than it is in the United States (Totfi & Farrington, 2011), which is another reason why there is disagreement on factors that should be included in school bullying definitions. School bullying definitions in the United States typically include an aggressive component (Gladden, Vivolo-Kantor, Hamburger, & Lumpkin, 2014) whereas definitions from Europe do not.

complicated. Yet, that there is agreement among scholars on power imbalances and repeated negative acts over time fits well with utilizing a definition that is inclusive of various types of school bullying perceptions, behaviors, and incidents.

Though much of the initial research on school bullying focused on utilizing definitions to identify improper perceptions, behaviors, and incidents, most of the school bullying research today is focused on best practices and evidenced-based strategies for creating high-quality interventions (Swearer & Espelage, 2010). School bullying intervention programs have increased in the past ten years, and draw from a relatively long history. These interventions are multifaceted and use a wide-range of approaches to help mitigate school bullying.

### **School Bullying Intervention Programs**

The emergence of school-based programs began in 1983 with the implementation of the Olweus Bullying Prevention Program (OBPP) (Olweus & Limber, 2010). Implemented nationally in Norway, the OBPP is considered the first large-scale school bullying prevention program. In 1991 the first evaluation of the OBPP was conducted in Bergen, Norway (Farrington et al., 2008). The implementation of the OPBB in 1983 and the evaluation conducted in 1991 served as the catalyst for a multiplicity of school bullying intervention programs and evaluations to follow. These first evaluation studies documented several positive results, such as 20 to 70 percent reductions in student reports of being bullied and bullying others, marked reductions in other anti-social behaviors, and noticeable improvements to classroom social climate (Hazelden Foundation, 2007). Although positive, there is wide variation in these results, which is typical for many school bullying intervention programs (Mishna, 2014; Swearer, Espelage & Napolitano,

2009). Furthermore, these first interventions also found that for older students, especially students in grades 8-12, it may take up to two years or more to achieve similar positive results.

These first intervention programs laid the groundwork for the development of the multiplicity of school bullying intervention programs that followed. Today, school bullying intervention programs utilize various theories, most of which are grounded in psychology; all of which look to change perceptions and behaviors. Although there has been a recent shift toward an emphasis on more holistic approaches, such as ecological theory, there are several other prominent theories still used today that include risk and resiliency models, social and behavioral cognitive models, attribution models, and social emotional learning models (Mishna, 2012). These theories are typically focused at the peer level, which is essential to understand how youth interact. Focusing on peer interactions alone, however, does not address how other contexts affect youth. Therefore, many researchers today are calling for more holistic theories that can address the various ways in which youth are affected, as well affect the contexts in which they interact on a daily basis (Swearer et al., 2010).

Though more holistic theories are being called for, school bullying intervention programs still included a wide range of delivery approaches, such as programs focused on the peer-level, the classroom level, or the whole-school level (Swearer, Espelage & Napolitano, 2009). Thus, considering each type of approach is necessary to understand the range of program strategies school bullying interventions utilize.

Peer-level approaches focus on cognitive change. These programs aim to change individual perceptions and behaviors by educating youth about bullying. Typically, these

programs are delivered to youth via video or the internet. Peer-level programs aim to distinguish bullying from other forms of conflict, and to decrease bullying behaviors by increasing individual awareness (Baldry & Farrington, 2007; Baly & Cornell, 2011; Evers et al. 2007). Although associated with lower costs and increased efficiency, peer-level programs do not subscribe to models that integrate all system levels. For example, although these programs aim to change individual perceptions and behaviors in relation to bullying, they do not consider how families and other contexts affect these behaviors and perceptions. Thus, over time, it is possible that these programs may not be optimal as many other contexts affect bullying perceptions and behaviors as young people make their way through adolescence.

There are several classroom-level approaches to school bullying interventions, all of which work from a group (class) level that requires youth to work together to reduce bullying. Several of these programs work to engage youth in ways that increase empathy and the capacity to solve conflicts (Gollwitzer et al., 2007; Jiminez-Barbero, 2013; Menesini et al., 2003), expand social skills and competencies (Domino, 2013; Tangen & Campbell, 2010), and strive to create positive classroom environments (van der Meulen et al., 2010). Although not whole-school approaches, these programs work from a more holistic model. For instance, classroom approaches utilize group discussions and role plays to teach youth about the role of the individual and the group in an attempt to reduce bullying incidents.

Whole-school approaches are relatively common, and like classroom approaches there is also wide variation among these intervention programs. Yet, like classroom-level implementations there are a few components that are evidenced, to varying degrees,

among all school-wide programs. For instance, getting youth, teachers, staff, parents, and communities actively involved in the intervention process is used often by whole-school school bullying programs. Whole-school approaches also look to engage youth in ways that foster a whole school climate that educates teachers, parents, and staff about bullying (Bauer et al., 2007; Black et al., 2009; Bowlan, 2011; Cornell et al., 2009; Hunt 2007; Karna et al., 2013; Lewis et al., 2013; Olweus, 2005; Ortega et al., 2004; Pack et al., 2011; Pepler et al., 2004; Rawana et al., 2011; Schroeder et al., 2011; Strohmeier et al., 2012; Wong et al., 2011). Finally, whole-school approaches involve the greater community to varying degrees by harnessing ideas of community in relation to the school proper (Ortega et al., 2004), or by actively integrate community members into the intervention program (Black et al., 2009; Bowlan, 2011). For example, some whole-school approaches create a community culture within the school, or have local professionals come and share their experiences of bullying.

**Results from School Bullying Intervention Programs.** Findings from school bullying intervention program evaluation studies across the peer, classroom, and whole-school levels are mixed. Much of the variability seems to lie in measurement, school context, and intervention approach. That is, there are several different measures for assessing pre and post intervention change, there is much diversity between school contexts, and all outcomes vary as a function of whether they are aimed at the peer, classroom, or whole-school level. As such, some school bullying interventions show positive effects while others do not. Some of these mixed results may also be a product of the wide-range of school bullying intervention program strategies, some of which do not employ an ecological framework (Baldry & Farrington, 2007; Baly & Cornell, 2011;

Domino, 2013; Evers et al., 2007; Gollwitzer et al., 2007; Jiminez-Barbero, 2013; Menesini et al., 2003; Tangen & Campbell, 2010; van der Meulen et al., 2010). Further, it is possible that these mixed results occur because school bullying interventions are often written generally with strategies that are conceptualized as applicable across ages and developmental stages. Although general approaches are common among school bullying intervention programs, PYD theory suggests that programs should develop and utilize strategies that are specific to the age and developmental stage of the youth participants (Eccles & Gootman, 2002).

Although results from school bullying intervention programs are mixed, the literature reveals that many bullying programs employ holistic models, which might align well theoretically with a PYD approach that is also grounded in utilizing the various contexts youth navigate to promote positive development. Determining whether school bullying interventions align well with the PYD indicators requires first understanding the emergence of PYD and the youth programs that followed.

### **PYD Research History and Definitions**

During the early 1990's, PYD developed simultaneously out of comparative psychology and biology, and emphasized the need to view youth as resources to be developed (Lerner et al., 2005). Because PYD represents a paradigm shift from the alleviation of negative behaviors to a focus on building youth capacities (Pittman, 2011), at first glance PYD seems like a theory that might not fit well with school bullying interventions, which are focused on reducing (or eliminating) negative behaviors that lead to bullying incidents. Yet, the evidence from youth programs that employ a PYD

approach contradicts this premise, revealing that these programs not only promote positive behaviors but also decrease power imbalances and negative actions.

### **Positive Youth Development Programs**

Youth programs that specifically work to alleviate power imbalances have several things in common. For instance, Mitra (2008) found that specific intervention strategies help to deconstruct power imbalances, such as “building meaningful roles based upon mutual responsibility and respect among all members; developing shared language and norms, and developing joint enterprises aimed at fostering voices that have previously been silenced from decision making and knowledge-building processes” (p. 238). By increasing youth voice, autonomy, responsibility and respect, programs can create contexts where youth thrive, which aligns well with a PYD approach and with a school bullying intervention perspective that seeks to create a program context where power is distributed more equally across students.

Integrating PYD into programs also helps promote youth development by building capacities and competencies (Catalano et al., 2004; Durlak et al., 2007; Lerner et al., 2005; Phelps et al., 2009; Roth et al., 1998; Shek & Sun, 2009; Smith et al., 2013), while also decreasing negative actions. For example, Catalano et al. (2004) found that the most effective youth programs had several strategies in common that promote a PYD context, which increase various youth competencies, such as “...methods to strengthen social, emotional, behavioral, cognitive, and moral competencies; build self-efficacy; shape messages from family and community about clear standards for youth behavior; increase healthy bonding with adults, peers, and younger children; expand opportunities and recognition for youth; [and] provide structure...” (p. 114). Further, by promoting a

PYD context through developing youth competencies, other negative outcomes can be prevented (Catalano et al., 2004).

Similarly, another study showed that the most effective youth programs are those that incorporate more of a youth development framework (Roth et al., 1998). Utilizing a youth development framework means that programs recognize the connections between adolescent development and effective programming. Because a youth development framework is theory-driven, understanding the theory behind how youth learn new skills and competencies is an integral part of this process. For instance, social-learning theory posits that youth learn new cognitive processes through direct experience and by observing the behaviors of others (Bandura, 1971). Thus, utilizing a developmental framework (like a PYD approach) that exposes youth to intentional learning experiences that are also scaffolded can build a youth's skills and competencies while *also* reducing the potential for negative outcomes.

In addition to decreasing power imbalances, increasing youth competencies and skill sets, and reducing negative actions (and outcomes), Eccles & Gootman (2002) found several other components beneficial to creating a high-quality PYD program. The eight PYD indicators are geared toward creating positive program contexts for youth by focusing on the individual youth and the contexts youth interact with.

### **The Eight PYD Indicators of High-quality Programs**

In 2002 the National Research Council created a project entitled, the Committee on Community-level Programs for youth. The 15-member committee planned a two-year project that included conducting an evaluation of current research on community-based youth programs (Eccles & Gootman, 2002). In this first comprehensive analysis of youth

development programs, authors Eccles & Gootman (2002) proposed eight indicators of high-quality PYD programs. These indicators are grounded in an ecological framework and are tailored to promote positive youth development.<sup>10</sup>

*Physical and Psychological Safety.* Physical and psychological safety includes safe and health-promoting facilities; practice that increases safe peer and group interaction and decreases unsafe or confrontational peer interactions.

*Appropriate Structure.* Appropriate structure entails creating rules and expectations that are clear, consistent, continuous, predictable, accompanied by firm-enough control, clear boundaries and age-appropriate monitoring.

*Supportive Relationships.* For youth, supportive relationships are enhanced when programs include warmth, closeness, connectedness, good communication, caring support, guidance, secure attachment, and responsiveness.

*Opportunities to Belong.* High-quality programs should strive to provide opportunities for meaningful inclusion, regardless of one's gender, ethnicity, sexual orientation, or disabilities; social inclusion, social engagement and integration; opportunities for socio-cultural identity formation; and support for cultural and bicultural competence.

*Positive Social Norms.* Positive social norms encourage rules of behavior, expectations, injunctions, ways of doing things, values and morals, and obligations for service.

---

<sup>10</sup> The eight PYD indicator descriptions are taken directly from *Community Programs to Promote Youth Development* (Eccles & Gootman, 2002, pp. 90-91).

*Support for Efficacy and Mattering.* Programs tailored to adolescents should be created with youth in mind; have elements that support autonomy; deliver youth opportunities to make a difference in their communities; be created in ways that take youth voice seriously; and incorporate practices that include empowerment, responsibility, and meaningful challenge alongside a focus on improvement rather than the status quo.

*Opportunities for Skill Building.* Programs that provide opportunities for skill building ensure that youth have access to learn physical, intellectual, psychological, emotional, and social skills; exposure to intentional learning experiences; opportunities to learn cultural literacies, media literacy, communication skills, and good habits of mind; preparation for adult employment; and, opportunities to develop social and cultural capital.

*Integration of Family, School, and Community Efforts.* A holistic approach demands that a youth's perceptions and interactions are addressed at every system level. Thus, concordance, coordination, and synergy among family, school, and community are needed.

Each of the eight PYD indicators contribute uniquely to a program context, while also working together to provide a positive experience for youth. The indicators were created to support a youth's positive development by focusing on various developmental domains, such as identity development, autonomy, and relationships. Further, because the PYD indicators draw from ecological theory, some are applicable outside the intervention context because they address the multiple contexts youth affect and are affected by.

Similar to Mitra's (2008) study, the eight PYD indicators also seek to alleviate power imbalances by embracing diversity and empowering youth; and, they align well with the program characteristics that Catalano et al. (2004) found most promising for increasing youth skill sets and competencies while also reducing negative youth outcomes. Because one of the main goals of all school bullying intervention programs is to alleviate negative behaviors, the potential benefit of the integration of the eight PYD indicators with school bullying intervention programs seems beneficial, yet remains unknown.

### **School Bullying Interventions and the PYD Indicators: A Possible Integration?**

Although school bullying interventions have increased over the past ten years, victimization rates are still very high (Polanin, et al., 2012; Renshaw & Jimerson, 2011; Swearer & Espelage, 2003) during a time frame when PYD programs have also been on the rise and have been shown to promote positive youth behaviors (Catalano, 2004; Durlak et al., 2007; Lerner et al., 2005; Phelps et al., 2009; Roth et al., 1998; Shek & Sun, 2009; Smith et al., 2013) while also limiting negative behaviors (Catalano et al., 2004). Although the previous statement seems contradictory, much of the contradiction lies in the reality that school bullying intervention programs and PYD come from separate paradigms.<sup>11</sup> Yet, the literature reveals several similarities between the two paradigms, such as a focus on ecological theory, the utilization of best practices and evidenced-based strategies, the aim to reduce power imbalances and negative youth

---

<sup>11</sup> Although there are theoretical similarities between school bullying intervention programs and PYD programs, the two are often differentiated due to the fact that school bullying intervention programs typically focus on the removal of negative behaviors and actions and PYD programs focus on building youth skills and competencies.

actions, and *potentially* a focus on promoting positive behaviors, skill sets, and competencies.<sup>12</sup> Thus, these similarities may mean that the differences between the two paradigms are less substantial than is considered at first glance. However, past reviews of youth programs have not incorporated many school bullying intervention programs into their analyses. For example, Eccles & Gootmans (2002) review of community programs that promoted PYD found that many school-based programs still operate from deficit models. Yet, in their comprehensive review only one school bullying intervention program was included. Likewise in the Catalano et al. (2004) study, school bullying intervention programs were not included in the programs reviewed. Thus, the potential for alignment between the two paradigms has not been fully explored in reviews of youth programs that promote PYD.

Similarly, previous systematic reviews of school bullying interventions do not include detailed analyses on program components, rather focusing more on outcomes and effect sizes (Ferguson et al., 2007; Jiminez-Barbero et al., 2012; Merrell et al., 2008; Polanin et al., 2012; Ryan & Smith, 2009; Smith et al., 2004; Ttofi & Farrington, 2011; Vreeman & Carrol, 2007), and none of them have used PYD as an analytic strategy. Thus, the potential alignment between school bullying interventions and the eight PYD indicators of high-quality programs has not been previously explored.

In an attempt to bridge this gap, this study employed a systematic review approach to analyze a select number of school bullying intervention programs for their

---

<sup>12</sup> Building capacities fits well with school bullying interventions as some youth lack the skills they need to cope with anger, aggression, and other psycho-social issues with which they are confronted on a daily basis. Therefore, building youth capacities for self-reflection, cooperation, and compassion, for example, may prove beneficial to deconstructing power imbalances and ultimately school bullying prevalence.

alignment with the eight PYD indicators that was directed by this two-part research question: 1) Do school bullying interventions utilize program strategies that align with the eight PYD indicators of high-quality youth programs?; and, 2) Are the strategies that align with the PYD indicators utilized explicitly or implicitly?

## Chapter 3: Methods

### Design

This study employed a systematic review approach, using existing school bullying intervention program evaluation studies published in the last ten years<sup>13</sup> as the sole data source. Using evaluation studies as the sole data source is a valid approach that is consistent with synthesizing large amounts of information into user-friendly formats (Higgins & Green, 2005). These user-friendly formats (or systematic reviews) provide researchers and practitioners an overview of multiple evaluations at one time, which can be a useful way to compare across programs. Deciding which evaluation studies to include in this type of review is a complex process (Higgins, 2008) that included two main steps: 1) Selecting the evaluation studies that made up the final sample; and, 2) Analyzing the program models constructed from the evaluation studies for alignment with the PYD indicators.

### Selecting the Evaluation Study Sample

A systematic step-by-step process was utilized to select evaluation studies for inclusion into this study. The step-by-step process was guided by the processes adopted in previously published systematic reviews on school bullying intervention programs to ensure the selection process was similarly rigorous (Ferguson et al., 2007; Jiminez-Barbero et al., 2012; Merrell et al., 2008; Polanin et al., 2012; Ryan & Smith, 2009; Smith et al., 2004; Ttofi & Farrington, 2011; Vreeman & Carrol, 2007).

**Sample Selection Processes.** The sample consisted of school bullying intervention program evaluations conducted in the last ten years, of which 13 individual school

---

<sup>13</sup> More information on the time delimiter in this study can be found in the methods section.

bullying intervention programs made up the final sample. The process of searching for and selecting the sample was guided by other systematic reviews of school bullying intervention programs completed during this time frame (Ferguson et al., 2007; Jiminez-Barbero et al., 2012; Merrell et al., 2008; Polanin et al., 2012; Ryan & Smith, 2009; Smith et al., 2004; Ttofi & Farrington, 2011; Vreeman & Carrol, 2007). Using published systematic reviews helped guide the search parameters to ensure that the final sample consisted of high-quality school bullying intervention programs.

Literature searches were conducted using the Oregon State University (OSU) library databases, which included: Sociological Abstracts, Social Services Abstracts, APA PsycNet, Education Research Complete, ERIC (EbscoHost), and NIH (PubMed). Selecting the databases included reviewing previous systematic reviews of school bullying intervention programs for databases commonly used across these studies (Ferguson et al., 2007; Jiminez-Barbero et al., 2012; Merrell et al., 2008; Polanin et al., 2012; Ryan & Smith, 2009; Smith et al., 2004; Ttofi & Farrington, 2011; Vreeman & Carrol, 2007), and incorporating databases that are typically used in the social sciences.

A search string was used with variations on words and phrases, such as “evaluation of bullying prevention programs” or “evaluation of anti-bullying intervention programs” or “school bullying intervention program evaluation” (for a complete list of search terms see Appendix A). The search strings were gleaned from published systematic reviews of school bullying intervention programs (Ferguson et al., 2007; Jiminez-Barbero et al., 2012; Merrell et al., 2008; Polanin et al., 2012; Ryan & Smith, 2009; Smith et al., 2004; Ttofi & Farrington, 2011; Vreeman & Carrol, 2007) that provided a wealth of terms already proven effective at returning relevant evaluation

studies. All terms and phrases were used in systematic combinations to ensure that each database returned evaluation studies that were relevant to this study.

**Initial Search Parameters.** Search filters were applied in a systematic process. First, parameters were set on each database to include only those programs evaluated in the past 10 years that were available in English. This filter was applied as the PYD indicators utilized to conduct the analysis for this study were published in 2002 (Eccles & Gootman, 2002), so evaluation studies conducted prior to this publication could not have incorporated the indicators into their studies. Furthermore, considering evaluation studies in other languages was beyond the scope of this study. In addition, keeping the range within the last ten years allowed for a focus on recent changes to school bullying intervention programs during a time when PYD programs have also been on the rise. Focusing on the past ten years also ensured that the evaluation studies returned were most current. Second, to ensure study rigor only evaluation studies that were peer-reviewed were considered.<sup>14</sup> Third, all evaluation studies that were about school bullying intervention programs were considered. Fourth, evaluation studies returned that had bullying, aggression, or victimization in the title were considered, as it was not always possible to determine whether the study was about an intervention program from the title alone. These first delimiting steps involved reviewing the titles and removing duplicates. The sample was delimited from 1,162 evaluation studies to 285 during these initial steps. In addition, a reference review of a recent comprehensive meta-analysis (Ttofi &

---

<sup>14</sup> For clarification the term considered refers to evaluation studies that were included in the initial sample, whereas included refers to evaluation studies in the final sample. The term returned refers to evaluation studies found via searching the databases.

Farrington, 2011) was conducted and six more evaluation studies that met the search criteria but were not returned via the searches were added (N=291).

**Evaluation Design Delimiter.** Once the initial selection of studies was identified, another round of delimiting was performed via a step-by-step analysis of the abstracts. First, only programs that targeted youth (grades 5-12) were included. Keeping only those programs aimed at youth was congruous to the overall goal of analyzing school bullying intervention programs delivered to youth. Second, studies that were not about school bullying intervention program evaluations were removed. For example, programs that dealt with aggression and not school bullying were eliminated. These additional two steps reduced the sample to 66 program evaluation studies. Third, only school bullying intervention evaluations that met specific design criteria were included. This delimiter was instituted because most evaluations employ one of four designs to measure a school bullying intervention programs effectiveness (Farrington & Ttofi, 2012; Ttofi & Farrington, 2011; Merrel et al., 2008; Wendy & Ryan, 2009). Thus, the evaluation studies had to meet one of four design requirements: a Randomized Control Trial (RCT), a Quasi-Experiment, an Intervention Control comparison, or a Cohort-Time Lapse design. While there is some disagreement in the field about the approaches that are most effective at achieving valid and reliable results (Ferguson et al., 2007), the design requirement was implemented so that only those programs utilizing the most rigorous evaluation study designs were examined, resulting in a further delimited sample of (N=22).<sup>15</sup>

---

<sup>15</sup> Although qualitative evaluation studies were not included in this study, future systematic reviews should incorporate qualitative evaluations into their studies to examine how they differ in terms of reporting on program processes.

**Final Sample.** A program length delimiter of 8 weeks was also used as the eight PYD indicators of high-quality programs take time to implement (Eccles & Gootman, 2002) and it takes time for youth to be affected by intervention programs (Catalano et al., 2004). Thus, it is not accurate to compare an intervention delivered over three days to one delivered over two months or a year, regardless of whether the PYD indicators are present. The eight week time-frame delimiter was instituted as two months was most common among the shorter delivery time-frames within the final sample.

The program length delimiter was also instituted to ensure the programs being assessed were comparable. Although program length is important to programs that utilize a PYD approach, and was also considered in this study (only two of the thirteen programs lengths were less than three months), making sure the final sample was comparable increased the efficacy of the analysis. Furthermore, the literature on youth program duration is not very specific. Whereas it is known, for example, that engagement in community programs over a longer period of time is beneficial for youth (Fredricks & Eccles, 2006), the exact number of weeks or months a youth should be involved in a program to attain these beneficial outcomes is not as clear.

Therefore, from the 22 evaluations that met the design criteria delimiter, 17 individual studies representing 13 different programs met the program length delimiter and made up the final sample (see Appendix B for more information on the sample selection and Appendix D for more information on the evaluation studies).

## **Analysis**

PYD and school bullying intervention programs operate from separate paradigms, so the language used to describe the PYD indicators and each of the individual

intervention programs goals, objectives, and activities does not always align. In their review of seven different large-scale evaluations, Eccles and Gootman (2002) comment on this issue stating that “Since none of the programs were designed with [the] specific assets and features [of PYD] in mind, we often had to make assumptions about likely features from the descriptions of the programs included in the various reviews.” (p.166). Similar assumptions were also made in this study, yet were comparatively minimal because an analysis was conducted on each individual evaluation study rather than on a systematic review or meta-analysis. Systematic reviews and meta-analyses provide useful information about evaluation studies, but are often reviewing or evaluating hundreds of evaluation studies at one time. Thus, information about program processes is not as detailed as when consulting individual evaluation studies.

Where systematic reviews and meta-analyses are useful for quick between-study comparisons, using individual evaluation studies for this analysis increased access to specific program information needed to assess each program's alignment with PYD. School bullying intervention program evaluations typically include information about program goals and the strategies utilized to reach those goals. Within these strategies are *activities* the programs plan to use, and within the goals are intermediate *objectives* that must be met for the long-term *goals* to be realized. For example, a program may hypothesize that in order to achieve the long-term goal of reducing bullying, youth participants must learn how to support victims (an objective) by participating in group discussions and role plays (activities) that help youth increase their empathetic response to bullying incidents (the goal). This kind of detailed information is not available in previous systematic reviews on school bullying intervention programs, nor is it always

available on program websites. Thus, using the individual evaluation studies was an appropriate source of program information available for this study because it overcomes, at least in part, those limitations.

**Program Models.** The primary aim of this study was to examine school bullying intervention programs for their alignment with the eight PYD indicators and to determine if PYD was being used explicitly or implicitly.<sup>16</sup>

The first step in making these determinations was to understand how each program planned to create the change necessary in the youth participants to reach the stated long-term goals. Theory of change models are used to present a comprehensive picture of how a program plans to create change (Anderson, 2005); included in these models are long-term goals, short-term objectives, and activities the program intends to use to reach specific outcomes (Wyatt-Knowlton & Phillips, 2012). Activities are part of a program's theory of action, which is the way in which a program plans to activate its theory of change (Funnell & Rogers, 2011).

Because theory of change models (also termed program models in this study) are often used by researchers and practitioners to understand (and convey) the steps a program plans to take to create change (Anderson, 2005), identifying the goals, objectives, and activities from the evaluation studies is an appropriate and valid way to reconstruct the program models. Reconstructing the program models for each of the school bullying interventions was necessary because whereas sufficient details about the goals, objectives, and activities are located throughout evaluations of these programs, full

---

<sup>16</sup> Explicit strategies referred to the PYD indicators explicitly, such as including *Opportunities for Skill Building*. Implicit strategies did not refer to the PYD indicators at all directly, but included opportunities for skill building nevertheless.

program models are not typically included in evaluation studies. However, the evaluation studies universally provided enough information to reconstruct the program models when focusing on the goals, objectives, and activities.

The analysis included a segment-by-segment examination (Wertz et al., 2011) of each of the evaluation studies for program goals, objectives, and activities to reconstruct the 13 different program models (see Appendix E for the reconstructed program models). Reconstructing the program models included three steps. First, every segment (paragraph) of each evaluation study was carefully examined and all program goals, objectives, and activities were highlighted. Doing so created an adequate representation of each of the program models. Second, the highlighted goals, objectives, and activities were extracted from each of the evaluation studies and moved into the reconstructed program model table, an excerpt of which is illustrated in Table 1 (see Appendix E for full program models). Third, once the program models were reconstructed, the evaluations studies were examined again to ensure that all program goals, objectives, and activities were accounted for. Rechecking the evaluation studies reduced the potential for error, and was used to increase the rigor of the analysis.

Table 1: Reconstructed Program Model Excerpt.

<b>Authors (DoP)</b>	<b>Program Title and Approach</b>	<b>Program Goals</b>	<b>Program Objectives</b>	<b>Program Activities</b>
Karna et al (2012)	<i>KiVa</i> Whole School	Create positive change in bystanders behavior to reduce the rewards of bullying and motivation to bully	Enhancing empathy, self-efficiency, and anti-bullying attitudes of bystanders, support procedures for handling acute cases of bullying, raise awareness, role of the group, increase empathy toward victims, promote strategies of supporting victims and increased responsiveness, self-efficacy, target the individual classroom and whole school	Themed days x 4 (e.g. Me and the Others, group interactions, forms of bullying, consequences and counterforces of bullying), 13-23 different lessons, kick off session, Internet forum, bright vests for recess staff; increased monitoring parent guide; teacher training, dedicated print materials, computer games

Using the reconstructed program models focused the analysis on the parts of the evaluation studies essential to the aim of this study, which eliminated text that was not relevant to the analysis. Organizing the program models collectively also facilitated a consistent comparison between studies for programs that were employing similar strategies (Wertz et al., 2011). For example, every program planned activities to include contexts youth regularly navigate within the school, but some also included contexts outside the school, such as the family, or community. Thus, having the reconstructed program models arranged collectively increased the ability to compare the ways in which each program created activities for specific contexts. Additionally, using the table (Appendix E) prepared the data for the next step in the analysis, which was to align each of the programs objectives and activities<sup>17</sup> with the PYD indicators.

**Program Model Alignment.** The central part of the analysis for this study was determining the extent to which the program objectives and activities aligned with the PYD indicators. Making these determinations included analyzing each of the programs objectives and activities closely and matching and classifying<sup>18</sup> their alignment with the PYD indicators.

---

<sup>17</sup> Whereas the goals were extracted from the evaluation studies and were also used to reconstruct the program models, the objectives and activities were the main focus of analysis in this study because the PYD indicators refer to features of youth development programs that foster positive development (Eccles & Gootman, 2002). Therefore, using the PYD indicators to assess alignment of program processes (activities) instituted to reach short-term goals (objectives) was appropriate because these indicators are best reflected in program activities and objectives.

<sup>18</sup> For clarification, the term matching (or match) refers to identifying similar language used to describe program objectives and activities and the PYD indicators. The term classifying (or classify) refers to the act of moving the objectives and activities from the reconstructed program models into the PYD indicator category that made sense. The term alignment (or align) refers to the process of matching and classifying the objectives and activities with the PYD indicators.

*Matching and Classifying the Objectives and Activities with the PYD Indicators.*

The goal of classifying the alignment of each program's objectives and activities with the indicators in this study was to provide one interpretation on how they appear to align, which is a valid qualitative research technique (Wertz et al., 2011; Wolcott, 2008). Because definitive alignment was not the main goal of this study, the decision was made to classify each program objective and activity with one of the eight PYD indicators. Focusing the alignment on one indicator eliminated the need to consider all possible alignments, which would have made the results confusing. Thus, selecting one indicator to represent each program objective and activity increased the clarity of assessing overall alignment and allowed for a more reasonable comparison across programs.

In order to make these comparisons an initial process of systematically analyzing each of the program's objectives and activities and matching and classifying their alignment with the PYD indicators was conducted. Matching and classifying alignment included several simultaneous steps. First, each of the reconstructed program models objectives and activities were examined one at a time while consulting each of the PYD indicator descriptions. These descriptions were used to help match the language used to describe each program objective and activity with the language used to describe each indicator (e.g. implementing procedures for handling bullying cases matches well with the *Appropriate Structure* indicator). Second, after each program objective and activity was checked against each of the PYD indicator descriptions, alignment was determined and the objectives and activities were classified into a table by each PYD indicator accordingly. An excerpt of the full table is presented in Table 2 (see Appendix C for the complete table). Third, once all objectives and activities were matched with the PYD

indicators and classified into the full table, each of the reconstructed program models were consulted again to ensure that all possible alignments were accounted for, and that the ways in which each objective and activity were classified with the PYD indicators made sense.

Table 2: Descriptive Alignment with the Eight PYD Indicators Excerpt.

Author (DoP)	Intervention Title	1 Safety	2 App. Structure	3 Supp. Relationships	4 Opp. to Belong	5 Positive Social Norms	6 Efficacy and Mattering	7 Skill Building	8 Family, School and Community
Karna, et al. (2012)	<i>KiVa</i>	Not discussed	Clear and consistent rules and boundaries; procedures for acute cases; implementation of bright vest for staff; increased monitoring	Support and responsiveness; good communication; care and guidance developing relationships	Not discussed	Expectations that bullying is not okay; focus on increasing bystander awareness and motivation to stop bullying incidents	Focus on improving bullying conditions; meaningful challenge to enhance student well-being	Develop: self-efficiency, raising awareness, knowledge about group processes, increase empathy, promote strategies of supporting the victim, group discussions, building bystander awareness	Inclusion of whole school, family and community

### ***Challenges with Aligning Program Objectives and Activities with the PYD***

***Indicators.*** In their comprehensive review of youth programs, Eccles and Gootman (2002) describe how the PYD indicators are not rigid categories, but are a fluid set of program guidelines grounded in ecological holism,<sup>19</sup> which means program objectives and activities can align with more than one indicator. The fluidity of the indicators made classifying the objectives and activities at times more difficult, and in some instances

<sup>19</sup> Ecological holism refers to the fact that all contexts (such as family, school, and the community) youth navigate affect their development. These various contexts affect their development differentially, thus having intervention strategies tailored to each level of the ecological system is beneficial for a youth's positive development.

required interpretation. Interpretation, however, is an integral part of a qualitative analysis (Wertz et al., 2011; Wolcott, 2008) and is an activity that involves making sense of data utilizing personal knowledge and experience (Wolcott, 2008). Thus, assessing alignment of each program's objectives and activities included both objective knowledge and subjective interpretation.

Objective alignment was drawn from the language used to describe the PYD indicators and studies that employed similar techniques (Catalano et al., 2004; Eccles & Gootman, 2002), which improved the knowledge base and ability to match the objectives and activities with a PYD indicator when alignment with one of the indicators was very clear. Subjective alignment decisions were drawn from the researcher's personal experiences, knowledge, and interpretation, which determined the classification of the objectives and activities that aligned with multiple indicators.<sup>20</sup> The subjective alignment of program objectives and activities with one of the eight PYD indicators is to be expected because the indicators are guidelines not rules (Eccles & Gootman, 2002); thus one person's interpretation of how program objectives and activities align with the indicators may be different from someone else's.<sup>21</sup>

*Classifying Three Objectives: An Example.* It was often quite clear how a program objective and/or activity should be classified. For instance, one of KiVa's objectives is to increase youth self-efficacy, (Karna, 2011; 2013) which aligns well with the *Support for Self-Efficacy and Mattering* indicator. Sometimes, however, the process was a little less

---

<sup>20</sup> The next section, *Classifying Three Objectives: An Example* includes examples of when classifying the objectives and activities was quite clear, and when it was not.

<sup>21</sup> Because this study was exploratory, however, the goal was to assess the potential alignment between school bullying intervention programs and the PYD indicators.

clear. KiVa's reconstructed program model also contains objectives about supporting and increasing empathy towards victims (Karna, 2011; 2013). Both of these objectives might be classified as *Opportunities for Skill Building*, but could also be classified as teaching students how to improve and enhance *Supportive Relationships*. In this example both supporting and enhancing empathy towards victims were classified as *Opportunities for Skill Building* and were thus categorized accordingly (see Appendix C for full table). The objectives were classified as *Opportunities for Skill Building* because the skills youth learn about increasing their empathy and support towards victims are transferable outside the intervention context, where the supportive relationship indicator is really about providing youth warmth, support, and guidance through the intervention process.

**Program Model Alignment Levels.** Once the objectives and activities were classified, the final step in the analysis was to assess each program's overall alignment with the PYD indicators. To assess overall alignment, program alignment levels were assigned based on the total number of indicators present, resulting in an alignment score of 0 (no indicators) to 8 (all indicators present). From there, each program was given a label ranging from low to high. These labels included five categories (high, moderate-high, moderate, low-moderate, low) created to provide a more nuanced view of the program's overall alignment with the PYD indicators (see Table 4 in the Results section, which shows each program's alignment with the PYD indicators; Table 3 is an excerpt from the full table as an example). Programs that were categorized in high alignment had objectives and activities that aligned with six or more of the PYD indicators, moderate-high alignment five, moderate alignment four, low-moderate alignment three, and low alignment two or less.

Table 3: Count Alignment with the Eight PYD Indicators Excerpt.

	<b>1</b> <b>Safety</b>	<b>2</b> <b>App</b> <b>Structure</b>	<b>3</b> <b>Supportive</b> <b>Relationships</b>	<b>4</b> <b>Opp.</b> <b>To</b> <b>Belong</b>	<b>5</b> <b>Pos.</b> <b>Social</b> <b>Norms</b>	<b>6</b> <b>Efficacy</b> <b>and</b> <b>Mattering</b>	<b>7</b> <b>Skill</b> <b>Building</b>	<b>8</b> <b>Family,</b> <b>School and</b> <b>Community</b>	<b>Total</b> <b>(8)</b>	<b>Alignment</b>	<b>Explicit</b> <b>use of</b> <b>PYD</b>
KiVa		x	x		x	x	x	x	6	High	N

## Chapter 4: Results

The analysis results are presented in the following sections, which includes the overall alignment table, a narrative description of the program objectives and activities that aligned with the PYD indicators, and details on whether a PYD approach was used explicitly or implicitly.

### Alignment with the Eight PYD Indicators

The overall program alignment with the PYD indicators was fairly high. Six of the 13 programs were categorized as having high alignment, two each as moderate-high and moderate, and only three programs were categorized as having low-moderate alignment (Table 4). No programs had low alignment. To help illustrate the levels of alignment, a narrative description of the program objectives and activities that each school bullying intervention utilized is presented next.

Table 4: Count Alignment with the Eight PYD Indicators.

	1 Safety	2 App. Structure	3 Supp. Relation	4 Opp. To Belong	5 Positive Social Norms	6 Efficacy and Mattering	7 Skill Build	8 Family, School and Community	Total (8)	Align	Explicit use of PYD
RWSA	x	x	x		x	x	x	x	7	High	N
OBPP	x	x	x		x	x	x	x	7	High	N
KiVA		x	x		x	x	x	x	6	High	N
P3R	x		x		x	x	x	x	6	High	N
Fairplayer Manual		x	x		x	x	x	x	6	High	N

Safe School Amb. Program		x	x	x		x	x	x	6	High	N
ViSCA		x	x		x	x	x		5	Moderate-high	N
Take the Lead			x		x	x	x	x	5	Moderate-high	Y
EQUIP			x		x	x	x		4	Moderate	N
Befriending Intervention			x		x	x	x		4	Moderate	N
Confident Kids Program			x		/	x	x	/	3	Low-moderate	N
P4C			x		/	x	x		3	Low-moderate	N
Empathy Training			x			x	x	/	3	Low-moderate	N
<b>Total (13)</b>	3	6	13	1	9	13	13	7			

Note: (/) indicates partial alignment while (x) indicates full alignment.<sup>22</sup>

**Physical and Psychological Safety.** Only three programs included objectives and/or activities about safety into their program models: P3R, the OPBB, and the RWSA. The objectives and activities integrated into these programs included creating safe spaces for students to explore their emotional, behavioral, and cognitive reactions (Renshaw &

<sup>22</sup> Partial alignment was noted in four instances where program objectives and/or activities did not fully meet the PYD indicator descriptions. For example, two programs were classified as in partial alignment with the *Family, School, and Community* indicator because whereas parents were included into the intervention context, the whole-school and community were not. Only full alignment was counted for each programs total alignment with the PYD indicators.

Jimerson, 2011); working to create a safe and positive school environment (Bauer et al., 2007; Bowllan, 2011); and, creating a peaceful learning environment, based in justice, order, and peace (Wong, Cheng, Ngan, & Ma, 2011).

**Appropriate Structure.** Eleven of the fourteen program models contained objectives and activities that addressed appropriate structure. The inclusion of appropriate structure ranged from whole-school processes to individual class processes. Whole-school processes included creating new structures, such as providing bright vests for recess staff and increased monitoring of youth during high risk times or in high risk areas (Karna et al., 2011, 2012), new processes for handling bullying incidents and the implementation of school-wide rules against bullying, including the development of individual student intervention plans (Bauer et al., 2007; Bowllan, 2011; Karna et al., 2011, 2012), and the creation of rules and expectations centered around a pastoral care policy code of conduct (Wong, Cheng, Ngan, & Ma, 2011). Classroom processes included the implementation of clear and consistent class-wide rules centered in personal responsibility and supporting victims (Scheithauer, Hess, Schultz, & Bull, 2012), and the creation of “positive rules” by constructing the intervention around building youth competencies and capacities in social interactions (Gollwitzer et al., 2006, 2007; Strohmeier et al., 2012).

**Supportive Relationships.** Every program, sans one, included objectives and activities that worked to create supportive relationships in their program models. Examples included providing support and care to youth by raising awareness of how to handle bullying and/or creating alternative ways to deal with bullying (Domino, 2013; Scheithauer, Hess, Schultz-Krumbollz, & Bull, 2012; Tangen & Campbell, 2010),

providing support, care, guidance, good communication, and responsiveness to youth through a whole-school approach that creates various points of contact with other people (staff, parents, community) (Bauer et al., 2007; Bowllan, 2011; Karna et al., 2011, 2012), developing youth perceptions of interconnectedness (Sahin, 2012; Wong, Cheng, Ngan, & Ma, 2011), fostering a sense of cooperation and trust (Gollwitzer et al., 2006, 2007; Menesini, Codecasa, Benelli, & Cowie, 2003; Strohmeier et al., 2012), developing positive relationships (Renshaw & Jimerson, 2011), and creating more secure attachments (Pack, White, Raczynski, & Wang, 2011).

**Opportunities to Belong.** Only one school bullying intervention program model included objectives and/or activities that addressed opportunities to belong. The *Safe School Ambassadors Program* included opportunities to belong by ensuring that the student ambassadors were demographically representative of the student population (Pack, White, Raczynski, & Wang, 2011). Thus, the program embraced diversity in an attempt to ensure that all students, regardless of their gender, grade, ethnicity, academic performance, and socioeconomic status felt included in the intervention process. Additionally, one program evaluation recommended that practitioners be aware of cultural diversity and embrace students with emerging ethnic identities<sup>23</sup> (Bauer et al., 2007).

**Positive Social Norms.** Eleven of the 13 program models had objectives and activities that addressed positive social norms in some way, including focusing on creating a positive sense of self and classroom (Berry & Hunt, 2009; van der Meulen,

---

<sup>23</sup> During the analysis for this program the recommendation for practitioners to be aware of cultural diversity and ethnic identities was not counted as *Opportunities to Belong* because the OBPP did not have objectives and/or activities about diversity in their reconstructed program model.

Granizo, & del Barrio, 2010), instituting school-wide expectations that bullying is not okay (Bauer et al., 2007; Bowllan, 2011), increasing bystander awareness and willingness to intervene (Karna et al., 2011, 2012), encouraging students to support positive messages that bullying in any form is unacceptable (Gollwitzer et al., 2006, 2007; Strohmeier et al., 2012), creating positive rules and expectations grounded in empowerment and youth voice that include strategies to develop positive behavioral solutions (Renshaw & Jimerson, 2011), fostering a positive school climate through ideas of an ethos of care, justice, and restoration (Wong, Cheng, Ngan, & Ma, 2011), creating a school culture that embraces and expects students to support victims (Menesini, Codecasa, Benelli, & Cowie, 2003; Scheithauer, Hess, Schultz-Krumbollz, & Bull, 2012), embracing a positive school climate focused on the promotion of positive behaviors and the reduction of negative ones (Domino, 2013), and creating a school climate grounded in pluralism, cooperation, and open dialogues (Tangen & Campbell, 2010).

**Efficacy and Mattering.** All 13 program models included objectives and activities that created opportunities for youth to build self-efficacy and mattering through intervention processes that were geared toward increasing youth capabilities, both internally and externally. Examples of internal objectives included short-term goals to develop youth self-efficacy, awareness, cognition, coping, empathy, assertiveness, self- (emotion-) regulation, perspective-taking, and moral-sensitivity (Berry & Hunt, 2009; Menesini, Codecasa, Benelli & Cowie, 2003; Renshaw & Jimerson, 2011; Sahin, 2012; Tangen & Campbell, 2010). Examples of external activities included opportunities to develop and foster youth autonomy and voice, responsibility, management, professionalism, leadership, facilitation, well-being, planning and goal-setting, conflict

resolution and/or mediation, decision-making, and critical thinking (Bauer et al., 2007; Bowllan, 2011; Domino, 2013; Gollwitzer, 2006, 2007; Karna et al., 2011, 2012; Pack, White, Raczynski, & Wang, 2011; Scheithauer, Hess, Schiltz, & Bull, 2012; Strohmeier et al., 2012; van der Meulen, Granzio, & del Barrio, 2010; Wong, Cheng, Ngan, & Ma, 2011)

**Opportunities for Skill Building.** There were a variety of ways in which the school bullying intervention program models included opportunities for youth to build their skills, primarily through program activities. These activities looked to increase youth skill sets both personally and relationally, which is positive for youth development, (Arnold & Nott, 2010) and were multifaceted.

Every program model, regardless of the alignment with the PYD indicators, included skill building activities and various youth empowerment techniques, examples of which were an intervention kick off session to get youth excited about the program (Bauer et al., 2007; Bowllan, 2011; Karna et al., 2011, 2012), experimental role-plays and modeling techniques, at home tasks that include parental involvement, creating slogans with peers about the need to stop bullying, working collaboratively to create their own show (Sahin, 2012), working together to achieve a common goal, gaining consensus on and creating a class project, collectively deciding how to stop bullying in their school (Gollwitzer, 2006, 2007; Strohmeier et al., 2012), discovering commonalities and building bridges (Pack, White, Raczynski, & Wang, 2011), peace education curriculum relating to working together to build a harmonious school (Wong, Cheng, Ngan, & Ma, 2011), practicing facilitation, mediation, and conflict resolution techniques (Menesini,

Codecasa, Benelli & Cowie, 2003; Wong, Cheng, Ngan, & Ma, 2011) and, practicing for an interview (Domino, 2013).

**Integration of Family, School, and Community.** Nine of the school bullying interventions included objectives and/or activities that integrated the whole-school, family and greater community into their programs in various ways. Five of the programs integrated professionals from the community into the intervention process within an approach that included every aspect of the school, from students to recess staff (Bauer et al., 2007; Bowllan, 2011; Karna et al., 2011, 2012; Pack, White, Raczynski, & Wang, 2011; Renshaw & Jimerson, 2011; Wong, Chen, Ngan, & Ma, 2011). One of the programs included at-home tasks for youth and parents to complete together (Sahin, 2012), and three of the programs included several ways in which they integrated parents into their program models by offering parent meetings, workshops, and information letters (Berry & Hunt, 2009; Domino, 2013; Scheithauer, Hess, Schultz-Krumbollz, & Bull, 2012).

### **Explicit and Implicit use of the PYD Indicators**

*Take the Lead* was the only school bullying intervention program that drew from PYD explicitly, and was categorized as in moderate-high alignment with the PYD indicators. *Take the lead* recognized PYD as a valid theoretical approach to reducing school bullying (that the promotion of positive behaviors is a legitimate strategy for the elimination of negative behaviors), which is why it was categorized as the only program that drew from PYD explicitly. The other 12 school bullying intervention programs drew from PYD implicitly, and had alignment levels ranging from low-moderate to high (Table 4). The programs that drew from PYD implicitly were primarily concerned with

the removal of negative behaviors. However, many of these programs did include objectives and/or activities to promote positive behaviors, which is why they were categorized as drawing from PYD implicitly.

## **Chapter 5: Discussion**

Although research on school bullying has shifted from a focus on understanding the antecedents of bullying behaviors and the negative outcomes of being bullied, to creating and sustaining effective interventions that reduce bullying incidents, children and youth still report alarming numbers of problems with bullying in their schools (Polanin, et al., 2012; Renshaw & Jimerson, 2011; Swearer & Espelage, 2003). Because school bullying rates are still so high, it is necessary to think of new ways to conceptualize interventions that seek to ameliorate school bullying. Although the eight PYD indicators of high-quality programs are not grounded in the elimination of negative behaviors (like school bullying), much evidence shows that programs that employ a PYD approach, which focuses on the promotion of positive behaviors, can and do limit negative actions (Catalano et al., 2004). Thus, from a theoretical perspective, PYD and school bullying intervention programs appear to have much more in common than is currently articulated in the research literature on school bullying.

### **Overall Program Alignment with the Eight PYD Indicators**

The overall school bullying program model alignment with the PYD indicators in this study was high. Ten of the 13 programs were categorized as in moderate to high alignment with the PYD indicators. This high overall alignment suggests that, although PYD and school bullying intervention programs are often assumed to operate from different paradigms, concepts integral to PYD are nevertheless being utilized by school bullying intervention programs. That the PYD indicators are being utilized by school bullying intervention programs in such a way creates an opportunity to be more explicit

and systematic about the integration between PYD and school bullying intervention programs.

Systematic integration would provide school bullying researchers with new program processes (like the PYD indicators) to draw from when creating interventions, which would also increase the potential for better outcomes. Researchers that specialize in PYD would likewise benefit from this integration by understanding how the PYD indicators function within an intervention context where the long-term goal is the reduction of negative behaviors. And, practitioners would gain from this systematic integration as well by gaining knowledge about the specific PYD indicators that make the most impact at promoting positive youth behaviors while also limiting negative behaviors.

Further, utilizing the PYD indicators explicitly in school bullying intervention programs would allow a proper examination of overall alignment and program outcomes. Because this study was about program processes and not outcomes, however, additional research is needed to understand how alignment with the PYD indicators relates to school bullying intervention program outcomes.

### **Program Alignment with Specific PYD Indicators**

Highlighting the PYD indicators that were used most widely across programs in this study, and those that were used least provides new insight for the literature on school bullying interventions and PYD programs. Furthermore, understanding where the alignment between the PYD indicators and the programs was *strongest* helps provide future insight for school bullying intervention specialists that want to use a PYD approach

Program alignment was strongest with the *Supportive Relationships*, *Support for Efficacy and Mattering*, and *Opportunities for Skill Building* indicators. That alignment was strongest in these areas is not surprising from a PYD perspective as creating new relationships and sustaining existing ones, developing a positive sense of self, and developing new skill sets are all known to buffer youth from adversity (Catalano et al., 2004; Eccles & Gootman, 2002). Yet, that the school bullying intervention programs in this study included program objectives and activities that reflected this understanding is evidence that these programs recognize the utility, at least in part, of an intervention approach that focuses on positivity instead of the absence of negativity, which is a valid PYD approach and important for *all* youth.

Program alignment was weakest with the *Opportunities to Belong* and *Physical and Psychological Safety* indicators. The *Opportunities to Belong* indicator states that through the intervention process youth need to have “opportunities for meaningful inclusion, regardless of one's gender, ethnicity, sexual orientation, or disabilities [...]” (Eccles & Gootman, 2012, p. 29). Thus, even though the school bullying intervention programs focused on several concepts critical to PYD, the programs missed an opportunity to consider (and potentially to help alleviate) the ways in which particular groups of marginalized youth are negatively affected by school bullying. It is known, for example, that youth who are LGBTQIA-self-identified (Birkett, Espelage, & Koenig, 2009; Greene, Britton, & Fitts, 2013; Hong & Garbarino, 2012) and/or who have a (dis)ability (Flynt & Collins Morton, 2004; Pittet et al., 2010) are at increased risk for bullying victimization. Therefore, that none of the programs measured sexual orientation and/or (dis)ability, and that only one of the programs used language that considered

diversity (which equated to considerations of gender, grade, ethnicity, academic performance, and socioeconomic status, but not sexuality and/or (dis)ability) is worth noting.

School bullying intervention programs should include considerations of diversity into program models, and evaluations of these programs should measure *all* of these categories (race, gender, class, sexuality, ability, geography, culture, etc.) *and* the ways they interact. The measurement and evaluation of demographic data is important for school bullying intervention programs delivered to children and youth, but may be most important for youth who are navigating complex identity issues in middle- (high-) school (Mishna, 2012; Swearer, Espelage & Napolitano, 2009; Ttofi & Farrington, 2011). For instance, youth who are gender non-conforming self-identified, and/or who are transgender self-identified are often singled out and bullied more frequently (Birkett, Espelage, & Koenig, 2009; Greene, Britton, & Fitts, 2013; Hong & Garbarino, 2012). Yet, if youth sexuality and gender are not measured there is no way to know how effective school bullying interventions are for these youth.

As such, school bullying intervention programs that fail to include goals, objectives, and activities in their program models that make intentional efforts to be inclusive of diverse groups of youth may not be effective at reducing bullying among groups that are most marginalized. Addressing and measuring the complexities of multiple youth identifications (for example, the ways in which race, sexual orientation, and class intersect) can further research into understanding which youth are at most risk for school bullying victimization in a particular geographic area.

However, because school bullying intervention programs draw from research conducted in countries such as Norway, where the population is less diverse, it is possible that being inclusive of diverse groups of youth is not deemed as pertinent. Yet, research in developmental science shows that during adolescence youth are working on forming independent identities that make them feel unique (Erikson, 1968; Kiang & Fuligini, 2009; Steinberg & Morris, 2001). As such, school bullying intervention programs in homogenous countries should still consider how youth work to individuate themselves from each other. Understanding how youth construct unique identities can help school bullying intervention programs be more inclusive of youth who might feel alienated from other youth, and thus possibly bullied more often.

The *Physical and Psychological Safety* indicator dictates that the first necessary step for any program should be to ensure that the intervention context is safe for youth (Eccles & Gootman, 2002). Yet, only three of the school bullying interventions used language about safety in their program models. The three programs that included safety into their program models did so explicitly, including objectives and activities that worked to create safer spaces, peaceful learning environments, and an ethos of care, guidance, and justice (Bauer et al., 2011; Bowllan, 2011; Renshaw & Jimerson, 2011; Wong, Cheng, Ngan, & Ma, 2011).

Although many of the objectives and activities that made up the other ten school bullying intervention program models are indicative of providing a safer school context, it would be beneficial for these programs to be more explicit about the exact ways in which they plan to ensure that safety is of the utmost priority. However, it is possible that language about safety was not addressed explicitly because reducing bullying (which

should create a safer school context) is the primary goal for most of these programs. At the same time, because many school bullying programs often obtain mixed results, programs might strive to include objectives and activities about safety into their program models that can outlast the intervention time frame, which would help create an overall culture of safety within the school.

It is also important for school bullying programs to distinguish between psychological safety and physical safety. Often, physical safety is considered before psychological safety; however, research shows that youth who are verbally bullied and alienated at school have some of the most long-lasting negative outcomes (Newman, Holden, & Delville, 2005). As such, programs might include in their models objectives that address youths' perceived sense of security, or implement activities that create safe spaces on campus to help students who are feeling more stressed. Addressing a youth's physical safety is important, but so is creating an opportunity to understand how youth perceive overall safety within their school, which may be very different from how they perceive the safety of their physical bodies and surroundings.

Reducing school bullying behaviors and prevalence is often associated with providing a safer school context, yet the two might not always be synonymous. For instance, school bullying intervention programs that assume all youth are heterosexual miss an opportunity to hear from LGBTIQA-self-identified youth (Mishna, Newman, Daley, & Solomon, 2009). Thus, it is possible that these interventions do not create safe spaces for these youth, which is why including objectives and activities in school bullying intervention program models that are geared toward creating both physical and psychological safety for *all* youth is necessary.

### **Explicit and Implicit Use of the PYD Indicators**

While only one school bullying intervention program explicitly utilized a PYD approach, it is important to note that every intervention employed implicit objectives and/or activities into their program models that aligned well with the PYD indicators. This implicit alignment suggests that the PYD indicators are seen as valuable to school bullying intervention programs. Because the analysis in this study was based on how the programs intended to implement their program models, however, further research is needed to determine the precise ways in which the interventions actually utilized the PYD indicators in the program, which would help confirm that intended use matched actual use.

### **A Textual Analysis**

Although most systematic reviews focus on analyzing program outcomes, this systematic review focused solely on analyzing program models constructed from published program evaluations. Utilizing program models, like theory of change and action models, created an avenue to analyze how each program planned to utilize specific activities to reach short- and long-term goals of reducing bullying. Connecting each program's activities to its objectives and goals by reconstructing the program models also allowed for a detailed analysis of how the school bullying intervention programs were utilizing strategies that aligned with the PYD indicators.

Developing comprehensive program models is necessary to ensure that researchers and practitioners can understand a programs theory of change, thus understand how a program intends to reduce bullying among youth participants. Without the development of proper program models, the theory of change that underpins school

bullying intervention programs can be confusing and, in some cases, hard to interpret for individuals not familiar with program model theory

Eccles and Gootman (2002) argue, in fact, that it is not appropriate to evaluate youth programs experimentally if the program does not have a comprehensive theory of change program model. Program models do not have to be elaborate, but should, at the very least, communicate how the program will effect change. Including the school bullying intervention programs process, implementation, and short- and long-term outcomes into a program model can help illuminate the change process (Eccles & Gootman, 2002; Funnell & Rogers, 2011). For example, reducing school bullying (the process) by creating opportunities for youth to be involved in activities (the implementation) geared toward increasing youth empathy (short-term goal), which will reduce the likelihood that youth will bully other youth (long-term goal).<sup>24</sup>

Creating comprehensive program models can also help ensure that programs are conducted with fidelity. Fidelity refers to how well an intervention was implemented in relation to a theoretical plan, or theory of change (Funnell & Rogers, 2011). Thus, evaluating an interventions program model in relation to the programs implementation can highlight aspects of the intervention that were implemented well, somewhat implemented, or not implemented at all. Knowing which parts of an intervention were implemented well is critical to determining whether the intervention was successful (Durlak & DuPre, 2008). If, for example, 5 of 10 school bullying intervention program activities were not implemented with high fidelity, and the program was not successful at

---

<sup>24</sup> The program model example included here is rather simple, but is straightforward and easy to follow. There are various theory of change model formats to choose from, thus school bullying intervention programs should choose a format that helps properly convey how their program plans to effect change.

reducing bullying, the program's lack of success may have more to do with implementation issues versus the theoretical soundness of program activities. Yet, if program models are not created for school bullying intervention programs, and are also not made available, determining how the program can be made more effective is much more difficult.

Therefore accessing and understanding a program's theory of change is crucial to researchers and practitioners who are looking for effective approaches and/or strategies to integrate into their school bullying intervention programs. Thus, school bullying intervention programs can be enhanced by: 1) creating comprehensive program models; 2) increasing accessibility to these models; and, 3) including program models into evaluations of school bullying intervention programs.

Because program models can highlight the specific ways in which school bullying intervention programs intend to create change and can also help assess fidelity, it seems prudent for future systematic reviews to consider program models alongside program outcomes. To do so, however, means that school bullying intervention programs need to have comprehensive program models available for replication purposes.

### **Implications**

The findings from this study suggest that the eight indicators of high-quality PYD programs and school bullying intervention programs have several similarities in common. These commonalities may be due, in part, to the influence of developmental theories on school bullying intervention programs, such as risk and resiliency theory. (Mishna, 2012; Swearer, Espelage, & Napolitano, 2009).

Risk and resilience (RR) research shows that adolescent relationships are paramount to buffering youth from risk, especially high levels of parental support (Fergus & Zimmerman, 2005). Similarly, research on school bullying shows that parental support buffers youth from the negative outcomes of being bullied (Davidson & Demaray, 2007), and research on PYD shows that parental support is also linked to positive school motivation, and better mental health (Eccles & Gootman, 2002). RR research also shows that prosocial behaviors buffer youth from current and future antisocial behaviors (Fergus & Zimmerman, 2005). Comparably, school bullying research shows that youth who have strong connections to their schools and an investment in prosocial behaviors report lower levels of bullying incidents (Cunningham, 2007); and, PYD research shows that intervention programs that promote prosocial norms have better outcomes overall (Eccles & Gootman, 2002).

The connections between school bullying, PYD, and RR research suggest that research in these areas may draw from a larger umbrella, or meta-theory, of adolescent development. As such, recognizing the parallels among these theories is important to better understand influences of one theory on another, such as RR on school bullying and PYD, and the *potential* of a theory, such as PYD, to influence other areas of research, such as school bullying.

Therefore, scholars from both disciplines may benefit by further exploring the possibilities of integrating PYD into existing or new school bullying intervention programs. Youth have much to gain from intervention programs that can promote positive behaviors while limiting negative behaviors. Thus the integration of the PYD indicators into school bullying intervention programs may serve all youth and may be

especially helpful for youth who are part of intervention programs that operate solely from deficit models.

Most importantly, then, one potential implication of the high overall alignment between the school bullying intervention programs and the PYD indicators found in this study points to the possibility of creating school bullying intervention programs utilizing the PYD indicators. Utilizing the PYD indicators to create new school bullying intervention programs may pave the way for future programs to make explicit their focus on promoting positive youth behaviors and the elimination of negative behaviors.

However, system-wide procedures and restrictions are important to consider also. Schools and intervention programs have limited time and resources; they are constricted by various policies that may prevent employing approaches that are more costly or that take more time. As such, future research on school bullying intervention programs and the PYD indicators may need to address policy considerations that preclude schools and school bullying intervention programs from developing and implementing more costly and time intensive interventions.

It is also important to remember that the results of this study are based on one interpretation of how the eight PYD indicators and the school bullying intervention programs appear to align. Therefore, it is possible that the high overall alignment result in this study was bolstered due to the researchers' own cognitive biases. It is further possible that some of the PYD indicators are more important to preventing school bullying incidents and behaviors and should be weighted accordingly. However, the aim of this study was not to determine definitive alignment, but, rather, to explore the *potential* that exists between the PYD indicators and school bullying intervention

programs. Thus, additional research is needed to determine the specific ways in which the PYD indicators and school bullying intervention programs can be integrated to build programs that work to alleviate school bullying.

### **Limitations**

There are several limitations to this study. First, because school bullying intervention program models are not readily available, it is possible that not all the ways in which the reconstructed program models aligned with the PYD indicators have been identified. Second, because the program models were reconstructed it is impossible to say that every goal, objective, and activity has been represented in this study. However, reconstructing the program models from the evaluation studies was chosen as the most effective way to understand the ways in which the programs intended to reach their long-term goals of reducing bullying. Third, the selection of the sample followed a rigorous systematic process, but it is possible that some studies were missed. Fourth, due to the English language delimiter the studies are heavily concentrated in the West, so studies from non-western countries are limited. Fifth, there are several ways to conceptualize PYD; as such there may be programs that utilize PYD in their school bullying interventions in ways that are not covered here. However, it is important to note that this study was focused on program indicators as they relate to program quality, thus the analysis in this study was not concerned with a PYD perspective in general, but a specific set of PYD indicators that are indicative of high-quality youth programming. Seventh, although the methods utilized in this study were rigorous, the analysis results are limited to the school bullying intervention programs reviewed and are thus not generalizable.

## Chapter 6: Conclusion

The overall goal of this study was to find out the extent to which school bullying intervention programs used objectives and activities that aligned with the eight PYD indicators of high-quality youth programs; and, to determine whether these programs used the PYD indicators explicitly or implicitly. Both of these goals were accomplished in this study by reconstructing and analyzing each of the school bullying intervention program models.

Because 10 of the 13 program models were categorized as in moderate to high alignment with the PYD indicators suggest that school bullying intervention programs are utilizing objectives and activities that align well with PYD program quality standards. Further, that the *Supportive Relationships, Efficacy and Mattering*, and *Opportunities for Skill Building* indicators were used by the programs most frequently indicates that these interventions are focused on promoting PYD by developing youth relationships, sense of self, and skill sets; each of which are important to a youth's positive development.

Yet, the *Opportunities to Belong* and *Physical and Psychological Safety* indicators, which are associated with diversity, inclusion, and safety, were underutilized by the programs. Because school bullying is largely about power imbalances, school bullying intervention programs should strive to include considerations of diversity into their programs that ensure every youth, regardless of their race, ethnicity, gender, sexuality, class, ability, and/ or cultural orientation is properly included into the intervention process in ways that are safe and meaningful. Incorporating considerations of diversity and safety into school bullying programs may help all youth feel safer, while

ensuring that the interventions are working to alleviate higher rates of victimization for specific groups of youth.

Most of the programs utilized objectives and activities that aligned well with the PYD indicators. Yet, in order to move research on PYD and school bullying intervention programs into new directions, there must be more explicit integration between the two paradigms, which will create new knowledge for researchers and practitioners alike.

Creating this new knowledge will require the formulation of and increased accessibility to school bullying intervention program models so that researchers and practitioners can follow a programs theory of change. The ability to access comprehensive program models will create new areas of inquiry into how school bullying intervention programs intend to create change; and, will increase knowledge about program activities that are used most, and/or work best.

Improving access to school bullying intervention program models will also improve evaluations of these programs by creating an avenue to assess program fidelity. Assessing implementation and program model theory of school bullying interventions is essential to a complete and thorough examination of the potential roadblocks a program faces.

Because this study was a qualitative exploration of the potential alignment between the PYD indicators and school bullying intervention programs means that it is not quite time to recommend specific strategies for integrating the two approaches to youth programming. However, this study did identify several avenues for future research that are needed to determine how the two approaches can be integrated in ways that are beneficial for all youth.

During an era where evidenced-based programs are on the rise and school bullying rates are still very high, the need to create new evidence (or knowledge) about the most effective ways to promote positive youth behaviors while also limiting negative behaviors is crucial. Thus, creating new ways to conceptualize school bullying interventions by using developmental theories, like PYD, from paradigms not typically associated with research on school bullying intervention programs seems like a very useful strategy that may help mitigate current and future rates of school bullying.

## Bibliography

- Anderson, A. (2005). An introduction to theory of change. *Evaluation Exchange*, 11(2), 12-19.
- Arnold, M. E., Nott, B. D. (2010). *4-H Youth Voice: Youth Choice: Wal-Mart Healthy Living Program Evaluation. Final Program Evaluation Report*. Corvallis, OR: 4-H Youth Development Program, Oregon State University.
- Baldry, A. C., & Farrington, D. P. (2007). Effectiveness of programs to prevent school bullying. *Victims & Offenders*, 2(2), 183–204.
- Baly, M. W., & Cornell, D. G. (2011). Effects of an educational video on the measurement of bullying by self-report. *Journal of School Violence*, 10(3), 221–238. doi:10.1080/15388220.2011.578275
- Bandura, A. (1977). *Social learning theory*. General Learning Press. Madison, Avenue, New York.
- Bauer, N. S., Lozano, P., & Rivara, F. P. (2007). The effectiveness of the Olweus Bullying Prevention Program in public middle schools: A controlled trial. *The Journal of Adolescent Health*, 40(3), 266–274.
- Berry, K., & Hunt, C. J. (2009). Evaluation of an intervention program for anxious adolescent boys who are bullied at school. *The Journal of Adolescent Health*, 45(4), 376–382. doi:10.1016/j.jadohealth.2009.04.023
- Birkett, M., Espelage, D. L., & Koenig, B. (2009). LGB and questioning students in schools: The moderating effects of homophobic bullying and school climate on negative outcomes. *Journal of youth and adolescence*, 38(7), 989-1000.

- Black, S., Washington, E., Trent, V., Harner, P., & Pollock, E. (2009). Translating the Olweus Bullying Prevention Program into real-world practice. *Health Promotion Practice, 11*(5), 733–740. DOI 10.1177/1524839908321562
- Bowlan, N. M. (2011). Implementation and evaluation of a comprehensive, school-wide bullying prevention program in an urban/suburban middle school. *The Journal of School Health, 81*(4), 167–173.
- Bronfenbrenner, U. (1992). *Ecological systems theory*. Jessica Kingsley Publishers. London, England.
- Brown, B. B., Larson, J. (2009). Peer Relationships in Adolescence. *Handbook of Adolescent Psychology*. Wiley. Hoboken, NJ. 74-103.
- Catalano, R. F., Berglund, M. L., Ryan, J. A. M., Lonczak, H. S., Hawkins, J. D. (2004). Positive youth development in the United States: Research findings on evaluations of positive youth development programs. *The annals of the American academy of political and social science, 591*(1), 98-124.
- Cornell, D., Sheras, P., Gregory, A., & Fan, X. (2009). A retrospective study of school safety conditions in high schools using the Virginia threat assessment guidelines versus alternative approaches. *School Psychology Quarterly, 24*(2), 119.
- Cunningham, N. J. (2007). Level of bonding to school and perception of the school environment by bullies, victims, and bully victims. *The Journal of Early Adolescence, 27*(4), 457-478.
- Davidson, L. M., & Demaray, M. K. (2007). Social support as a moderator between victimization and internalizing-externalizing distress from bullying. *School Psychology Review, 36*(3), 383.

- Domino, M. (2013). Measuring the impact of an alternative approach to school bullying. *Journal of School Health, 83*(6), 430–437. DOI 10.1111/josh.12047
- Durlak, J. A., & DuPre, E. P. (2008). Implementation matters: A review of research on the influence of implementation on program outcomes and the factors affecting implementation. *American journal of community psychology, 41*(3-4), 327-350.
- Durlak, J. A., Taylor, R. D., Kawashima, K., Pachan, M. K., DuPre, E. P., Celio, C. I., Berger, S. R., Dymnicki, A. B., Weissberg, R. P. (2007). Effects of positive youth development programs on school, family, and community systems. *American Journal of Community Psychology, 39*(3-4), 269-286
- Eccles, J., Gootman, J. Eds. (2002). *Community Programs to Promote Youth Development*. Washington, DC: The National Academies Press.
- Erikson, E. H. (1968). *Identity: Youth and crisis* (No. 7). New York, NY. WW Norton & Company.
- Evers, K. E., Prochaska, J. O., Van Marter, D. F., Johnson, J. L., & Prochaska, J. M. (2007). Transtheoretical-based bullying prevention effectiveness trials in middle schools and high schools. *Educational Research, 49*(4), 397–414.  
doi:10.1080/00131880701717271
- Farrington, D. P., Totfi, M. M. (2009). School-based programs to reduce bullying and victimization: A systematic review. *Campbell Systematic Reviews, 5*(6).
- Ferguson, C. J., Miguel, C. S., Kilburn, J., John C., & Sanchez, P. (2007). The effectiveness of school-based anti-bullying programs: A meta-analytic review. *Criminal Justice Review, 32*(4), 401–414.

- Fergus, S., & Zimmerman, M. A. (2005). Adolescent resilience: A framework for understanding healthy development in the face of risk. *Annu. Rev. Public Health, 26*, 399-419.
- Flynt, S. W., & Morton, R. C. (2004). Bullying and children with disabilities. *Journal of Instructional Psychology, 31*(4), 330–333.
- Fonagy, P., Twemlow, S. W., Vernberg, E., Sacco, F. C., & Little, T. D. (2005). Creating a peaceful school learning environment: The impact of an antibullying program on educational attainment in elementary schools. *Medical Science Monitor, 11*, 317–325.
- Fredricks, J. A., & Eccles, J. S. (2006). Extracurricular involvement and adolescent adjustment: Impact of duration, number of activities, and breadth of participation. *Applied Developmental Science, 10*(3), 132-146.
- Funnell, S. C., & Rogers, P. J. (2011). *Purposeful program theory: effective use of theories of change and logic models*, (Vol. 31). John Wiley & Sons. Hoboken, NJ.
- Gladden, R., M., Vivolo-Kantor, A. M., Hamburger, M. E., & Lumpkin, C. D. (2014). *Bullying surveillance among youths: Uniform definitions for public health and recommended data elements*. National Center for Injury Prevention and Control, (U.S.). Division of Violence Prevention. Retrieved from <http://stacks.cdc.gov/view/cdc/21596>
- Gollwitzer, M., Eisenbach, K., Atria, M., Strohmeier, D., & Banse, R. (2006). Evaluation of aggression-reducing effects of the “Viennese Social Competence Training”. *Swiss Journal of Psychology, 65*(2), 125-135.

- Gollwitzer, M., Banse, R., Eisenbach, K., & Naumann, A. (2007). Effectiveness of the Vienna Social Competence Training on explicit and implicit aggression: Evidence from an Aggressiveness-IAT. *European Journal of Psychological Assessment, 23*(3), 150–156.
- Greene, D. C., Britton, P. J., & Fitts, B. (2014). Long-Term outcomes of Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, and Transgender recalled school victimization. *Journal of Counseling & Development, 92*(4), 406-417.
- Hawker, D. S. J., & Boulton, M. J. (2000). Twenty years' research on peer victimization and psychosocial maladjustment: A meta-analytic review of cross-sectional studies. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry and Allied Disciplines, 41*, 441–455.
- Hazeldon Foundation. (2007). *The Olweus Bullying Prevention Program (OBPP)*. Retrieved from <http://www.clemson.edu/olweus/about.html>.
- Higgins, J. P. G. S., & Green, S. (2005). Cochrane handbook for systematic reviews of interventions 4.2. 5 [updated May 2005]. The Cochrane library, (3).Hamilton, S.F., Hamilton, M.A., & Pittman, K. Principles for Youth Development. In S.F. Hamilton & M.A. Hamilton (Eds.) 2004, *The Youth Development Handbook: Coming of Age in American Communities* (pp.3-22). Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Higgins, J. P. (Ed.). (2008). *Cochrane handbook for systematic reviews of interventions* (Vol. 5). Chichester, England: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Hong, J. S., & Garbarino, J. (2012). Risk and protective factors for homophobic bullying in schools: An application of the Social–Ecological Framework. *Educational Psychology Review, 24*(2), 271-285.

- Hunt, C. (2007). The effect of an education program on attitudes and beliefs about bullying and bullying behavior in junior secondary school students. *Child & Adolescent Mental Health, 12*(1), 21–26. doi:10.1111/j.1475-3588.2006.00417.x
- Jiménez Barbero, J. A., Ruiz Hernández, J. A., Llor Esteban, B., & Pérez García, M. (2012). Effectiveness of anti-bullying school programmes: A systematic review by evidence levels. *Children & Youth Services Review, 34*(9), 1646-1658.
- Jiménez-Barbero, J. A., Ruiz-Hernández, J. A., Llor-Esteban, B., Llor-Zaragoza, L., & Pérez García, M. (2013). Efficacy of a brief intervention on attitudes to reduce school violence: A randomized clinical trial. *Children & Youth Services Review, 35*(9), 1313–1318.
- Kaltiala-Heino, R., Rimpela, M., Rantanen, P., & Rimpela, A. (2000). Bullying at school - An indicator of adolescents at risk for mental disorders. *Journal of Adolescence, 23*, 661–674.
- Kärnä, A., Voeten, M., Little, T. D., Poskiparta, E., Alanen, E., & Salmivalli, C. (2011). Going to scale: A nonrandomized nationwide trial of the KiVa antibullying program for grades 1–9. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 79*(6), 796.
- Karna, A., Voeten, M., Little, T. D., Alanen, E., Poskiparta, E., & Salmivalli, C. (2013). Effectiveness of the KiVa Antibullying Program: Grades 1-3 and 7-9. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 105*(2), 535–551.
- Kiang, L., & Fuligni, A. J. (2009). Ethnic identity and family processes among adolescents from Latin American, Asian, and European backgrounds. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 38*(2), 228–241.

- Kumpulainen, K., Räsänen, E., & Henttonen, I. (1998). Children involved in bullying: Psychological disturbance and the persistence of the involvement. *Child Abuse & Neglect, 23*, 1253–1262.
- Lewis, K. M., Schure, M. B., Bavarian, N., DuBois, D. L., Day, J., Ji, P., Flay, B. R. (2013). Problem behavior and urban, low-income youth. *American Journal of Preventive Medicine, 44*(6), 622–630. DOI 10.1016/j.amepre.2013.01.030
- Lerner, R. M., Lerner, J. V., Almerigi, J. Theokas, C., Naudeau, S., Gestsdottir, S., Naudeau, S., Jelicic, H., Alberts, A. Ma, L., Smith, L., Bobek, D., Richman-Raphael, D., Simpson, I., Christiansen, E. D., von Eye, A. (2005). Positive youth development, participation in community youth development programs, and community contributions of fifth grade adolescents: Findings from the first wave of the 4-H study of positive youth development. *Journal of Early Adolescence, 25*(1), pp. 17-71.
- Lerner, R. M., & Steinberg, L. (2009). The scientific study of adolescent development. *Handbook of adolescent psychology*.
- McDougall, P., Vaillancourt, T., & Hymel, S. (2008). What happens over time to those who bully and those who are victimized? In S.Hymel, S. Swearer & P. Gillett (Eds.). *Bullying at School and Online*, a special invited issue of education.com. Retrieved from <http://www.education.com>.
- Mahoney, J. L., Vandell, D. L., Simpkins, S., & Zarrett, N. (2009). Adolescent out-of-school activities. *Handbook of Adolescent Psychology*. Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons. Retrieved from <http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1002/9780470479193.adlpsy002008/full>

- Menesini, E., Codecasa, E., Benelli, B., & Cowie, H. (2003). Enhancing children's responsibility to take action against bullying: Evaluation of a befriending intervention in Italian middle schools. *Aggressive Behavior, 29*(1), 1–14.
- Merrell, K. W., Gueldner, B. A., Ross, S. W., & Isava, D. M. (2008). How effective are school bullying intervention programs? A meta-analysis of intervention research. *School Psychology Quarterly, 23*(1), 26–42. doi:10.1037/1045-3830.23.1.26
- Mishna, F., Newman, P. A., Daley, A., & Solomon, S. (2009). Bullying of lesbian and gay youth: A qualitative investigation. *British Journal of Social Work, 39*(8), 1598-1614.
- Mishna, F. (2012). *Bullying: A Guide to Research, Intervention, and Prevention*. Oxford University Press. New York, NY.
- Mitra, D. L. (2008). Balancing power in communities of practice: An examination of increasing student voice through school-based youth–adult partnerships. *Journal of Educational Change, 9*(3), 221-242.
- Newman, M. L., Holden, G. W., & Delville, Y. (2005). Isolation and the stress of being bullied. *Journal of adolescence, 28*(3), 343-357.
- Olweus, Dan. (1993). *Bullying at school: What we know and what we can do*. Blackwell Publishing, LTD. Cambridge, MA.
- Olweus, D. (2005). A useful evaluation design, and effects of the Olweus Bullying Prevention Program. *Psychology, Crime & Law, 11*(4), 389-402.
- Olweus, D., & Limber, S. P. (2010). Bullying in school: Evaluation and dissemination of the Olweus Bullying Prevention Program. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 80*(1), 124-134.

- Ortega, R., Rey, R. D., & Mora-Merchdn, J. A. (2004). SAVE model: An anti-bullying intervention in Spain. *Bullying in Schools*. Cambridge University Press London, England. Retrieved from <http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511584466>.
- Pack, C., White, A., Raczynski, K., & Wang, A. (2011). Evaluation of the Safe School Ambassadors Program: A student-led approach to reducing mistreatment and bullying in schools. *Clearing House*, 84(4), 127–133.
- Pepler, D., Wendy, M., Craig, P. O. C., Atlas, R., & Charach, A. (2004). Making a difference in bullying: Evaluation of a systemic school-based programme. *Bullying in schools: How successful can interventions be?* Cambridge University Press. London, England.
- Phelps, E., Zimmerman, S. Warren, A. E. A., Jelicic, H., von Eye, A., Lerner, R. M. (2009). The structure and developmental course of positive youth development (PYD) in early adolescence: Implications for theory and practice. *Journal of Applied Developmental Psychology*, 30(5), 571-584.
- Phillips, D. A., & Shonkoff, J. P. (Eds.). (2000). *From Neurons to Neighborhoods:: The Science of Early Childhood Development*. National Academies Press.
- Pittet, I., Berchtold, A., Akre, C., Michaud, P. A., & Suris, J. C. (2010). Are adolescents with chronic conditions particularly at risk for bullying? *Archives of disease in childhood*, 95(9), 711-716.
- Pittman, K. J., Irby, M., Tolman, J., Yohalem, N., & Ferber, T. (2011). *Preventing problems, promoting development, encouraging engagement*. Washington, DC: Forum for Youth Investment.

- Polanin, J. R., Espelage, D. L., & Pigott, T. D. (2012). A meta-analysis of school-based bullying prevention programs' effects on bystander intervention behavior. *School Psychology Review, 41*(1), 47–65.
- Rawana, J. S., Norwood, S. J., & Whitley, J. (2011). A mixed-method evaluation of a strength-based bullying prevention program. *Canadian Journal of School Psychology, 26*(4), 283–300.
- Renshaw, T. L., & Jimerson, S. R. (2011). Enhancing student attitudes via a brief, universal-level bullying prevention curriculum. *School Mental Health, 4*(2), 115–128. doi:10.1007/s12310-011-9069-2
- Roth, J., Brookes-Gunn, J., Murray, L., Foster, W. (1998). Promoting healthy adolescents: Synthesis of youth development program evaluations. *Journal of Research on Adolescence, 8*(4): 423-459.
- Ryan, W., & Smith, J. D. (2009). Antibullying programs in schools: How effective are evaluation practices? *Prevention Science, 10*(3), 248-259.
- Scheithauer, H., Hess, M., Schultze-Krumbholz, A., & Bull, H. D. (2012). School-based prevention of bullying and relational aggression in adolescence: The fairplayer manual. *New directions for youth development, 2012*(133), 55-70.
- Schroeder, B. A., Messina, A., Schroeder, D., Good, K., Barto, S., Saylor, J., & Masiello, M. (2011). The Implementation of a Statewide Bullying Prevention Program: Preliminary findings from the field and the importance of coalitions. *Health Promotion Practice, 13*(4), 489–495.

- Shek, D. T. & Sun, R., C. (2009). Development, implementation and evaluation of a holistic positive youth development program: Project PATHS in Hong Kong. *International Journal on Disability and Human Development*, 8(2): 107-118.
- Smith, E. P., Faulk, M., & Sizer, M. A. (2013). Exploring the meso-system: The roles of community, family, and peers in adolescent delinquency and positive youth development. *Youth & Society*. DOI 10.1177/0044118X13491581
- Smith, J. D., Schneider, B. H., Smith, P. K., & Ananiadou, K. (2004). The effectiveness of whole-school antibullying programs: A synthesis of evaluation research. *School Psychology Review*, 33(4), 547–560.
- Sourander, A., Jensen, P., Rönning, J. A., Niemelä, S., Helenius, H., Sillanmäki, L., & Almqvist, F. (2007). What is the early adulthood outcome of boys who bully or are bullied in childhood? The Finnish “From a Boy to a Man” study. *Pediatrics*, 120(2), 397-404.
- Steinberg, L., & Morris, A. S. (2001). Adolescent development. *Journal of Cognitive Education and Psychology*, 2(1), 55-87.
- Strohmeier, D., Hoffmann, C., Schiller, E. M., Stefanek, E., & Spiel, C. (2012). ViSC social competence program. *New directions for youth development*, 2012(133), 71-84.
- Steinberg, L. (2010). A behavioral scientist looks at the science of adolescent brain development. *Brain and cognition*, 72(1), 160-164.
- Swearer, S. M., Song, S. Y., Cary, P. T., Eagle, J. W., & Mickelson, W. T. (2001). Psychosocial correlates in bullying and victimization: The relationship between

- depression, anxiety, and bully/victim status. *Journal of Emotional Abuse*, 2(2-3), 95-121.
- Swearer, S. M., Espelage, D. L. (2003). Research on school bullying and victimization: What have we learned and where do we go from here? *School Psychology Review*, 32(3), 365-383.
- Swearer, S. M., Espelage, D. L., Napolitano, S. A. (2009). *Bullying intervention and prevention: Realistic strategies for schools*. Guilford Press, New York, NY.
- Swearer, S., Espelage, D. L., Vaillancourt, T., Hymel, S. (2010). What can be done about school bullying? Linking research to educational practice. *Educational Researcher*, 39(1), 38-47.
- Tangen, D., & Campbell, M. (2010). Cyberbullying prevention: One primary school's approach. *Australian Journal of Guidance & Counselling*, 20(2), 225–234.
- Ttofi, M. M., & Farrington, D. P. (2011). Effectiveness of school-based programs to reduce bullying: A systematic and meta-analytic review. *Journal of Experimental Criminology*, 7(1), 27–56.
- van der Meulen, K., Granizo, L., & Del Barrio, C. (2010). Using equip for educators to prevent peer victimization in secondary school. *Journal of Research in Character Education*, 8(1), 61–76.
- Vreeman, R. C., & Carroll, A. E. (2007). A systematic review of school-based interventions to prevent bullying. *Archives of Pediatrics & Adolescent Medicine*, 161(1), 78.

- Way, N., & Greene, M. L. (2006). Trajectories of perceived friendship quality during adolescence: The patterns and contextual predictors. *Journal of Research on Adolescence, 16*(2), 293–320.
- Wyatt-Knowlton, L., Phillips, C. C. (2013). *The Logic Model Guidebook: Better Strategies for Great Results*. Sage Publications. Thousand Oaks, CA.
- Wertz, F. J., Charmaz, K., & McMullen, L. M., Josselson R., Anderson, R., & McSpadden, E. (2011). *Five ways of doing qualitative analysis: Phenomenological psychology, grounded theory, discourse analysis, narrative research, and intuitive inquiry*. Guilford Press. New York, NY.
- Wolcott, H. F. (2008). *Writing up qualitative research*. Sage Publications. Thousand Oaks, CA
- Wong, D. S. W., Cheng, C. H. K., Ngan, R. M. H., & Ma, S. K. (2011). Program effectiveness of a restorative whole-school approach for tackling school bullying in Hong Kong. *International Journal of Offender Therapy & Comparative Criminology, 55*(6), 846–862.

## **Appendices**

**Appendix A**

The search string used variations on words and phrases, such as Evaluation of bullying prevention programs OR Evaluation of anti-bullying prevention programs OR Bullying prevention programs. OR Bullying intervention programs OR School bullying prevention program evaluation OR School bullying intervention program evaluation OR School anti-bullying intervention program evaluation.

**Appendix B: Sample Selection**

Delimiter	N
Initial Search	1162
First round – title review	416
Duplicate Removal	285
Study retrieval from previous meta-analysis	291
Second round – abstract review	66
Design delimiter	22
Time delimiter	17
Final Sample	13 programs

### Appendix C: Program Model Alignment with PYD

<b>Author (DoP)</b>	<b>Intervention Title</b>	<b>1 Safety</b>	<b>2 Appropriate Structure</b>	<b>3 Supportive Relationships</b>	<b>4 Opp. to Belong</b>	<b>5 Positive Social Norms</b>	<b>6 Efficacy and Mattering</b>	<b>7 Skill Building</b>	<b>8 Family, School and Community</b>
Karna, et al. (2012)	<i>KiVa</i>	Not discussed	Clear and consistent rules and boundaries; procedures for acute cases; implementation of bright vest for staff; increased monitoring	Support and responsiveness; good communication; care and guidance developing relationships	Not discussed	Expectations that bullying is not okay; focus on increasing bystander awareness and motivation to stop bullying incidents	Focus on improving bullying conditions; meaningful challenge to enhance student well-being	Develop: self-efficiency, raising awareness, knowledge about group processes, increase empathy, promote strategies of supporting the victim, group discussions, building bystander awareness	Inclusion of whole school, family and community
Karna, et al. (2011)	<i>KiVa</i>	Not discussed	Clear and consistent rules and boundaries; procedures for acute cases; implementation of bright vest for staff; increased monitoring	Support and responsiveness; good communication; care and guidance developing relationships	Not discussed	Expectations that bullying is not okay; focus on increasing bystander awareness and motivation to stop bullying incidents	Focus on improving bullying conditions; meaningful challenge to enhance student well-being	Develop: self-efficiency, raising awareness, knowledge about group processes, increase empathy, promote strategies of supporting the victim, group discussions, building bystander awareness	Inclusion of whole school, family and community
Sahin (2012)	<i>Empathy Training</i>	Not discussed	Not discussed	Focus on interconnectedness through improved communication	Not discussed	Not discussed	Focus on improving bullying conditions; meaningful challenge to increase leadership	Develop students cognition and sensitivity involving empathy, leadership skills, reflection, global awareness, group discussions, perceptions of others	At home tasks
Strohmeier, et al. (2012)	<i>ViSCA Social Competence Training</i>	Not discussed	Creation of positive rules geared toward increasing youth competencies and capacities	Fostering a sense of cooperation and trust through interpersonal relationships	Not discussed	Expectations that bullying is not okay and must be stopped	Focus on improving bullying conditions; increase youth voice and responsibility	Develop social competencies in key areas: social situations, emotions, social interactions, cooperation, positive behavior, youth define how best to tackle bullying in school, group discussions, youth led project	No other contexts involved

**Appendix C: Program Model Alignment with PYD (Continued)**

<b>Author (DoP)</b>	<b>Intervention Title</b>	<b>1 Safety</b>	<b>2 Appropriate Structure</b>	<b>3 Supportive Relationships</b>	<b>4 Opp. To Belong</b>	<b>5 Positive Social Norms</b>	<b>6 Efficacy and Mattering</b>	<b>7 Skill Building</b>	<b>8 Family, School and Community</b>
Gollwitzer, et al. (2007)	<i>ViSCA Social Competence Training</i>	Not discussed	Creation of positive rules geared toward increasing youth competencies and capacities	Fostering a sense of cooperation and trust through interpersonal relationships	Not discussed	Expectations that bullying is not okay and must be stopped	Focus on improving bullying conditions; increase youth voice and responsibility	Develop social competencies in key areas: social situations, emotions, social interactions, cooperation, positive behavior, youth define how best to tackle bullying in school, group discussions, youth led project	No other contexts involved
Gollwitzer, et al. (2006)	<i>ViSCA Social Competence Training</i>	Not discussed	Creation of positive rules geared toward increasing youth competencies and capacities	Fostering a sense of cooperation and trust through interpersonal relationships	Not discussed	Expectations that bullying is not okay and must be stopped	Focus on improving bullying conditions; increase youth voice and responsibility	Develop social competencies in key areas: social situations, emotions, social interactions, cooperation, positive behavior, youth define how best to tackle bullying in school, group discussions, youth led project	No other contexts involved
Renshaw & Jimerson (2011)	<i>Promoting Positive Peer-relationships (P3R)</i>	Creates safe spaces - emotional, behavioral	Not discussed	Support and guidance to foster positive relationships and a sense of interconnectedness	Not discussed	Expectations grounded in empowerment, youth voice, and strategies to develop positive behavioral solutions	Focus on youth empowerment techniques and creating a difference in ones' community; youth responsibility	Develop: empathy and prosocial behavior, teamwork, reflection, goal-setting and planning, negative behaviors serve a function (considering all contexts); raise awareness, promote well-being and empowerment; problem solving skills; improve attitudes	Family and community involved

**Appendix C: Program Model Alignment with PYD (Continued)**

<b>Author (DoP)</b>	<b>Intervention Title</b>	<b>1 Safety</b>	<b>2 Appropriate Structure</b>	<b>3 Supportive Relationships</b>	<b>4 Opp. to Belong</b>	<b>5 Positive Social Norms</b>	<b>6 Efficacy and Mattering</b>	<b>7 Skill Building</b>	<b>8 Family, School and Community</b>
Bowllan (2011)	<i>OBPP</i>	Works to secure a safe and positive school climate	Clear and consistent rules and boundaries; process for handling bullying incidents, development of individual intervention plans	Provide support, guidance, and care through good communication and contact with community members	Not discussed	Institute school-wide expectations about bullying, including messages that bullying is not okay; evaluate the supervisory system	Focus on improving bullying conditions; youth active in making a difference in their school	Develop: attitudes against bullying behaviors; promote prosocial behaviors; improve peer relations	Meetings and committees created and held with parents, staff, and faculty, community involved
Bauer, et al. (2007)	<i>OBPP</i>	Works to secure a safe and positive school climate	Clear and consistent rules and boundaries; process for handling bullying incidents; development of individual intervention plans	Provide support, guidance, and care through good communication and contact with community members	Not discussed	Institute school-wide expectations about bullying, including messages that bullying is not okay; evaluate the supervisory system	Focus on improving bullying conditions; youth active in making a difference in their school	Develop: attitudes against bullying behaviors; promote prosocial behaviors; improve peer relations	Meetings/ committees created and held with parents, staff, and faculty, community involved
Pack, White, Raczynski, & Wang (2011)	<i>Safe School Ambassadors Program</i>	Not discussed	Structure is filtered through the students who are selected and recruited to disrupt bullying	Supports more secure attachments through good communication and increased responsiveness	Measures were taken to ensure the Ambassadors were representative of the school population	Not discussed	Focus on building student self-efficacy and mattering through interactions with their peer ambassadors	Develop student ambassador awareness and knowledge of/on: commonalities, building bridges of understanding, problems and the costs of mistreatment; acquiring and sharpening skills to respond to mistreatment and violence on campus; motivation to use these new skills	Involves whole school

**Appendix C: Program Model Alignment with PYD (Conintued)**

<b>Author (DoP)</b>	<b>Intervention Title</b>	<b>1 Safety</b>	<b>2 Appropriate Structure</b>	<b>3 Supportive Relationships</b>	<b>4 Opp. to Belong</b>	<b>5 Positive Social Norms</b>	<b>6 Efficacy and Mattering</b>	<b>7 Skill Building</b>	<b>8 Family, School and Community</b>
van der Meulen, Granizo, & del Barrio (2010)	<i>Equip</i>	Not discussed	Not discussed	Provide support, guidance, and care through building interpersonal relationships and trust	Not discussed	Focused on creating a positive classroom environment	Focused on improving bullying conditions; enabling youth through meaningful challenge; autonomy granting	Develop: responsibility, peer relationships, social skills, social decision-making, intervention abilities, listening skills, conflict resolution, group processes, youth strategies	No other contexts involved
Wong, Cheng, Ngan, & Ma (2011)	<i>A Restorative Whole-School Approach (RwsA)</i>	Create a peaceful learning environment, based in justice, order, and peace	Clear and consistent rules and expectations; implementation of a pastoral care policy code of conduct	Provide support, guidance, and care through good communication; focus on interconnectedness and secure attachments; increased responsiveness	Not discussed	Focused on creating a positive school climate through ideas of an ethos of care, justice, and restoration	Focused on improving bullying conditions; youth empowerment through increased autonomy and making a difference	Develop empathy, assertiveness, coping, and problem-solving; strategies to help their anger and conflict resolution skills; build quality relationships; strengthen relationship with self and others; support the victim; enhance social skills and emotional control	Family, whole-school, and community actively integrated and involved
Berry & Hunt (2009)	<i>Confident Kids Program</i>	Not discussed	Not discussed	Provide support, guidance, and care through good communication and a focus on increasing social ability	Not discussed	Focused on creating a positive sense of self	Focused on improving bullying conditions; meaningful challenge to increase self-esteem and decrease anxiety	Increase youth knowledge and awareness of: self-regulation, internalizing behaviors, self-esteem, social skills, and coping behaviors	Parents integrated into the process

### Appendix C: Program Model Alignment with PYD (Continued)

<b>Author (DoP)</b>	<b>Intervention Title</b>	<b>1 Safety</b>	<b>2 Appropriate Structure</b>	<b>3 Supportive Relationships</b>	<b>4 Opp. to Belong</b>	<b>5 Positive Social Norms</b>	<b>6 Efficacy and Mattering</b>	<b>7 Skill Building</b>	<b>8 Family, School and Community</b>
Menesini, Codecasa, Benelli, & Cowie (2003)	<i>Befriending Intervention</i>	Not discussed	Not discussed	Provides support, guidance, and care through good communication focused on fostering a sense of cooperation and trust	Not discussed	Positive social norms grounded in supporting the victim through peer support	Focused on improving bullying conditions; meaningful challenge to increase awareness	Develop: cooperation, prosocial skills and helping behaviors, positive attitudes toward others, attitudes and values that support peers, emotional support, empathetic feelings	No other contexts involved
Scheithauer, Hess, Schultz-Krumbollz, & Bull (2012)	<i>The Fairplayer Manual</i>	Not discussed	Clear and consistent class-wide rules centered in personal responsibility and supporting victims	Provides guidance, support, and care through good communication and a focus on creating alternative ways to deal with bullying by working together	Not discussed	Fostering positive school climate and norms of supporting the victim, personal responsibility, and prosocial behaviors	Focused on improving bullying conditions; meaningful challenge to improve decision-making	The fostering of social-emotional competencies (such as perspective-taking skills, empathy and sympathy, and adequate social-cognitive perception) and moral sensitivity; increasing prosocial behavior; helping students to develop alternatives to relational aggression, and supporting the acquisition of adequate strategies to act, or react, in case of bullying	Parents involved, invited to attend one of two scheduled meetings; community resources available to families
Tangen and Campbell (2010)	<i>The Philosophy for Children (P4C) Approach</i>	Not discussed	Not discussed	Provides guidance, support, and care through good communication and a focus on working together to create alternative ways to handle bullying incidents	Not discussed	Foster positive school climate and norms grounded in pluralism, cooperation and dialogue	Focused on improving bullying conditions; meaningful challenge to improve judgement	Develop critical thinking skills, curiosity and questioning, reasoning and judgment skills, social and interaction skills (competencies), conflict resolution, and problem solving skills	No other contexts involved

**Appendix C: Program Model Alignment with PYD (Continued)**

<b>Author (DoP)</b>	<b><i>Intervention Title</i></b>	<b>1 Safety</b>	<b>2 Appropriate Structure</b>	<b>3 Supportive Relationships</b>	<b>4 Opp. to Belong</b>	<b>5 Positive Social Norms</b>	<b>6 Efficacy and Mattering</b>	<b>7 Skill Building</b>	<b>8 Family, School and Community</b>
Domino (2013)	<i>Take the Lead</i>	Not discussed	Not discussed	Provides support, guidance, and care through good communication; focus on finding new ways to handle and deal with bullying by working together	Not discussed	Foster positive school climate focused on the promotion of positive behaviors and reductions in negative behaviors	Focused on improving bullying conditions; youth empowerment through autonomy granting and service	Increase: self-awareness, self- management, social-awareness, relationship skills, decision making, problem solving, leadership, communication skills; build competence and confidence; identify and manage emotions; identify different forms of bullying; participation in a service learning project.	Educational workshops offered to parents; information letters sent to parents also; community involved

### Appendix D: Evaluation Study Information

Author (DoP)	Location	Sample	Gender (% Female)	Grade / Yrs Old	Intervention	Facilitator Length	Intervention Measurement	Design	Theoretical Framework
Karna et al (2012)	Finland	16503	50.00%	7-9 grade	<i>KiVa</i>	Classroom teachers, other professionals; 9 months	Random assignment by school; post-test by individual	RCT	Social-cognitive theory, bystander intervention
Karna et al, (2011) -	Finland	150000	49.00%	7-9 grade	<i>KiVa</i>	Classroom teachers, other professionals; 9 months	Cohort-longitudinal design; post-test from intervention students compared with pretest from same age students in same school	Quasi-CLD	Social-cognitive theory, bystander intervention
Sahin (2012)	Trabzon, Turkey	38	38 (only students who have bullied others)	6 grade	<i>Empathy Training</i> <i>*developed by researcher, no intervention name</i>	Researcher; 11 weeks	Random assignment by student, pre and post-test by student	RCT	Empathy Theory/Training
Strohmeier et al (2012)	Austria	2042	N/A	5-8 grade	<i>ViSCA Social Competence Training</i>	Train the trainer model; ViSCA coaches train teachers and teachers train students; 1 year	Random assignment by classroom	RCT	Social-competence

**Appendix D: Evaluation Study Information (Continued)**

<b>Author (DoP)</b>	<b>Location</b>	<b>Sample</b>	<b>Gender (% Female)</b>	<b>Grade / Yrs Old</b>	<b>Intervention</b>	<b>Facilitator Length</b>	<b>Intervention Measurement</b>	<b>Design</b>	<b>Theoretical Framework</b>
Gollwitzer et al (2006)	Germany	270	44.60%	6-9 grade	<i>ViSCA Social Competence Training</i>	Teachers; consultation from professional staff; 1 year	Quasi-experiment; cohort intervention-control design, comparison between age groups; pre post-tests by student	Quasi	Behavioral change and organizational change theories
Golwitzer	Germany	184	N/A	6-9 grade	<i>ViSCA Social Competence Training</i>	Taught by teams of trainers; 8- 12 weeks	Quasi-experiment; cohort intervention-control design, comparison between classes; pre post-tests by student	Quasi	Social information processing theory
Renshaw & Jimerson (2011)	CA, U.S	636	N/A	6-7 grade	<i>Promoting Positive Peer-relationships (P3R)</i>	Teachers; 3 different time-frames – 1 week, 1 month, and 2 months	Quasi-experiment; intervention-control, pre post-test by student	Quasi	Transactional-ecological; psychoeducational
Bowllan (2011)	Northeast U.S.	117	45.6	7-8 grade	<i>OBPP</i>	Teachers, plus training coach; 1 year	Quasi-experiment; time-lag cohort, pre post-test by student	Quasi	Behavioral and organizational change theories
Bauer, et al., (2007)	Seattle, U.S	6518	51	6-8 grade	<i>OBPP</i>	Teachers, plus training coach; 1 to 2 years after implementation	Quasi-experiment; control trial, pre post-test by student	Quasi	Behavioral and organizational change theories
Pack, White, Raczynski, & Wang (2011)	Texas, U.S.	4600	N/A	6-8 grade	<i>Safe School Ambassadors Program</i>	Trained adults; 2 years	Quasi-experiment; pre post by student	Quasi	Social Influence

**Appendix D: Evaluation Study Information (Continued)**

<b>Author (DoP)</b>	<b>Location</b>	<b>Sample</b>	<b>Gender (% Female)</b>	<b>Grade / Yrs Old</b>	<b>Intervention</b>	<b>Facilitator Length</b>	<b>Intervention Measurement</b>	<b>Design</b>	<b>Theoretical Framework</b>
van der Meulen, Granizo, & del Barrio (2010)	Spain	80	50	14-17 yrs old	<i>EQUIP</i>	Researcher (trained in the program); 6 months	Quasi-intervention control; pre posttest by student	Quasi	Social-cognitive; social decision making
Wong, Cheng, Ngan, & Ma (2011)	Hong Kong	1480	50	7-9 grade	<i>Restorative Whole-School Approach</i>	Trained teachers; 2 years	Quasi-intervention partial intervention control; pre posttest by student	Quasi	Restorative Justice
Berry & Hunt (2009)	Sydney	46	N/A	7-10 grade	<i>Confident Kids Program</i>	Trained adults; 3 months	Random assignment; pre post follow up test by student	RCT	Cognitive-behavioral
Menesini, Codecasa, Benelli, & Cowie (2003)	Italy	293	48	11-14 yrs old	<i>Befriending Intervention</i>	Youth are trained to facilitate; 1 year	Quasi-intervention control, pre post-test by student	Quasi	Peer support and empathy
Scheithauer, Hess, Schultz-Krumbollz, & Bull (2012)	Germany	678	50	13-21 yrs old	<i>Fairplayer Manual</i>	Trained teachers; 2 years	Quasi-intervention control, pre post follow up tests by student	Quasi	Social constructivist and social learning theory
Tangen and Campbell (2010)	Australia	70	49	10-13 yrs old	<i>Philosophy for Children (P4C) Approach</i>	Teacher trained; intervention school has had the program implemented for 13 years	Quasi-intervention control, pre posttest by students	Quasi	Cognitive-behavioral; social constructivism

**Appendix D: Evaluation Study Information (Continued)**

<b>Author (DoP)</b>	<b>Location</b>	<b>Sample</b>	<b>Gender (% Female)</b>	<b>Grade / Yrs Old</b>	<b>Intervention</b>	<b>Facilitator Length</b>	<b>Intervention Measurement</b>	<b>Design</b>	<b>Theoretical Framework</b>
Domino (2013)	Connecticut	323	N/A	7th grade	<i>Take the Lead</i>	Trained teachers; 16 weeks	Quasi-time lag cohort pre post- test by student	Quasi	Social Emotional Learning and Positive Youth Development

### Appendix E: Reconstructed Program Models

<b>Authors (DoP)</b>	<b>Program Title and Approach</b>	<b>Program Goals</b>	<b>Program Objectives</b>	<b>Program Activities</b>
Karna et al (2012)	<i>KiVa</i> Whole School	Create positive change in bystanders behavior to reduce the rewards of bullying and motivation to bully	Enhancing empathy, self-efficiency, and anti-bullying attitudes of bystanders, support procedures for handling acute cases of bullying, raise awareness, role of the group, increase empathy toward victims, promote strategies of supporting victims and increased responsiveness, self-efficacy, target the individual classroom and whole school, focus on bystander	Themed days x 4 (e.g. Me and the Others, group interactions, forms of bullying, consequences and counterforces of bullying), 13-23 different lessons, kick off session, Internet forum, bright vests for recess staff; increased monitoring parent guide; teacher training, dedicated print materials, computer games
Karna et al, (2011)	<i>KiVa</i> Whole School	Same Program	Same Program	Same Program
Sahin (2012)	<i>Empathy Training</i> *developed by researcher, no intervention name Classroom	Decreasing bullying behaviors among school-aged youth	Develop students cognition and sensitivity involving empathy, insights, leadership skills, reflection, global awareness, group discussions, perceptions of others, interconnectedness, improved communication	Eleven sessions of 75-minutes, study used cognitive features like recognizing, evaluating, and naming feelings; didactic, experimental, role playing and modeling techniques; social promotion, giving responsibility, sensitive support, and home tasks (compare own perceptions to parents on certain events, like watching TV, etc.); activity where bully students were to create a slogan in compliance with each training session; psychodrama technique, shadow game, lecture and discussion, develop insight from pictures and representations of emotional states; sketch show, create your own show, group work, evaluate study
Strohmeier et al (2012)	<i>ViSCA Social Competence Training</i> Classroom	Reduce aggressive behavior and bullying and foster social and interactional competencies in schools	Geared to develop social competencies in or on: positive rules, trust, social situations, emotions, social interactions, cooperation, positive behavior, youth voice, and group consensus	Separate training for teachers and youth; training for youth has 13 units where students work together to find ways to prevent bullying; students work together to achieve a positive common goal by: foster discussions, include interactive games, role plays, work on hypothetical situations (problem solving), youth seek consensus on a class project and complete it (some examples: photos, short films, songs, or newspapers, interviews, etc.)

### Appendix E: Reconstructed Program Models (Continued)

<b>Authors (DoP)</b>	<b>Program Title and Approach</b>	<b>Program Goals</b>	<b>Program Objectives</b>	<b>Program Activities</b>
Gollwitzer et al (2007)	<i>ViSCA Social Competence Training Classroom</i>	Strengthen students sense of class commitment, perception of responsibility, and foster non-aggressive behavior in conflict situations	Enrichment of the behavioral repertoire and participation; aim to reduce hostile attribution bias and increase the salience and cognitive accessibility of social competence; responsibility of the individual to recognize their role in conflict situations and to bring about a peaceful solution; class commitment to these ends; aimed at changing individual and group-level behavior	13 lessons are divided into three phases – impulse phase: learn alternative ways to perceive, interpret, and deal with critical situations using vignette stories, discussions, and role plays; reflection phase: gives both teachers and students the opportunity to reflect on what has been learned; and action phase: teachers and students decide together how they want to benefit from the remaining lessons – the students express goals for class projects and generate ideas to realize them.
Gollwitzer et al (2006)	<i>ViSCA Social Competence Training Classroom</i>	Same Program	Same Program	Same Program
Renshaw & Jimerson (2011)	<i>Promoting Positive Peer-relationships (P3R) Whole School</i>	Enhance students' general attitudes towards bullying and their perceptions of their schools' support system and create safe school spaces; emotional and behavioral	Increase empathy and prosocial behavior; teamwork, reflection, goal-setting and planning, negative behaviors serve a function (considering all contexts); raise awareness, promote well-being and interconnectedness; positive behavioral solutions; empowerment, problem solving skills, improve attitudes and foster positive relationships	Classroom, professional development, and community involvement, group activities, manual for teachers, viewing film segments about bullying; class discussion; providing psycho-educational information

### Appendix E: Reconstructed Program Models (Continued)

Authors (DoP)	Program Title and Approach	Program Goals	Program Objectives	Program Activities
Bowllan (2011)	<i>OBPP</i> Whole School	Reduce the prevalence of bully/victim problems that exist within the school setting while improving the overall school climate.	Reduce bullying among children [youth], improve the social climate of classrooms, and reduce related antisocial behavior; promote prosocial behaviors and attitudes against bullying; improve peer relations	<p><b>School-Level Components:</b> Establish a Bullying Prevention Coordinating Committee. Conduct committee and staff trainings. Administer Olweus Bullying Questionnaire school wide. Hold staff discussion group meetings. Introduce school rules against bullying. Review and refine the school's supervisory system. Hold a school kick-off event to launch the program. Involve parents.</p> <p><b>Classroom-Level Components</b> Post and enforce school wide rules against bullying. Hold regular class meetings. Hold meetings with students' parents.</p> <p><b>Individual-Level Components:</b> Supervise students' activities. Ensure that all staff intervenes on the spot when bullying occurs. Hold meetings with students involved in bullying. Hold meetings with parents of involved students. Develop individual intervention plans for involved students.</p> <p><b>Community-Level Components:</b> Involve community members on the Bullying Prevention Coordinating Committee. Develop partnerships with community members to support your school's program.</p> <p>Help spread anti-bullying messages and principles of best practice in the community.</p>
Bauer, et al., (2007)	<i>OBPP</i> Whole School	Same Program	Same Program	Same Program
Pack, White, Raczynski, & Wang (2011)	<i>Safe School Ambassador Program</i> Whole School	Harness the power of students to prevent and stop bullying and violence	Harnesses the power of the socially-influential leaders of a school's diverse cliques. Student-leaders are trained to promote a healthy school environment, respond to aggression and mistreatment (act as proactive and helpful bystander)	Two day training focused on activities, such as: discovering commonalities and building bridges of understanding across diverse groups; becoming more aware of the problem and the costs of mistreatment and violence on campus; acquiring and sharpening skills for preventing and responding to mistreatment and violence; developing motivation to actually use those skills.

### Appendix E: Reconstructed Program Models (Continued)

<b>Authors (DoP)</b>	<b>Program Title and Approach</b>	<b>Program Goals</b>	<b>Program Objectives</b>	<b>Program Activities</b>
van der Meulen, Granizo, & del Barrio (2010)	<i>Equip</i> Classroom	Aimed at educating young people at-risk or with behavioral problems in thinking and acting responsibly using a peer-helping method	Increase youth knowledge about: anger management and thinking errors, social skills, and social decision-making; students to develop responsibility, peer relationships, decision-making, intervention abilities, listening skills, conflict resolution, group processes, youth strategies	29 units including: a student manual, group work and discussion, conflict resolution, peer-helping, understanding group processes, and moral alignment.
Wong, Cheng, Ngan, & Ma (2011)	<i>A Restorative Whole-School Approach (RwsA)</i> Whole School	Building a long-term positive environment to prevent bullying	Create a shared ethos among all parties in schools in the concerted effort to develop an anti-bullying policy based in care, justice, and restoration that becomes the school's existing discipline policy, pastoral care policy or code of conduct, building up quality relationships within the classroom, and providing support to students to strengthen their relationship with self and others; provide victim support and empowerment; community building; develop students empathy, assertiveness, coping, and problem-solving strategies to help their anger and conflict resolution skills; create a sense of partnership with all staff, teachers, and community members	Train teachers, parents, and senior students to handle school bullying; training opportunities to enhance their social skills and emotional control; implementation of mediation for bullying incidents; consistent monitoring; special attention to "at-risk" youth; peace education curriculum; student competition relating to building harmony in school.
Berry & Hunt (2009)	<i>Confident Kids Program</i> Classroom	Reduce the incidence and impact of bullying experiences	Increase youth knowledge and awareness of: self-regulation, internalizing behaviors, self-esteem, social skills, and coping behaviors	8 weekly hour-long sessions of cognitive behavioral manual-led group intervention; parents attend separate parallel program; anxiety management strategies (psychoeducational, cognitive restructuring, and graded exposure); education about bullying (adaptive coping strategies, enhancement of social skills, and cognitive strategies); include skill demonstration, role plays, and group discussions.

### Appendix E: Reconstructed Program Models (Continued)

Authors (DoP)	Program Title and Approach	Program Goals	Program Objectives	Program Activities
Menesini, Codecasa, Benelli, & Cowie (2003)	<i>Befriending Intervention</i> Classroom	Reduce bullying	To reduce bullying episodes through developing bullies' awareness of their own and others' behavior; enhance youth capacities to offer support to victims; enhance the responsibility and involvement of bystanders; improve the quality of interpersonal relationships in the class group; analyze possible age and gender differences related to the effect of the intervention. Develop students' responsibility toward others, empathetic feelings, communication, cooperation and trust, emotional support, and reciprocal interactions	Class interventions; selection of peer-supporters; selected youth are trained on facilitating interactions with peers; circle meetings; involvement of victims; task assignments; supervision; transmitting the training and passing on the rules.
Scheithauer, Hess, Schultz-Krumbollz, & Bull (2012)	<i>The Fairplayer Manual</i> Whole School	Reduce bullying behaviors and increasing prosocial behaviors	Raise awareness of bullying and/or of relational aggression and its negative effects on prosocial behavior; modify pro-bullying into anti-bullying attitudes and norms (i.e., personal responsibility to intervene, readiness to take action against bullying, proscription of bullying behavior, and supporting victims); foster positive peer relationships and a positive class climate; foster social-emotional competencies (such as perspective-taking skills, empathy and sympathy, and adequate social-cognitive perception) and moral sensitivity; prevent or decrease bullying or relational aggressive behavior; increase pro-social behavior; help students to develop alternatives to relational aggression, and support the acquisition of adequate strategies to act, or react, in case of bullying	Awareness raising and attitude change through discussion groups, information, feedback, and role plays; cognitive-behavioral methods, such as model learning, behavioral exercises, implementation of behavioral rules and class wide rules, social reinforcement and feedback; fostering social skills and students' social-cognitive information processing by a differentiated perception of social situations, empathy training, structured role plays, behavioral exercises; moral dilemma discussions; modify group dynamics through structured role plays, preparation and enactment of a play, and behavioral group exercises.

### Appendix E: Reconstructed Program Models (Continued)

<b>Authors (DoP)</b>	<b>Program Title and Approach</b>	<b>Program Goals</b>	<b>Program Objectives</b>	<b>Program Activities</b>
Tangen & Campbell (2010)	<i>The Philosophy for Children (P4C) Approach Classroom</i>	To create school classrooms that are pluralistic and centered in dialogue and collaboration	To encourage curiosity and questioning; strengthen judgment and reasoning skills; improve understanding and encourage consideration of different viewpoints. Develop critical thinking skills, social and interaction skills (competencies), conflict resolution, and problem solving skills.	Reading or viewing various stimuli (such as a dilemma someone might face), developing questions in relation to the stimulus, then participate in dialogue with each other.
Domino (2013)	<i>Take the Lead Whole-School</i>	Increase social competencies and reduce bullying behaviors	Increase self-awareness, self-management, social-awareness, relationship skills, decision making, problem solving, leadership, communication skills, build competence and confidence, identify and manage emotions, identify different forms of bullying, find new ways to handle and deal with bullying by working together; participation in a service learning project.	Taught once per week (during class - 45 min) for 16 weeks: knowledge, skill, and application components for each lesson; brainstorming sessions; individual and paired practice; real-world scenario practice (for example, going through an interview with a parent volunteer); educational workshop offered, parent information letter.

