COUNTRY: UNITED KINGDOM

2A ORGANIZATIONS INVOLVED


Other government organisations include: Child Exploitation and Online Protection Centre (CEOP), Local Safeguarding Children Boards (LSCB). Other major Non-Governmental Organisations working across the UK working with bullying include: the National Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Children (NSPCC); Barnardos; Anti Bullying Alliance; National Children’s Bureau; National Bullying Helpline; Bullying Intervention Group; Young Minds; Mencap; Kidscapes; Peaceworks; Ditch the label; Educational Action Challenging Homophobia (EACH); Stonewall; Action for Scotland; LGBT Youth Scotland; Childnet; Diana Award; Action for Children; Bullies Out.

2B NATIONAL OR LOCAL PROGRAMS (PREVENTION AND INTERVENTION)

UK 2B-1: ZAP

1. **Title of intervention:** Zap
2. **Organization who carried out intervention:** Kidscape. Founded in 1985, Kidscape was the first charity in the UK established specifically to prevent bullying and child sexual abuse.
3. **Time frame:** 3 years
4. **Program description (in brief narrative format describe aims and procedure):** ZAP is a free day-long group based (size unknown) assertiveness training course for 9 to 16 year olds and their families that teaches practical strategies to prevent bullying and abuse. Sessions run two to three times a month at the Kidscape offices in London
5. **Checklist of program elements** (based on the Campbell Systematic Reviews by Farrington & Ttofi, 2009): check as relevant to program implementation

CHILD

- x work with victims (i.e. individualized work, not offered at the classroom level, with children involved in bullying.)

PEER

- x work with peers (i.e. formal engagement of peers in tackling bullying: peer mediation and peer mentoring.)

TEACHER


x information for teachers

x teacher training (i.e. present or absent)

PARENT

x information for parents

x parent training/meetings (i.e. organization on behalf of the school of ‘information
nights/educational presentations’ for parents and/or ‘teacher-parent meetings’ during
which parents were given information about the anti-bullying initiative in the school.)

6. **Age or grade:** 9 to 16 years

7. **Sample characteristics** During 2012-13, Kidscape ran ZAP workshops for almost 300
children and their families from across the UK. About a quarter of the young people who
participated had self-harmed or contemplated suicide. A large number were on the autistic
spectrum or had special educational needs, including ADHD, dyslexia and hearing or visual
impairments.

8. **Informants used.** Children completed pre course questionnaires; Staff fed back general
observations; Children completed evaluation at end of session; Children completed follow up
questionnaire.

9. **Sampling of population:** Parental-referral or referral via social workers, teachers, Doctors
and NSPCC. The majority attended the course as a result of the parents contacting the
Kidscape Helpline due to bullied child is reported as feeling suicidal, truanting, self harming,
aggressive or depressed the course was offered.

10. **Control group:** no

11. **Definition of the problem:** A Kidscape survey, "Long-term effects of Bullying 1995-
1997", had shown that the stress caused to children by bullying could continue into
adulthood. In the short-term it leads to feelings of low self-esteem and low self-
confidence. Many victims become anxious and withdrawn and may truant to avoid
the bullying. At worst, some children may attempt to harm themselves.

12. **Use of term bullying or cyber-bullying in questionnaire and definition** Yes: term used with
following definition: Bullying is the repetitive, intentional hurting of one person or group by
another person or group, where the relationship involves an imbalance of power. It can
happen face-to-face or through cyberspace, and comes in many different forms: **Verbal:**
Name calling, persistent teasing, mocking, taunting and threats. **Physical:** Any form of
physical violence, intimidating behaviour, theft or the intentional damage of possessions.
This includes hitting, kicking and pushing. **Emotional:** Excluding, tormenting, ridiculing,
humiliation, setting people up and spreading rumours. **Cyber:** Cyber bullying is the misuse of
digital technologies or communications to bully a person or a group, typically through
messages or actions that are threatening and/or intended to cause offence, anxiety or
humiliation.

13. **Measures used:** Pre Zap questionnaire, General observations recorded on arrival, during and
after the Zap sessions, written feedback from the children on the day and then Follow-up
questionnaires were sent out in the months after the session. These established whether the
child was still being bullied, how he or she was coping and generally how things had been
since the ZAP session. In addition to the questionnaires, on the day of the session Kidscape
staff noted the children's behaviour and attitude as they arrived, during the day, and as they
left the course. How confident were they? How did they interact with other children, with
parents and with the Kidscape staff? The children were also asked to complete a course
evaluation form at the end of the session.

14. **Interviews:** None
15. **Theoretical approach and basis on previous intervention:** Assertiveness and confidence skills training

16. **Type of analysis** Both qualitative and quantitative using questionnaires with yes/no and written narrative to gather the information

17. **Outcome measures:** Bullying incidents, confidence and handling incidents and mental health

18. **Duration/ intensity of intervention:** 3 years

19. **Evaluation** Reduction in bullying incidents; children feeling more confident in handling bullying; reduction in truanting; self reported improvement in mental health and wellbeing; development of own anti bullying strategies. Kidscape reports that 79% of children say they are no longer being bullied, and a further 8% say the situation has improved - the figures have been verified by Charities Evaluation Services. Of the young people still being bullied the majority said they were being bullied less. 100% felt it was useful, 94% felt they could stand up for themselves more effectively, 85% reported increase in self confidence and 83% identified improvement in self esteem. 19% found it easier to make new friends. The number of children who truanted was reduced from 50% to 2% while the number who wanted to stay away from school reduced from 31% to 8%. There was a reduction from 92% to 35% in the number who reported feeling depressed about bullying.

20. **Full reference and URL of intervention:**

   http://www.kidscape.org.uk/media/39411/kszapyear3report.pdf

---

**UK 2B-2: ANTI-BULLYING AMBASSADORS**

1. **Title of intervention:** Anti-Bullying Ambassadors programme

2. **Organization who carried out intervention:** The Diana Award – NGO charity founded as a legacy to Diana, Princess of Wales' belief that young people have the power to change the world for the better.

3. **Time frame:** The Diana Award has been running a peer-led anti-bullying programme since 2007, but received funding from the Department for Education to scale up this programme across schools in England in 2011. Since then, over 15,000 young people have been trained and supported to become Anti-Bullying Ambassadors.

4. **Program description (in brief narrative format describe aims and procedure):**

   The Anti-Bullying Ambassador programme provides training and resources to young people, staff and parents in the UK and Ireland to give them the skills, knowledge and confidence to effectively tackle bullying in their schools and communities.

   Young people become Anti-Bullying Ambassadors by attending a one day regional training event led by Diana Award staff.

   At the training the young people and their staff members learn what bullying is, what the different types of bullying are, why people are bullied and the impact that bullying can have on a person. When they return to their schools as Anti-Bullying Ambassadors, the students run campaigns and activities which encourage the whole school to treat each other with respect and be upstanders, not bystanders to bullying.

5. **Checklist of program elements** (based on the Campbell Systematic Reviews by Farrington & Ttofi, 2009): check as relevant to program implementation
PEER

☐ X work with peers (i.e. formal engagement of peers in tackling bullying: peer mediation and peer mentoring.)

OTHER CONTEXT

☐ X improved playground supervision (i.e. Some anti-bullying programs aimed to identify ‘hot-spots’ or ‘hot-times’ of bullying (mostly during playtime or lunchtime) and provided improved playground supervision of children.)

TEACHER

☐ X information for teachers

☐ X cooperative group work (i.e. cooperation among different professionals -- usually among teachers and some other professional groups, in working with bullies and victims of bullying.)

☐ X teacher training (i.e. present or absent)

PARENT

☐ X information for parents

SCHOOL

☐ X whole-school anti-bullying policy (i.e. presence of a formal anti-bullying policy on behalf of the school.)

☐ X school conferences (i.e. organization of school assemblies during which children were informed about bullying.)

☐ X non-punitive methods (i.e. restorative justice approaches and other non-punitive methods in dealing with children involved in bullying.)

6. **Age or grade:** The training is inclusive for 6 – 18 year olds and school staff members.

7. **Sample characteristics:** The programme has been evaluated at two levels. 1) Training event questionnaires: Questionnaires have been given to a total of 176 participants from different training days to evaluate the effectiveness and relevance of the training; 2) The programme has also worked with the Open University to evaluate the impact that the programme has had in three schools. The Open University evaluation looked at the programme in two secondary schools and one special school.

8. **Informants used** Training event questionnaires – Young people and staff who have received our training. Open University evaluation – Young people and staff who have received our training. Students and staff from the school who haven’t received our training but have access to the Anti-Bullying Ambassador programme in their school.
9. **Sampling of population:** Open University: Students and staff from two Secondary Schools and one Pupil Referral Unit. This included staff and students who had attended the programme’s training and those who hadn’t but had the programme set up in their schools. Training event evaluation forms – 176 from a range of different training events.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Questionnaires</th>
<th>Individual interviews</th>
<th>Focus groups (total number of participants)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School A</td>
<td>ABAs 85</td>
<td>NABAs 15</td>
<td>Staff1 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NABAs 76</td>
<td>ABAs 2</td>
<td>ABAs 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Staff 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12 n/a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total number returned and subject to analysis of closed question responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School B</th>
<th>Questionnaires</th>
<th>Individual interviews</th>
<th>Focus groups (total number of participants)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sample subject to analysis of open question responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School C</th>
<th>Questionnaires</th>
<th>Individual interviews</th>
<th>Focus groups (total number of participants)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10. **Control group:** No

11. **Definition of the problem:** Bullying is a major concern for many children and young people, especially growing up in the digital age where cyber bullying is increasingly a serious problem. The most recent Childline report states that online bullying concerns rose by 87% from last year. Bullying threatens children and young people’s safety and well-being; it causes lasting damage to victims’ self-esteem, confidence and mental health.

12. **Use of term bullying or cyber-bullying in questionnaire and definition (if provided):** Researchers and participants involved in the study were all using the definition of bullying as: the repetitive, intentional hurting of one person or group by another person or group, where the relationship involves an imbalance of power.

13. **Measures used:** Open University: Pre and post questionnaires either side of the training, interviews and focus groups with young people and staff who have received our training. Questionnaires, interviews and focus groups with students and staff from the school who haven’t received our training but have access to the Anti-Bullying Ambassador programme in the school.

14. **Interviews**

   Individual interviews were conducted with two students who had received the programme’s training in two of the schools.

   - Individual interviews were conducted with three members of staff in one school and with two members of staff in both the other schools.
   - One focus group was conducted with four students who had received the programme’s training in two schools.
   - Focus groups were conducted with three groups of students who hadn’t received the training in one school and two groups in the two other schools.

15. **Theoretical approach and basis on previous intervention:** Importance of peer to peer education and a whole school approach to effectively tackle bullying and change behavior.

16. **Programme’s Aim**

   The Anti-Bullying Ambassador programme aims to give young people, staff and parents the skills, knowledge and confidence to tackle bullying online and offline in their schools, youth
organisations and communities. The programme focuses on preventing bullying happening in the first place, rather than solely focussing on the after effect of bullying.

The Anti-Bullying Ambassador programme believes that young people are the best agents for change and therefore encourages young people to lead the programme in their schools and communities. By showing young people what bullying behaviour looks like, what the different types of bullying are, and giving them tips to reduce bulling Anti-Bullying Ambassadors go back to their schools and help shape the behaviour of their peers, and the culture of the school as a whole. The Anti-Bullying Ambassadors are supposed to become an integral part of the school’s approach to behaviour and bullying.

17. **Type of analysis** Mixed methods approach
18. **Outcome measures:** Increased knowledge and understanding among staff and students of what bullying is and how to effectively respond to it. Increased confidence of how to effectively tackle bullying in their schools and communities. Increased perception of feeling safe in school and reduced incidents of bullying.

**Open University evaluation** - Questionnaires asked young people about how confident they felt about dealing with issues of bullying, if they knew who to report bullying to in the school, how safe they felt at school, their perception of levels of bullying at their school, the last time they had been bullied/bullied someone else in school, if their school has a child friendly Anti-Bullying Policy. Focus groups and interviews in the two mainstream Secondary schools examined young people and staff’s perceptions of the value of the Anti-Bullying Ambassador programme in mainstream Secondary schools. Focus groups and interviews in the Pupil Referral Unit examined how students in a special school can benefit from the Anti-Bullying Ambassadors programme.

**Training event evaluation** – The evaluation forms given out to students and staff after the training day seek to analyse the impact that the training has had on: their knowledge of the different types of bullying, what they can do if they see bullying happening in school, their confidence to help someone being bullied and their understanding of what they can do in their schools to reduce incidences of bullying.

19. **Duration/ intensity of intervention:** 1 day training day for both staff and students together with ongoing free support after training.

20. **Evaluation:**

**Open University**

The results from the Open University’s focus groups and interviews showed that young people and staff found the training day informative, interactive, engaging and relevant. The training helped young people empathise with those who have been bullied, including helping them to understand how people feel when they have been bullied. It also helped young people understand the severity of bullying and its consequences if it is not dealt with effectively. In turn this helped students to be more aware of their own behaviour towards others.

The data showed that students in the school feel more confident about telling a peer Anti-Bullying Ambassador than a teacher if they are being bullied. Staff also reported that Anti-Bullying Ambassadors provide a role model for other students and help inspire them to make a difference.

Staff highlighted how being an Anti-Bullying Ambassador gave students more confidence, self-esteem and resilience. In the Pupil Referral Unit being an Anti-Bullying Ambassador had helped a number of students to improve their behaviour and have more focus in school. For
those students who had been bullied the Anti-Bullying Ambassador group acted as a support network and helped them to deal with their own personal experiences of bullying.

**Training day evaluation form**

After the training day:
- 99% of students and 100% of staff understand the different types of bullying
- 100% of students and 100% of staff understand what they can do if they are being bullied
- 95% of students and staff understand what they can do to stop bullying in their schools
- 97% of students and 100% of staff said they now feel more confident to help people being bullied
- 95% of students and staff said after the training they were excited to go back their school and make a difference


---

**UK 2B-3: ROOTS OF EMPATHY**

1. **Title of intervention**: Roots of Empathy Programme
2. **Organization who carried out intervention**: Action for Children Scotland and Inspiring Scotland – NGO
3. **Time frame**: In 2010, eight schools (Phase 1) were introduced to ROE and the following year nine schools (Phase 2) were introduced to the programme. The research evaluation of ROE in North Lanarkshire began in August 2011
4. **Program description (in brief narrative format describe aims and procedure)**: Founded in Canada in 1996, Roots of Empathy (ROE) is a classroom based, social and emotional programme. It aims to promote emotional competence and development of empathy in primary school children. The programme is delivered by a trained ROE instructor and consists of nine themes which are delivered across the school year. The baby is central to the delivery of the ROE programme and is considered the ‘teacher’. The instructor guides the class to observe and raise awareness of the baby’s development, the relationship with their parent and subsequent attachment. In order to ensure all areas of the ROE curriculum are covered instructors are required to deliver certain aims within each lesson, which vary in content and quantity. The fidelity of the programme is essential to ROE to ensure that all children receive the maximum benefit from the programme.

In Autumn 2010, Action for Children, one of the UK’s largest charities, became the ‘Lead Agency’ for Roots of Empathy in Scotland and piloted the programme in partnership with North Lanarkshire Council, with funding from Scottish Government’s Community Safety Unit. This was the first time the Roots of Empathy programme was delivered on mainland Britain.

5. **Checklist of program elements**

   - **CLASSROOM**
     x curriculum materials (i.e. use of materials about bullying during classroom lessons.)
   - **TEACHER**
     x information for teachers
     x teacher training (i.e. present or absent)
   - **PARENT**
6. **Age or grade**: Primary (7 – 9 yr olds) 419 children
7. **Sample characteristics**: 17 experimental schools, 19 classes
8. **Informants used**: Children self-reports, teachers, video observations in three schools. Programme fidelity was measured through ROE instructor diaries which recorded how complete aims were for each theme. Additionally, instructors recorded dates for each lesson and their comments on the diaries. ROE class teachers and Head Teachers were also asked for their comments on the programme and the research procedure. Social and emotional programmes which ROE and control schools were participating in throughout the school year were also recorded by class teachers as this may have had an impact on the results.
9. **Sampling of population**: school-based convenience sampling
10. **Control group**: Yes 17 control schools (18 classes) 366 children
11. **Definition of the problem**: Yes, definition provided in report as follows: It is often overlooked that in 85 per cent of school bullying episodes there are onlookers and bystanders (Pepler & Craig, 1995). These witnesses, our children, are being adversely affected. Unlike other programs that address bullying by targeting the victim or bully, Roots of Empathy works universally with the whole class. The program teaches perspective taking skills that enable all students to gain insight into how others feel and develop a sense of social responsibility for each other. In the ROE classroom, children are empowered to challenge cruelty whether it is in the form of bullying or meanness.
12. **Use of term bullying or cyber-bullying in questionnaire and definition (if provided)**: No definition in report
13. **Measures used**: At the beginning and end of the ROE programme in academic session 2011/2012 participants completed various questionnaires to assess a number of areas: Empathy, Prosocial Behaviour, Anger Management/Aggression, Wellbeing and Class Climate. The questionnaires used were: The Thinking & Feeling Questionnaire (Pupil rated); The Altruism Drawing Measure (Pupil rated); Child Anger Management Scale (CAMS) (Pupil rated); The Stirling Wellbeing Scale (Pupil rated); My Class Inventory (Short Form) (MCI-SF) (Pupil & Teacher rated); Strengths & Difficulties Questionnaire (SDQ) (Teacher rated). Pupils also participated in a group task which examined Knowledge of Infant Development and Recognition of Emotions. Class teachers completed questionnaires measuring pupils’ Prosocial Behaviours and Total Difficulties as well as their perception of class climate. Video observations were carried out in three Phase 2 schools of differing deprivation levels. Groups of four pupils were observed five times throughout the ROE programme. Empathic, prosocial and aggressive behaviours were investigated for each child.
14. **Interviews**: No
15. **A. Theoretical approach and basis on previous intervention**: the program was based attachment theory and empathy theories
16. **B. KEY ELEMENTS of program**: classroom based, social and emotional skills programme. **Type of analysis**: Both quantitative and qualitative methods were used: questionnaires (pupil and teacher reported), video observations and group tasks. Analysis of data was conducted by calculating the difference scores which is the difference between pre-test and post-test scores on all questionnaires. T-tests were then used to calculate whether difference between the difference scores of ROE and control pupils were statistically significant.
17. **Outcome measures**:

**Quantitative**

As a result of the ROE Programme there will be:

1. **Empathy (Pupil Self Rated)**
1.1. A significant increase in cognitive empathy in the ROE group compared to the control group

1.2. A significant increase in emotional empathy in the ROE group compared to the control group

1.3. A significant increase in sympathy in the ROE group compared to the control group

2. Prosocial behaviour:

(Pupil Self Rated)

2.1. A significant increase in altruistic tendencies in the ROE group compared to the control group

(Teacher Rated)

2.2. A significant increase in prosocial behaviour in the ROE group compared to the control group

3. Anger management:

(Pupil Self Rated)

3.1. A significant decrease in inhibition in the ROE group compared to the control group

3.2. A significant decrease in dysregulated expression in the ROE group compared to the control group

3.3. A significant increase in emotion regulation in the ROE group compared to the control group

Total difficulties

(Teacher Rated)

3.4. A significant decrease in total difficulties in the ROE group compared to the control group

4. Wellbeing

(Pupil Self Rated)

4.1. A significant increase in positive emotion in the ROE group compared to the control group

4.2. A significant increase in positive outlook in the ROE group compared to the control group

5. Class climate:

(Pupil Self Rated)

5.1. A significant positive impact on the pupils’ perception of classroom climate in the ROE group.

5.2. A significant positive impact on the relationship between the ROE pupils’ pre-test preferred classroom environment score and their post-test actual classroom environment score.
(Teacher Rated)

5.3. A significant positive impact on the teachers’ perception of classroom climate in the ROE group compared to the control teachers.

5.4. A significant positive impact on the relationship between the ROE teachers’ pre-test preferred classroom environment score and their post-test actual classroom environment score compared to the control teachers.

2.2 Qualitative

1. Empathy

In the Phase 2 ROE group will there be an increase in observed empathic behaviours?

2. Prosocial behaviour

In the Phase 2 ROE group will there be an increase in observed prosocial behaviours?

3. Aggression

In the Phase 2 ROE group, will there be a decrease in observed aggressive behaviours?

4. Knowledge of infant development

Will there be an increase in children’s knowledge of infant development (KoID) in the ROE group in comparison to the control group?

5. Recognition of emotion

Will there be an increase in children’s recognition of emotion in the ROE group in comparison to the control group?

18. Duration/intensity of intervention: One academic year

19. Evaluation: Empathy: Overall a positive impact was found for the ROE pupils who increased in Cognitive Empathy (distinction between oneself and another) and Emotional Empathy (feeling with another), as measured by pupil self reports, compared to the control pupils who decreased on these subscales. When Phases were analysed separately significant differences between ROE and control pupils were only found in Phase 2; ROE increased in Cognitive Empathy and Emotional Empathy and Sympathy compared to the control group who decreased on these subscales. Video observations (in Phase 2) also identified an increase in empathic behaviours.

Prosocial behaviour: Overall a positive impact on teacher rated Prosocial Behaviour was found, with the ROE group increasing and the control group decreasing. These findings were also evident when Phases were examined individually.

Anger Management/Aggression: Overall a positive impact was found for ROE pupils who decreased in Inhibition (turning emotion inward), as rated by pupil self report, compared to control pupils who increased. When Phases were analysed separately significant differences between ROE and control were only found in Phase 1, with ROE pupils showing a decrease in Inhibition and Emotion Regulation and control pupils showing an increase in both subscales. Video observations (in Phase 2) identified a decrease in aggressive behaviours. A positive
impact was also found for ROE pupils in Total Difficulties (sum of Emotional Symptoms, Conduct Problems, Hyperactivity and Peer Problems subscales of the SDQ) as rated by teachers. Overall ROE pupils showed a decrease in Total Difficulties compared to control pupils who showed an increase. When analysed separately, only Phase 1 pupils showed a significant difference between ROE and control, with control pupils increasing significantly more in Total Difficulties.

**Knowledge of Infant Development:** Across the three questions asked it was clear ROE pupils had a greater understanding of infant development, particularly around the specific teachings from the ROE lesson aims and outcomes. Differences were also noted in the language used by the ROE group compared to the control group which highlighted a greater understanding of knowledge of infant development.

**Recognition of Emotions:** Across the two questions asked it was clear ROE pupils had a greater understanding of recognition of emotions particularly around the specific teachings from the ROE lesson aims and outcomes. Differences were also noted in the language used by the ROE group compared to the control group which highlighted a greater understanding of recognition of emotions.


---

**UK- 2B-4: ALL TOGETHER NOW!**

1. **Title of intervention:** All together now!
2. **Organization who carried out intervention:** Save the Children NI
3. **Time frame:** 3 years 2006 - 2009
4. **Program description (in brief narrative format describe aims and procedure)**

The ABC (Anti-Bullying Consortium.) Project set out to show how changes in anti-bullying culture can be successfully implemented and monitored within schools. The project aimed to move beyond the creation of an anti-bullying policy, to consider how policy is updated using learning and experience of dealing with bullying on an ongoing basis. The project saw the schools anti-bullying policy as a live document, something that could and should change as the school community learned how to reduce bullying behaviour and increase pupils’ confidence. The project partners, Save the Children (SC) and the Belfast Education and Library Board (BELB), worked with five primary schools using a whole school approach to tackling bullying behaviours. The project partners provided support for schools to develop ways of enabling pupils to participate fully within their school community, by contributing to the decisions that affect them. They also encouraged parents and staff to contribute with the intention of increasing communication and feedback in order to reduce bullying behaviour.

The project aimed to:

- Improve policy and practice in primary schools
- Improve children’s learning and educational experience
- Promote participation
5. **Checklist of program elements** (based on the Campbell Systematic Reviews by Farrington & Ttofi, 2009): check as relevant to program implementation

**PEER**
- work with peers (i.e. formal engagement of peers in tackling bullying: peer mediation and peer mentoring.)

**CLASSROOM**
- classroom rules (i.e. use of rules against bullying that students were expected to follow.)
- curriculum materials (i.e. use of materials about bullying during classroom lessons.)
- classroom management (i.e. emphasis on classroom management techniques in detecting and dealing with bullying behavior.)

**OTHER CONTEXT**
- improved playground supervision (i.e. Some anti-bullying programs aimed to identify ‘hot-spots’ or ‘hot-times’ of bullying (mostly during playtime or lunchtime) and provided improved playground supervision of children.)

**TEACHER**
- information for teachers
- cooperative group work (i.e. cooperation among different professionals -- usually among teachers and some other professional groups, in working with bullies and victims of bullying.)

**SCHOOL**
- whole-school anti-bullying policy (i.e. presence of a formal anti-bullying policy on behalf of the school.)
- school conferences (i.e. organization of school assemblies during which children were informed about bullying.)
- non-punitive methods (i.e. restorative justice approaches and other non-punitive methods in dealing with children involved in bullying.)

6. **Age or grade**: Primary
7. **Sample characteristics** Five schools were selected from the Belfast area. The schools were selected on the level of economic disadvantage of the children attending i.e. poorest 10% and/or the numbers of children from minority ethnic backgrounds. None of the schools had particular problems with their approach to antibullying, nor had they high levels of reported bullying incidents. The schools were also of varying types – girls, boys, co-ed and from both the controlled and maintained sectors. It was considered that this might highlight interesting comparisons.
8. **Informants used** Children. Survey instruments were developed to facilitate the collection and analysis of information from the pupils involved, audits used for school baseline information.

9. **Sampling of population**: School based sampling

10. **Control group**: No

11. **Definition of the problem**: Bullying is now a high profile concern for all schools, parents and young people. If unchecked, the negative impact of bullying behaviour can severely restrict children and young people’s ability to access and sustain a positive and developmental learning experience. Extensive research demonstrates that well designed bullying prevention programmes can reduce bullying behaviours. There is also evidence that prevention can significantly contribute to developing positive changes in the culture of a school.

12. **Use of term bullying or cyber-bullying in questionnaire and definition** (if provided): Definition not provided

13. **Measures used**: ‘My Life in School’ checklist and The Nowicki-Strickland Internal/External Locus of Control Scale. Minor changes were made to the language; in order to aid the pupils’ understanding of the questions, and a few questions were added to gauge pupils’ opinion on their participation within their school community.

14. **Interviews**: No


16. **Type of analysis** qualitative evidence from the baseline audits and the quantitative results from the baseline surveys

17. **Outcome measures**: Bullying behaviours and experiences reduced, increased happiness at school, lower aggression, increase self-esteem

18. **Duration/ intensity of intervention**: 3 years

19. **Evaluation**: all schools were successful in:

   - The development of their anti-bullying policy
   - The revision of their management strategies in relation to their playgrounds and playtimes
   - The introduction of school/class councils
   - The use of peer mediation

Whole school approach in developing policies, training and support strategies lead to reduction in bullying experiences; increased levels of happiness at school; reduction in bullying behaviour; reduction in aggressive behaviour, increase in self esteem

The pupils’ responses to the questionnaires provided snapshots of their lives in school. The results from Years 1 and 2 of the study show a 35% reduction in bullying behaviour among pupils in years 1 – 3 (falling from 20% in the baseline analysis to 13% in the Year 2 analysis) and a reduction of 29% in bullying behaviour among pupils in years 4 - 7 (dropping from 17% in the baseline analysis to 12% in the Year 2 analysis). These results support the supposition that increasing participation and developing a whole-school approach can reduce the prevalence of bullying behaviour in schools.


---

**UK 2B – 5: KIVA**

1. **Title of intervention**: KiVa

2. **Organization who carried out intervention**: Bangor University Wales
3. **Time frame**: 2012/13

4. **Program description (in brief narrative format describe aims and procedure)**

KiVa is an acronym for “Kiusaamista Vastaan” (against bullying) and kiva is also a Finnish adjective for nice (Salmivalli, 2010). The programme is based on robust research that shows how the responses of bystanders maintain or decrease bullying behaviour (Salmivalli, Lagerspetz, Bjorkqvist et al., 1996). It aims to affect norms and skills, behaviour, attitudes, and the classroom and school climate. The programme has universal actions, at both class and school level, and indicated actions, to address confirmed cases of bullying. Fourteen Welsh schools from across North and South Wales and three Cheshire schools were recruited and trained for delivery in the 2012/3 school year. The programme was delivered to mainstream Primary School pupils in Years 5 (age 9-10 years) and/or Year 6 (age 10-11 years) pupils.

5. **Checklist of program elements** (based on the Campbell Systematic Reviews by Farrington & Ttofi, 2009): check as relevant to program implementation

   **CHILD**
   - x work with bullies (i.e. individualized work, not offered at the classroom level, with children involved in bullying.)
   - x work with victims (i.e. individualized work, not offered at the classroom level, with children involved in bullying.)

   **PEER**
   - x work with peers (i.e. formal engagement of peers in tackling bullying: peer mediation and peer mentoring.)

   **CLASSROOM**
   - x classroom rules (i.e. use of rules against bullying that students were expected to follow.)
   - x curriculum materials (i.e. use of materials about bullying during classroom lessons.)
   - x classroom management (i.e. emphasis on classroom management techniques in detecting and dealing with bullying behavior.)

   **OTHER CONTEXT**
   - x improved playground supervision (i.e. Some anti-bullying programs aimed to identify ‘hot-spots’ or ‘hot-times’ of bullying (mostly during playtime or lunchtime) and provided improved playground supervision of children.)

   **TEACHER**
   - x information for teachers
   - x cooperative group work (i.e. cooperation among different professionals -- usually among teachers and some other professional groups, in working with bullies and victims of bullying.)
   - x teacher training (i.e. present or absent)

   **PARENT**
   - x information for parents
x parent training/meetings (i.e. organization on behalf of the school of ‘information nights/educational presentations’ for parents and/or ‘teacher-parent meetings’ during which parents were given information about the anti-bullying initiative in the school.)

x non-punitive methods (i.e. restorative justice approaches and other non-punitive methods in dealing with children involved in bullying.)

6. **Age or grade:** 9 – 11 yrs
7. **Sample characteristics** 748 students
8. **Informants used:** Children self-reports and teacher reports
9. **Sampling of population:** school-based convenience processed 201 through Bangor university
10. **Control group:** No
11. **Definition of the problem:** Yes, definition provided in report as follows: A recent review of 44 anti-bullying programs reported that the involvement of parents significantly reduced both bullying and victimization. It concluded: “New anti-bullying initiatives should go beyond the scope of the school and target wider systemic factors such as the family... [E]fforts should be made to sensitize parents about the issue of school bullying through educational presentations and teacher–parent meetings.” One intervention singled out for praise in this review was KiVa, an evidence-based Finnish program targeting children aged 7–15.
12. **Use of term bullying or cyber-bullying in questionnaire and definition** “It is bullying when one or more children deliberately and repeatedly make another child feel bad. The bully usually has power over the victim and the victim of bullying is usually unable to defend himself or herself against the bully. A child is being bullied when one or more children say mean or unkind things about him or her, or make fun of him or her, or call him or her mean and unkind names, completely ignore him or her, leave him or her out of their group of friends, or leave him or her outside on purpose, hit, kick, push or order him or her around or, for example, lock him or her in a room try to make other children dislike him or her by spreading lies about him or her, or by sending mean notes or doing other unkind things other than the ones mentioned above. Also, it is bullying when a child is teased repeatedly in a mean and unkind way. Friendly and playful teasing is not bullying. It is also not bullying when children willingly argue or fight.”
13. **Measures used:** The pupil measure was the annual KiVa online pupil survey that record whether pupils self identify as victims, non-victims, bullies or non-bullies. Versions of this questionnaire have been used by hundreds of researchers world-wide, including in some large scale studies (Curry et al., 2012). In addition to the child survey teachers completed questionnaires on their experience of delivering the programme. Schools participated in both pre- and post-test measurements
14. **Interviews:** None
15. **Theoretical approach and basis on previous intervention** KiVa is a research-based antibullying program that has been developed in the University of Turku
16. **Type of analysis** Quantitive
17. **Outcome measures:** self reported victimization, self reported bully
18. **Duration/ intensity of intervention:** 1 year
19. **Evaluation:** The pre-test percentage of self-reported victimisation was 16 per cent and for bullying was six per cent. At post-test mean victimisation decreased to nine per-cent, and bullying to two per-cent, a six per-cent reduction in victimisation and four per-cent reduction in bullying. Follow-up of the KiVa pilot schools into their second year of receiving the programme has shown that the reductions in bullying reported by year five children at the end of year five have been maintained at the end of year six.
20. 20. Full reference and URL of intervention: [http://www.kivaprogram.net/wales](http://www.kivaprogram.net/wales)
### TABLE 2B. SUMMATIVE TABLE OF ANTI-BULLYING PROGRAMS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study number</th>
<th>Program name/title of intervention</th>
<th>Year of program implementation (an duration-time frame)</th>
<th>Brief Description of program</th>
<th>Informants (children, teachers, parents)</th>
<th>Theoretical approach/Program based on existing program</th>
<th>KEY ELEMENTS</th>
<th>Outcome measures (what was targeted/measured)</th>
<th>Evaluation Of program</th>
<th>EFFICACY Overall (yes/no)</th>
<th>url or reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UK 2B-2</td>
<td>Anti Bullying Ambassadors Award - England</td>
<td>3 years 2011-2015</td>
<td>Young people, staff and parents given the skills through training and support to enable peer support champions or</td>
<td>Young people self select to become ambassadors</td>
<td>Training for children, staff &amp; parents</td>
<td></td>
<td>Confidence Knowledge of bullying behaviour and what to do when it happens Safety in school Celebration of difference</td>
<td>Increase in understanding among young people of what bullying is and the impact it has on people. Increased confidence among staff and young people on how to tackle</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td><a href="http://diana-award.org.uk/programme/anti-bullying">http://diana-award.org.uk/programme/anti-bullying</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK</td>
<td>2B - 3</td>
<td>Ambassadors</td>
<td>2010/11/12</td>
<td>Development of empathy in children</td>
<td>Attachment theory/empathy building approach</td>
<td>Year long intervention in classroom</td>
<td>Bullying in their school.</td>
<td>Increase in confidence in dealing with incidence of bullying, feeling safe in school, how to report, child centeredness of school anti bullying policy Increase in empathy and understanding of impact of behaviour.</td>
<td>Y Robust evaluation using a variety of methods</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK</td>
<td>2B - 4</td>
<td>All Together Now - NI</td>
<td>2006 - 2009</td>
<td>Whole school approach starting with policy and moving on to various implementation strategies</td>
<td>School based</td>
<td>Step approach starting with the ethos of the school and moving on to implementing peer strategies and engaging with the ‘bystander’</td>
<td>Reduction in incidence and increase in self esteem, happiness in school. Looks at the day in the life of the child at school</td>
<td>Y Robust evaluation showing marked improvements and results.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uk</td>
<td>2B - 5</td>
<td>KiVa - Wales</td>
<td>2012/13</td>
<td>Adaption of a Finnish</td>
<td>KiVa is a research-based</td>
<td>Through the class lessons, the programme promotes social skills,</td>
<td>Victimization and bullying</td>
<td>Reduction in self reported</td>
<td>Y Evaluation using</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

http://www.actionforchildren.org.uk/our-services/for-professionals/roots-of-empathy


http://www.ki-vaprogramme.org.uk/
| model to reduce bullying | adopting Organisational and individual incident approaches | antibullying program that has been developed in the University of Turku | such as making friends and supporting and protecting children from victimization. This increases pupil empathy for their bullied peers (Pelegrini, 2002) providing them with the foundations for friendships, conflict resolutions and social responsibility. The programme includes detailed actions to be undertaken by a KiVa team and the class teacher when a bullying incident is identified | victimization and bully | questionnaires by Bangor university | am.net/wales |
2C SYNTHESIS OF EVALUATIONS

Provide a summative paragraph on all interventions conducted locally: i.e. In Greece 5 prevention programs and 8 intervention protocols have been realized in the last 10 years. Results show that 5 of the programs were efficacious in ... while

Draw conclusions of program elements/characteristics that were shown to be efficacious and elements that were not, in the specific country. Draw conclusions on existing programs and suggestions on elements that could be used in future programs, linking these to local contextual needs and conditions.

We want the synthesis to answer the question: what made these local programs efficacious/what did not, and what should future local initiatives include/exclude?

The above are five examples of successful initiatives in the UK. The four regions – Scotland, Northern Ireland, wales and England, all have different cultures and difficulties. However, across all four those schemes that have successful outcomes for children have similar themes that transcend this cultural difference. These programmes had a focus on the bystander, culture and building up resilience within the victim, whether through group/classroom based activities or the development of empathy. (There are others not included in the data collated for example Childnet Let’s fight it together, and Ceop Exposed, which both used videos as a way of triggering discussion but evaluation found them to have a short term impact on behavior).

Focus on the development of a culture of support and reporting, from this evaluation, are the most effective. Where schools have an active prevention programme, clear policy and culture of supporting the victim, developing empathy within classrooms, supporting students to be peer mentors, engaging with parents the outcomes are very positive.

Based on this, we would recommend the following for a successful anti-bullying intervention:

- Programmes that are successful engage with children, young people and their support networks at an emotional level. The focus is on changing both behavior and the individual responses to situations by developing emotional intelligence and empathy.
- They are not one off ‘quick fixes’ but rather supported by a whole systems approach, including not just the victim and the protagonist, but the bystanders and a system that enables or does not actively challenge.
- Whole school interventions rather than one off sessions have the greatest impact. This involves developing a culture that does not tolerate bullying of any kind all the way through the organization
- Where the intervention is peer-led, this is Peer-led is more successful if all ages and different types of peer groups are represented within the intervention.
- Staff need to be engaged in all programmes and understand both the methodology and research to be in a position to act as champions
- All intervention needs to be fresh, relevant, exciting, interactive and engaging for students parents and staff.
- The intervention needs to provide resources and support for students and staff to help kick-start them with an anti-bullying programme in their schools.
- The parents need to be engaged from the beginning