Standing Committee for the Social Sciences (SCSS)

The Future of Evidence-based Bullying and Violence Prevention in Childhood and Adolescence

Science Position Paper

European Science Foundation (ESF)

The European Science Foundation (ESF) was established in 1974 to provide a common platform for its Member Organisations to advance European research collaboration and explore new directions for research. It is an independent organisation, owned by 67 Member Organisations, which are research funding organisations, research performing organisations and academies from 29 countries. ESF promotes collaboration in research itself, in funding of research and in science policy activities at the European level. Currently ESF is reducing its research programmes while developing new activities to serve the science community, including peer review and evaluation services.

www.esf.org

Science Position Paper

The objective of ESF Science Position Papers is to provide evidence-based foresight and advice on science, research infrastructure and science policy issues of European significance to underpin decisions on strategic directions and priorities. Special attention is paid to promoting Europe's ability to open up new research areas. Published under the responsibility of one or more ESF Standing Committees, they represent a considered opinion of the community represented by the Committee(s) involved.

www.esf.org/social

Authors

The content of this paper was drafted by **Professor Manuel Eisner** (Institute of Criminology, University of Cambridge) and **Professor Tina Malti** (Department of Psychology, University of Toronto)

This Science Position Paper has been prepared under the responsibility of the Standing Committee for the Social Sciences (SCSS):
Chair: **Professor Sir Roderick Floud**
Head of Humanities and Social Sciences Unit:
Dr Nina Kancewicz-Hoffman
Editorial support:
Mr Étienne Franchineau, Junior Science Officer

Cover picture: © iStockphoto

Contents

Foreword

● ● ●

Youth violence is probably one of the most visible forms of violence in society; each day newspapers report on violence at home, in schools or on the streets, involving young people. It is defined by the United Nation as "all forms of physical or mental violence, injury or abuse, neglect or negligent treatment, maltreatment or exploitation, including sexual abuse".[1] According to the World Health Organization, an average of 565 children and young adults die daily; and for every youth homicide there are around 20–40 victims of non-fatal youth violence receiving hospital treatment.[2]

In its 2009 Position Paper entitled *Vital Questions*, the Standing Committee for the Social Sciences expressed concerns about "child poverty, but also about infant mortality, school exclusion, access to training programmes, quality of working life and discrimination" and called for "intersectoral actions [...] to be incorporated in all economic, social and health policies to promote child health, education, healthy environment".[3]

Over the past decade, significant advances have been made in European evidence-based research on the prevention of violence and bullying. However, despite this progress, there is still a great need for action due to the constantly high numbers of children and adolescents involved in bullying and violence. Across Europe, there appears to be an increasing demand for a valid evidence base in order to understand the developmental and contextual factors that contribute to an effective violence and

bullying prevention approach in childhood and adolescence. There are still considerable conceptual, methodological and practical challenges, a gap that is reinforced by rapidly changing social and demographic conditions across Europe.

Youth violence has an important effect on individuals in terms of quality of life but also on the fabric of society. This position paper aims at generating new insights into how to produce rigorous evidence on the effectiveness of violence and bullying prevention practices. This will contribute to enhancing the mental health and social responsibility of young people, and thus help to secure future social integration in times of an increasingly diverse and pluralistic Europe.

Professor Sir Roderick Floud
SCSS Chair

---

1. Art. 19, *Convention on the Rights of the Child*, adopted by General Assembly resolution 44/25 of 20 November 1989
2. *World report on violence and health*, World Health Organization, 2002
3. Cf. ESF SCSS Science Position Paper *Vital Questions – The Contribution of European Social Science*, p. 20 & 25

Executive Summary

Across Europe, there is an increasing demand for good evidence that can inform policies aimed at reducing violence against and among children and adolescents. However, there is still a paucity of high-quality research on the effective prevention of bullying and violence. This position paper outlines nine recommendations for a European research policy that can contribute to achieving a significant reduction in bullying and violence. The recommendations include the following:

1. The research-based evidence for effective and sustainable violence prevention is still narrow in Europe. We therefore recommend a more coherent financial and organisational support for high-quality experimental evaluation research, and the encouragement of collaborative work between academic institutions and practitioners.

2. Progress on the research-led reduction of bullying and violence requires advances in the design of prevention and intervention measures. We therefore recommend support for the development of innovative high-quality and cost-effective programmes across the full range of violence prevention strategies that suit the needs of local and national agencies across Europe.

3. We note a lack of cooperation in the field of violence and bullying prevention between basic research and applied prevention science. We therefore recommend research policies that promote collaborative projects between basic developmental, psychological and biological research on the causes of violence and applied prevention research.

4. Across Europe a large proportion of violence prevention and intervention measures are delivered as embedded practices by established services, but there is an almost complete lack of knowledge about their effectiveness. We therefore recommend more research that uses innovative methodologies to evaluate the effectiveness of embedded prevention and intervention practices and to evaluate the effectiveness of system change as a result of new policies.

5. In the past, research on the developmental prevention of aggression during the life course and on situational violence prevention has mostly been conducted separately. We believe that combining situational and developmental approaches bears great promise. We therefore recommend more evaluations of strategies that combine developmental with situational interventions.

6. There is a distinct lack of knowledge about the extent to which it is desirable and necessary to adapt and tailor prevention strategies to the needs of different risk groups and different cultures. We therefore recommend specific support for studies that compare the effectiveness of different delivery formats or variations in programme contents when delivered to different groups.

7. In many European countries we find a lack of research capacity to conduct high-quality evaluations of violence prevention measures, and a lack of understanding for evaluation research amongst practitioners. We therefore recommend support for training programmes, partly directed at practitioners and policy makers, that facilitate the introduction of evidence-led development and design into education, public health policy, social services or family services.

8. There is a lack of knowledge about which intervention components contribute to the effec-

tiveness of a violence prevention strategy. We therefore believe that further progress requires innovative evaluation designs where researchers improve their capacity to isolate, on the basis of prior findings and theoretical considerations, the most effective elements of an intervention.

9. There is an acute lack of large-scale field trials that assess the long-term effects of violence prevention strategies and that provide policy makers with realistic estimates of effects in real-world conditions. We therefore encourage support for large-scale field trials and for translational research on how evidence-based interventions can be rolled out at a larger scale.

Introduction

● ● ●

Across Europe, there is an increasing demand for good evidence that can inform policies aimed at reducing violence against and among children and adolescents. However, there are wide differences between countries in the extent to which research supports prevention policy. In some countries evidence-based principles have become an important basis for policy implementation. In others, the underlying principles of evidence-based prevention are hardly known among policy makers.

Overall, significant progress has been made. Across northern Europe, in particular, the past ten years have seen policy makers increasingly interested in evidence-based prevention and intervention. In the United Kingdom, for example, the recent *Allen Report on Early Intervention* (Allen 2011) – which makes a strong case for evidence-based early prevention of child maladjustments – demonstrates broad support for research-based strategies to promote children's development. Also, centres such as the *Centre for Evidence-Based Intervention* (Oxford), the *Centre for Evidence-Based Early Intervention* (Bangor), the *National Evaluation of Sure Start* (Birkbeck College) and the *Centre of Experimental Criminology* (Cambridge) are home to internationally recognised prevention research conducted in the United Kingdom. Major foundations such as the *Dartington Foundation* in the United Kingdom, *Atlantic Philanthropies* in Ireland and the *Jacobs Foundation* in Switzerland have also committed significant resources to supporting research on evidence-based prevention. Scandinavian countries, as so often, lead the way. In Sweden, for example, the government has identified the dissemination of evidence-based research knowledge into mainstream services as a major challenge, and the Swedish government now considers evidence-based practice as an essential vehicle for improving the quality of care and services. Finally, there are encouraging signs of increased European cooperation: the *European Crime Prevention Network*, founded in 2001, is committed to identifying and disseminating good practice in crime prevention. Since 2006, the *Stockholm Symposium of Criminology* has brought together policy makers, practitioners and researchers with the goal of finding better ways of reducing violence and crime. And in 2009, almost twenty years after its American sister organisation, the *European Society of Prevention Research* was founded.

Despite undeniable progress and increasing interest amongst governments in understanding how violence prevention can be made more effective, daunting challenges persist. To address some of these the *Institute of Criminology at the University of Cambridge* organised a conference on Evidence-Based Prevention of Bullying and Youth Violence: European Innovations and Experiences on 5 and 6 July 2011. Supported by the *European Science Foundation* and the *Jacobs Foundation*, its purpose was to bring together researchers, policy makers and practitioners to discuss innovative research. The conference also sought to identify areas where progress is essential to provide policy makers with better knowledge about how to support positive child development and reduce the substantial harm resulting from violence and aggression.

1.
What is the Issue?

● ● ●

The perpetuation of bullying and aggression by young people is a widespread problem in Europe. According to the 2005/6 *Health Behaviour of School-Aged Children* survey, which covers almost all countries in Europe, an average of 42% of eleven-year-olds and 35% of fifteen-year-olds reported having been involved in a physical fight at least once during the previous twelve months (Currie *et al.* 2008). Aggressive behaviour can have serious and long-term negative effects on young people's health and emotional well-being. For example, children and adolescents actively involved in bullying and violence are at a significantly greater risk of later problem behaviours such as substance abuse, academic failure, unemployment and criminal convictions (Fergusson, Horwood and Ridder 2005; Loeber and Hay 1997). Data from the Second International Self-Report Delinquency Study (ISRD-2) indicate large variations in self-reported total delinquency across European countries, ranging from 40.1% at the highest end (Ireland), to low prevalence rates in Mediterranean countries (18.7%) (Enzmann *et al.* 2010).

Violence is also an important source of suffering amongst victims. According to the same *Health Behaviour of School-Aged Children* survey, 37% of eleven-year-olds and 27% of fifteen-year-olds reported having been the victim of bullying at least once during the previous couple of months. Experiences of violent victimisation have been found to be associated with a range of negative effects including social withdrawal, academic difficulties, substance use and future anxiety and depressive symptoms (Averdijk *et al.* 2009; Ttofi *et al.* 2011).

Over the past ten years, new forms of coercive and threatening behaviour have emerged while others may have declined. For example, cyberbullying (threatening or hurtful behaviour towards the victim via electronic media) has become a serious problem in line with increasing use of social media and mobile telephones (Perren *et al.* 2012; Slonje and Smith 2008). Also, sexually coercive behaviours among adolescents are emerging as a pressing issue (Averdijk, Mueller-Johnson and Eisner 2011).

Due to the consistently high numbers of children and adolescents involved in bullying and violence, the negative long-term consequences for victims and perpetrators, and the emergence of new manifestations of bullying and violence, the effective prevention of violence should be high on the agenda of European public health and public safety policy makers. High-quality research in the fields of prevention science, psychology, education, criminology, anthropology, sociology and public health could potentially make a significant contribution to achieving the goal of a more productive youth development and reducing problematic behaviours.

Bullying and violence prevention differs, in part, from other public health issues, because it involves the criminal justice system, which is not a typical concern for other public health issues. Importantly, therefore, bullying and violence prevention is not only a health issue, but it is also one of public safety and community concerns. In addition, bullying and violence is most often interpersonal in nature; thus, they point to the significance of children's social development and relationship quality with significant others, such as peers, parents and teachers.

2.
General Principles of Effective Prevention
●●●

What is needed to make the prevention of bullying and youth violence prevention in Europe more effective? Evidence-based prevention must be based on correct identification of the causal risk factors and mechanisms that lead to violence and aggressive behaviour, as well as knowledge about the mechanisms that impede the manifestation of problem behaviours even where risk factors are present (i.e., protective factors). Prevention is likely to be effective if it reduces risk factors and/or builds up protective factors (Coie *et al.* 1993, Beelmann 2011). Recent research, in particular, has shifted away from the more traditional concern with risk factors to paying more attention to protective factors, and how a better understanding of protective factors can help to build resilience and inform prevention policy (Lösel and Farrington 2012; Malti and Noam 2012; Pardini *et al.* 2012; Rutter 2012). Table 1 gives examples for risk and protective factors at the level of the individual, family, school and neighbourhood/society at large.

There is now widespread agreement amongst prevention specialists about the general principles that underlie effective prevention of aggression, bullying, and violence across the life course. These principles

Table 1: Examples of risk and protective factors underlying bullying and violence

	Risk factor	Protective factor
Individual	• perinatal complications • impulsivity • restlessness and irritability • low empathy • social-cognitive biases • low academic achievement • antisocial beliefs • alcohol and other drug use	• positive mood • low irritability • emotion regulation skills • self-efficacy • high academic achievement • social competencies
Parents and family	• child abuse and neglect • poor parental monitoring • erratic parenting • partner conflict and separation • parental and sibling antisocial behaviour	• parental support • secure attachment and bonding • intensive supervision • parental disapproval of antisocial behaviour
School and peers	• truancy • poor teacher-child bond • high school disorder • association with delinquent peers • negative school climate	• positive teacher-child bonds • academic motivation and success • high school-level discipline and clear rules • non-deviant best friends • involvement in structured prosocial activities • mentors and positive role models
Neighbourhood and society	• social inequality and deprivation • discrimination and racism Islamophobia	• high social cohesion and trust • community involvement and access to social support

See Lösel and Farrington (2012) for a more extensive discussion.

include (Allen 2011; Eisner, Ribeaud and Locher, 2009; Krug *et al.* 2002; World Health Organization 2010):

1. The need to start prevention during the first years of life by reducing risk factors and promoting protective factors during a time when humans have a high degree of plasticity ("start early in life").

2. The need to have developmentally adequate prevention strategies in place across the whole life course from conception to adulthood ("developmentally adequate provision across the life course").

3. The principle of embedding violence prevention into a general public health strategy that aims at reducing a range of negative outcomes including school dropout, teen pregnancy, substance abuse, delinquency and violence, unhealthy eating and physical inactivity. These behaviours share many risk factors and should hence be considered as elements of a larger prevention strategy ("a public health perspective").

4. The combining of universal, indicated and selective prevention so that the largest resources reach the children and adolescents with the greatest needs ("adapt intervention intensity to risk exposure").

5. The consideration of a socio-ecological model that recognises the interplay influences at the levels of the individual, the family, the school, peers and leisure-time activities, the neighbourhood and the wider social, cultural and political context ("an ecological perspective of multi-layered prevention").

6. An approach that integrates policy making and research by using high-quality basic research to guide innovation in prevention programmes and strategies, by rigorously testing prevention strategies in methodologically sound outcome evaluations, and by working with governments and policy makers to achieve real-world effects ("an evidence-based approach to policy change").

We believe that governments could achieve noticeable population-wide reductions in bullying and aggressive behaviour by adopting an evidence-based prevention and intervention policy (Cartwright and Hardie 2012). This requires close cooperation between local and national governments and prevention researchers. Currently, many European countries do not have the requisite research capacity or the evidence base to provide effective support in their societies. In the following postulates, we propose nine domains where research is needed to contribute to more effective violence prevention.

3.
Nine Recommendations for Future Priorities

● ● ●

3.1 Expanding the Evidence Base

A move towards more effective prevention of aggression and violence requires efforts to expand the scientific evidence on what works (Sherman *et al.* 2002). The creation of a better evidence base entails a staged process that includes small-scale efficacy trials of innovations or adaptations, effectiveness trials of the most promising approaches, and large-scale field trials of programmes that are planned to be taken to scale. Despite progress over the past twenty years the current knowledge base is generally still thin in Europe (Lösel and Beelmann 2003). Also, significant differences remain between European countries in the amount of research done.

Future Research Recommendations

More and better evaluation research into bullying and violence intervention is needed in order to create the knowledge basis required for achieving a major population-level reduction in youth violence. This demands a more coherent financial and organisational support for high-quality experimental research and the encouragement of collaborative work between academic institutions and practitioners. Also, systematic reviews for different types of preventive interventions suggest that more knowledge has been accumulated in respect of short-term effects and effects found in relatively small efficacy trials (Lösel and Beelmann 2003; Ttofi and Farrington 2011). In contrast, there are several areas where the lack of studies is particularly acute. In particular, these include field trials that examine whether violence prevention programmes work under real-life conditions and studies that examine long-term effects over months or even years (but see Little *et al.* 2012; Salmivalli and Poskiparta 2012).

3.2 Promoting Innovation in Programme Development

Progress in effective prevention depends on the development of interventions that reflect advances in research. Over the past two decades many impulses for evidence-based prevention strategies – such as parent training programmes, early support for at-risk mothers, and school-based social skills programmes – have come to Europe from elsewhere. As a result, many evaluations conducted have examined whether existing products can be transferred into the European context (e.g., Hutchings 2012). In contrast, few innovations in research-based prevention have been initiated in Europe (but see Kärnä *et al.* 2011; Lösel and Stemmler 2012, Menesini, Nocentini and Palladino 2012; Ortega-Ruiz, Del Rey and Casas 2012).

Future Research Recommendations

Testing the transportability of interventions will remain important in the future. However, we believe that there is much potential in Europe for developing new practices and programmes that have a better fit to the structure of social services, education or cultural expectations of European societies. In particular, there is considerable scope for innovative high-quality and cost-effective programmes across the full range of prevention strategies that suit the needs of local and national agencies across Europe. Specific funding should support collaborations between researchers, private partners and service providers to develop innovative and research-based interventions for individuals, schools, families and neighbourhoods. These interventions should be tailored to meet the needs of different systems of services, specific target groups, diverse group of

children, with diverse manifestations of aggression and violence (Forster, Kling and Sundell 2012; Perren *et al.* 2012).

3.3 A Better Link between Basic and Applied Research

Preventive interventions are more likely to be effective if they are based on empirically validated models of the causation of violence. There is therefore an important link between basic research on the causes of youth violence and the development of more effective interventions (see Stokes 1997). Too many preventive programmes in Europe are still implemented with little basis in developmental research. This increases the risk that significant resources will be invested in ineffective programmes.

Future Research Recommendations

We believe that improved collaboration between basic research and applied prevention research will produce a better knowledge base for effective youth violence prevention. Examples where this potential is particularly clear include the preventive implications of the link between developmental neuroscience and aggression (Bradshaw *et al.* 2012; Séguin *et al.* 2004), the implications of research on social networks for group-based prevention (Salmivalli, Huttunen and Lagerspetz 1997), the lessons for violence prevention to be learned from research on moral development (Malti and Krettenauer 2012), or the ways in which research on judgement and decision making can inform prevention strategies (Nagin 2007; Wikström *et al.* 2012). Specifically, interdisciplinary studies that combine quantitative and qualitative information, that utilise information from different sources (such as parents, peers and teachers) and methods (such as questionnaires, interviews, behavioural observations, physiological information) and employ rigorous sampling and design techniques, such as representative longitudinal samples, will help to move the field of evidence-based bullying and violence prevention research forward.

3.4 Evaluation of Embedded Practices and System Change

Much prevention research has examined the effects of standardised programmes that are added to an existing system. However, social services and education systems comprise many activities with a preventative purpose (Little 2010). For example, if a pupil shows disruptive behaviour in a class-room, teachers, head teachers and social workers may intervene in various ways. However, we lack knowledge about the effectiveness of these interventions, and how they can be improved. Also, many evaluations test commercially distributed products. Yet local and national authorities often deliver services that are similar in purpose and structure (e.g., support for young mothers, parenting advice, anti-bullying programmes, social competencies in school curricula). Little is currently known about the effectiveness of practices embedded in mainstream services. But some findings suggest that interventions delivered as part of mainstream services may sometimes be as effective as new products (de Graaf *et al.* 2008). Finally, most policy changes in education, social welfare, family policy and policing and youth justice are implemented without any consideration of their effectiveness, and very few studies have attempted to assess whether new policies achieve their goals.

Future Research Recommendations

A better understanding of how whole systems can be made more effective could have considerable benefits for youth violence reduction (Little 2010). However, good research on this question requires that prevention science partly move beyond classical randomised controlled experiments and broaden its methodological scope. Also, we believe that substantial progress could be made by building evaluation components into the process of policy change (Cartwright and Hardie 2012). For example, Spiel, Wagner and Strohmeier (2012) present a research-led violence prevention strategy for Austria that incorporated evaluation components during the roll-out phase.

3.5 Integrate Situational and Developmental Approaches to Violence Prevention

Researchers often distinguish between *developmental* approaches that try to influence the propensity to engage in violent acts over the life course (i.e., change the person and his or her social, emotional, cognitive and moral development; see Tremblay and Craig 1995) and *situational* approaches that try to influence the likelihood of a violent act happening. Situational approaches include CCTV cameras in public spaces, targeted police patrols in crime and violence hot-spots, firearm controls, school surveillance in corridors, strengthening peer interventions against bullying, surveillance mechanisms on the internet, and alcohol sales policies (Clarke 1995).

For historic reasons, situational and developmental approaches to violence prevention have been seen as opposites rather than as complementary strategies.

Future Research Recommendations
We believe that the most promising approach to violence prevention combines developmental and situational interventions. However, evaluation research that addresses both components has been rare, both in Europe and internationally. Strategic support for innovative research that combines situational and developmental components is likely to yield highly interesting findings with a direct impact on policy making across areas such as policing, urban planning, social and family policies and education. For example, rigorous evaluations of programmes that combine intervention techniques that target change of children's individual social-emotional development and problem behaviour with strategies that aim at creating social change, such as reducing poverty, crime in peer groups, etc., are warranted.

3.6 Developing and Testing Tailored Prevention Strategies

Many risk and protective factors are similar for different types of aggression and violence. Also, most risk factors are relevant in different cultures and societies rather than being specific to any particular society. This suggests that an effective prevention strategy should be based on similar principles across all of Europe and that it should target a broad range of problem behaviours rather than being highly specific.

However, there is controversy about the extent to which delivery format, recruitment and framing need cultural adaptation. For example, some evidence suggests that regular parent training programmes may be less effective for single parents than for two-parent families (Gardner *et al.* 2009). Also, children and adolescents differ in the extent to which they are exposed to specific risk factors, and different combinations of environmental and individual risks may require different approaches. For example, the approach required for socially isolated adolescents with concurrent attention deficits and academic difficulties may differ from the approach required for more dominant, sociable and academically successful bullies.

Future Research Recommendations
Future research should examine how prevention programmes can be tailored to the specific needs of

different risk groups or different types of aggression (Malti and Noam 2009). There is currently limited knowledge about the extent to which the tailoring of prevention strategies to specific needs increases their effectiveness and to which extent such tailoring would be practically desirable.

3.7 Improving Quality Standards in Prevention Evaluation Research

Reviews of violence prevention research suggest much variation in the methodological quality of outcome evaluations. While some studies meet high methodological standards, the methodological limitations of many make it difficult to draw firm conclusions about genuine treatment effects (Eisner 2009). Such limitations include poor overall study design, low validity of core outcome measures, limited or no measures of the implementation process, and insufficient reporting of study characteristics and analytic approaches.

There is significant scope for improving the quality standards of outcome evaluations conducted in Europe. Better-quality studies would provide more valid and generalisable information for policy makers and practitioners on what works and what does not. For example, the study by Forster *et al.* (2012) shows the importance of developing uniform standards for assessing the clinical relevance of treatment effects when different studies are compared. Other measures for improving methodological standards include compulsory registration of all outcome evaluations (de Angelis *et al.* 2004), guidelines on the design and reporting of outcome studies, training in evaluation design, and greater transparency concerning potential conflicts of interest (Farrington 2003). Where there is likely to be a conflict of interest between the role of evaluator and of programme provider, funding agencies should request an independent review of the study design and the data analyses.

Future Research Recommendations
Progress in evidence-based prevention is often hampered by obstacles to cooperation between researchers, intervention providers and local stakeholders. Introducing evidence-led development and design into education, public health policy, social services or family services requires that policy makers and practitioners have a good understanding of the principles of evaluation research.

3.8 Improving Knowledge of Mechanisms and Active Components

Despite some success in identifying effective programmes, we still have a very limited understanding of the *causal mechanisms* that make them work. Also, we know little about the active components that render a preventive intervention effective. A better understanding of the active components of preventive interventions is essential for further progress. Only if we understand the principles of *why* some interventions work can we make progress in designing the next generation of prevention approaches.

Progress on these issues has been difficult. The most frequent approach is to conduct analyses of mediators (mechanisms transporting the causal effect from the intervention to the outcome) and moderators (factors that are associated with variation in the achieved effect). For example, Malti, Ribeaud and Eisner (2012) examined whether a school-based intervention was more or less effective for children with different socio-economic backgrounds. At the level of meta-analyses the study by Hahn Fox, Ttofi and Farrington (2012) presents important results on the factors that influence the effectiveness of anti-bullying programmes. It shows, amongst others, that bullying prevention programmes tend to be more effective if they are more intensive and if they include a parent training component.

Future Research Recommendations

We believe that further progress requires a new and innovative type of evaluation research. Rather than randomly allocating participants to whole packages of interventions ('programmes') researchers will need to improve their capacity to isolate, on the basis of prior findings and theoretical considerations, promising elements of an intervention whose effects can then be examined. To the extent that innovative research could identify the active building blocks of prevention activities, it could help to progressively tailor more effective interventions.

3.9 Up-scaling and Mainstreaming

While a lot has been learned about how prevention approaches can be made to work in efficacy trials, much less is known about how programmes can be taken to scale without losing their effectiveness. Comparatively often, findings suggest that even evidence-based programmes fail to produce any desirable effects in large field trials (Goossens *et al.* 2012; Little *et al.* 2012). We also know little about how evidence-based programmes can be taken to scale and embedded into mainstream services (see Spiel *et al.* 2012). More studies are therefore necessary to examine intervention effects in large-scale field trials, preferably with follow-up measures over several years. Also, more *translational research* on programmes and policies that can effectively be inserted into mainstream services is necessary (Woolf 2008).

Future Research Recommendations

We therefore believe that more well-designed, large-scale field trials that assess long-term effects are necessary (Farrington and Welsh 2007). The trials can provide policy makers with realistic estimates of effects that are replicable at the level of whole populations. Often, such evaluations should be conducted as independent evaluations, in which the role of the evaluators and programme developers are institutionally separated. Large-scale dissemination trials are costly and it is essential that they are carefully planned and adequately resourced, and that their findings are effectively communicated amongst researchers and policy makers in Europe. Also, more *translational research* on programmes and policies that can effectively be inserted into mainstream services is necessary (Woolf 2008).

Conclusion

●●●

Shaping the socio-political and mental health discourse on children and youth in advanced European industrial society at the beginning of the 21st century embraces the understanding of responsible and healthy young generations. Civic responsibility and positive mental health outcomes are major assets for competing in a globalised environment and for securing democratic values. The recommended course of action will provide much-needed evidence of conditions that enhance positive development and impede bullying and violence in young people. This evidence is needed to effectively promote the conditions linked to favourable outcomes and alter the conditions linked to violence and bullying. It is also desired to integrate existing approaches into policies that aim at promoting young people's social, moral and emotional competencies, and fostering successful educational careers.

References

Allen, G. (2011) *Early Intervention: The Next Steps (An Independent Report to Her Majesty's Government)*. London: HM Government.

Averdijk, M., Mueller-Johnson, K. and Eisner, M. (2011) *Sexual Victimisation of Children and Adolescents in Switzerland*. Zurich: Optimus Foundation.

Averdijk, M., Müller, B., Eisner, M. and Ribeaud, D. (2009) Bullying Victimization and Later Anxiety and Depression among Pre-Adolescents in Switzerland. *Journal of Aggression, Conflict and Peace Research* 3 (2): 103–109.

Beelmann, A. (2011) The Scientific Foundation of Prevention. The Status Quo and Future Challenges for Developmental Crime Prevention. In: *Antisocial Behavior and Crime: Developmental and Evaluation Research to Prevention and Intervention*, T. Bliesener, A. Beelmann and M. Stemmler (Eds), 137–64. Cambridge, MA: Hogrefe.

Bradshaw, C.P., Goldweber, A., Fishbein, D. and Greenberg, M.T. (2012) Infusing Developmental Neuroscience into School-Based Preventive Interventions: Implications and Future Directions. *Journal of Adolescent Health* 51(2): 41–S47.

Cartwright, N. and Hardie, J. (2012) *Evidence-based Policy*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Clarke, R.V. (1995) Situational Crime Prevention. *Crime and Justice* 19: 91–150.

Coie, J.D., Watt, N.F., West, S.G., Hawkins, J.D., Asarnow, J.R., Markman, H.J., Ramey, S.L., Shure, M.B. and Long, B. (1993) The Science of Prevention. A Conceptual Framework and Some Directions for a National Research Program. *American Psychologist* 48 (10): 1013–22.

Currie, C., Gabhainn, S.N., Godeau, E., Roberts, C., Smith, R., Currie, D., Picket, W., Richter, M., Morgan, A. and Bernekow, V. (Eds) (2008) *Inequalities in Young People's Health: HBSC International Report from the 2005/06 Survey*. Copenhagen: WHO Regional Office for Europe.

De Angelis, C., Drazen, J.M., Frizelle, F.A., Haug, C., Hoey, J., Horton, R., . . . Weyden, M.B.V.D. (2004) Clinical Trial Registration: A Statement from the International Committee of Medical Journal Editors. *New England Journal of Medicine, 351*(12), 1250-1251.

de Graaf, I., Speetjens, P., Smit, F., de Wolff, M. and Tavecchio, L. (2008) Effectiveness of the Triple P Positive Parenting Program on Behavioral Problems in Children: A Meta-Analysis. *Behavior Modification* 32 (5): 714–35.

Eisner, M., Ribeaud, D. and Locher, R. (2009) *Prävention von Jugendgewalt* (report for the Swiss Ministry of Social Affairs). Berne: Bundesamt für Sozialversicherung.

Eisner, M. (2009) No Effects in Independent Prevention Trials: Can We Reject the Cynical View? *Journal of Experimental Criminology* 5 (2): 163–83.

Enzmann, D., Haen Marshall, I., Killias, M., Junger-Tas, J., Steketee, M. and Gruszcynka, B. (2010) Self-reported Youth Delinquency in Europe and beyond: First results of the Second International Self-Report Delinquency Study in the context of police and victimization data. *European Journal of Criminology, 7*(2), 159-183.

Farrington, D. P. (2003) Methodological Quality Standards for Evaluation Research. *The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, 587*(1), 49-68.

Farrington, D.P. and Welsh, B.C. (2007) *Saving Children from a Life of Crime; Early Risk Factors and Effective Interventions*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Fergusson, D.M., Horwood, L.J. and Ridder, E.L. (2005) Show Me the Child at Seven: The Consequences of Conduct Problems in Childhood for Psychosocial Functioning in Adulthood. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry* 46 (8): 837–49.

Forster, M., Kling, Å. and Sundell, K. (2012) Clinical Significance of Parent Training for Children with Conduct Problems. *International Journal of Conflict and Violence* 6 (2): 187-200.

Gardner, F., Connell, A., Trentacosta, C.J., Shaw, D.S., Dishion, T.J. and Wilson, M.N. (2009) Moderators of Outcome in a Brief Family-Centered Intervention for Preventing Early Problem Behavior. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology* 77 (3): 543–53.

Goossens, F.X., Gooren, E.M.J.C., Orobio de Castro, B., Van Overveld, K.W., Buijs, G.J., Monshouwer, K., Onrust, S.A. and Paulussen, T.G.W.M. (2012) Implementation of PATHS Through Dutch Municipal Health Services:

References

A Quasi Experiment. *International Journal of Conflict and Violence* 6 (2): 234-48.

Hahn Fox, B., Ttofi, M. and Farrington, D.P. (2012) Successful Bullying Prevention Programs: Influence of Research Design, Implementation Features, and Program Components. *International Journal of Conflict and Violence* 6 (2): 273-282.

Hutchings, J. (2012) Introducing, Researching, and Disseminating the Incredible Years Programmes in Wales. *International Journal of Conflict and Violence* 6 (2): 252-233.

Kärnä, A., Voeten, M., Little, T.D., Poskiparta, E., Kaljonen, A. and Salmivalli, C. (2011) A Large-Scale Evaluation of the KiVa Antibullying Program: Grades 4–6. *Child Development* 82 (1): 311-30.

Krug, E.G., Dahlberg, L.L., Mercy, J.A., Zwi, A.B. and Lozano, R. (2002) *World Report on Violence and Health*. Geneva: World Health Organization.

Little, M. (2010) *Improving Children's Outcomes Depends on Systemising Evidence-based Practice...* London: Demos.

Little, M., Berry, V., Morpeth, L., Blower, S., Axford, N., Taylor, R., Bywater, T., Lehtonen, M. and Tobin, K. (2012) The Impact of Three Evidence-Based Programmes Delivered in Public Systems in Birmingham, UK. *International Journal of Conflict and Violence* 6 (2):260-272.

Loeber, R. and Hay, D. (1997) Key Issues in the Development of Aggression and Violence from Childhood to Early Adulthood. *Annual Review of Psychology* 48: 371-410.

Lösel, F. and Beelmann, A. (2003) Effects of Child Skills Training in Preventing Antisocial Behavior: A Systematic Review of Randomized Evaluations. *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 587 (1):84-109.

Lösel, F. and Farrington, D.P. (2012) Direct Protective and Buffering Protective Factors in the Development of Youth Violence. *American Journal of Preventive Medicine* 43 (2): 8-23.

Lösel, F. and Stemmler, M. (2012) Preventing Child Behavior Problems in the Erlangen-Nuremberg Development and Prevention Study: Results from Preschool to Secondary School Age. *International Journal of Conflict and Violence* 6(2): 214-224.

Malti, T. and Krettenauer, T. (2012) The Relation of Moral Emotion Attributions to Prosocial and Antisocial Behavior: A Meta-Analysis. *Child Development*, early online publication, September 24, 2012. doi:10.1111/j.1467-8624.2012.01851.x

Malti, T. and Noam, G.G. (2009) A Developmental Approach to the Prevention of Adolescents' Aggressive Behavior and the Promotion of Resilience. *European Journal of Developmental Science* 3: 235-246.

Malti, T., Ribeaud, D. and Eisner, M.P. (2012) Effectiveness of a Universal School-Based Social Competence Program: The Role of Child Characteristics and Economic Factors. *International Journal of Conflict and Violence* 6 (2): 249-259.

Menesini, E., Nocentini, A. and Palladino, B.E. (2012) Empowering Students Against Bullying and Cyberbullying: Evaluation of an Italian Peer-led Model. *International Journal of Conflict and Violence* 6 (2): 313-320.

Nagin, D.S. (2007) Moving Choice to Center Stage in Criminological Research and Theory: The American Society of Criminology 2006 Sutherland Address. *Criminology* 45 (2): 259–272.

Noam, G., Malti, T. and Guhn, M. (2012) From Clinical-Developmental Theory to Assessment: The Holistic Student Assessment Tool. *International Journal of Conflict and Violence* 6 (2): 201-213.

Ortega-Ruiz, R., Del Rey, R. and Casas, J.A. (2012) Knowing, Building, and Living Together on Internet and Social Networks: The ConRed Cyberbullying Prevention Program. *International Journal of Conflict and Violence* 6 (2): 302-312.

Pardini, D.A., Loeber, R., Farrington, D.P. and Stouthamer-Loeber, M. (2012) Identifying Direct Protective Factors for Nonviolence. *American Journal of Preventive Medicine* 43 (2, supplement 1): S28–S40.

Perren, S., Corcoran, L., Cowie, H., Dehue, F., Garcia, D., McGuckin, C., Sevcikova, A., Tsatsou, P. and Völlink, T. (2012) Tackling Cyberbullying: Review of Empirical Evidence Regarding Successful Responses by Students, Parents, and Schools. *International Journal of Conflict and Violence* 6 (2): 283-292.

References

Rutter, M. (2012) Annual Research Review: Resilience: Clinical Implications. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry* (online first). doi:10.1111/j.1469-7610.2012.02615.x

Salmivalli, C., Huttunen, A. and Lagerspetz, K.M.J. (1997) Peer Networks and Bullying in Schools. *Scandinavian Journal of Psychology* 38 (4): 305–312.

Salmivalli, C. and Poskiparta, E. (2012) KiVa Antibullying Program: Overview of Evaluation Studies Based on a Randomized Controlled Trial and National Rollout in Finland. *International Journal of Conflict and Violence* 6 (2): 293-301.

Séguin, J.R., Nagin, D., Assaad, J.-M. and Tremblay, R.E. (2004) Cognitive-Neuropsychological Function in Chronic Physical Aggression and Hyperactivity. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology* 113 (4): 603–13.

Sherman, L.W., Farrington, D.P., Welsh, B.C. and MacKenzie, D.L. (Eds) (2002) *Evidence-Based Crime Prevention*. London: Routledge.

Slonje, R. and Smith, P.K. (2008) Cyberbullying: Another Main Type of Bullying? *Scandinavian Journal of Psychology* 49 (2): 147–54.

Spiel, C., Wagner, P. and Strohmeier, D. (2012) Violence Prevention in Austrian Schools: Implementation and Evaluation of a National Strategy. *International Journal of Conflict and Violence* 6 (2): 176-186.

Stokes, D.E. (1997) *Pasteur's Quadrant – Basic Science and Technological Innovation*. Washington: The Brookings Institution.

Tremblay, R.E. and Craig, W.M. (1995) Developmental Crime Prevention. In: *Building a Safer Society: Strategic Approaches to Crime Prevention*, Crime and Justice: An Annual Review of Research 19, M. Tonry and D.P. Farrington (Eds). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Ttofi, M. and 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.

Ttofi, M., Farrington, D.P., Lösel, F. and Loeber, R. (2011) Do the Victims of School Bullies Tend to Become Depressed Later in Life? A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis of Longitudinal Studies. *Journal of Aggression, Conflict and Peace Research* 3 (2): 63–73.

Wikström, P.-O., Oberwittler, D., Treiber, K. and Hardie, B. (2012) *Breaking Rules: The Social and Situational Dynamics of Young People's Urban Crime*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Woolf, S.H. (2008) The Meaning of Translational Research and Why It Matters. *JAMA: The Journal of the American Medical Association* 299 (2): 211–13. doi:10.1001/jama.2007.26

World Health Organization (2010) *Violence Prevention: The Evidence*. Geneva: World Health Organization.

Annexes

Annex I: List of Participants

Conference on Evidence-Based Prevention of Bullying and Youth Violence: European Innovations and Experiences

University of Cambridge, 5-6 July 2011

The conference brought together senior and junior researchers, policy makers and practitioners to provide new insights into innovative approaches to evidence-based bullying and violence prevention across Europe. It aimed at contributing to the further progress in our knowledge of how the socially competent development of children and adolescents can be promoted, and how problematic developments can be prevented. The conference was supported by the European Science Foundation and the Jacobs Foundation.

Convenors:

- **Manuel Eisner**
  Institute of Criminology, University of Cambridge, United Kingdom
- **Tina Malti**
  Department of Psychology, University of Toronto, Canada

Participants:

- **Margit Averdijk**
  Department of Sociology, ETH Zurich, Switzerland
- **Stephen Bediako**
  The Social Innovation Partnership (TSIP), London, United Kingdom
- **Vashti Berry**
  Dartington Social Research Unit, United Kingdom
- **Kirstie Cooper**
  School of Psychology, Bangor University, Wales, United Kingdom
- **Stefan Daniel**
  German Forum for Crime Prevention, Germany
- **Rosario De Rey**
  Department of Psychology, Cordoba University, Spain
- **Ivy Defoe**
  Adolescent Development Research Centre, Utrecht University, The Netherlands
  Visiting Scholar, University of Cambridge
- **David Farrington**
  Institute of Criminology, University of Cambridge, United Kingdom
- **Erik Flygare**
  School of Law, Psychology & Social Work, Örebro Universitet, Sweden
- **Martin Forster**
  National Board of Health and Welfare, Sweden
- **Barbara Gallo**
  Children and Violence Education Fund, Brussels, Belgium
- **Frances Gardner**
  Department of Social Policy and Social Work, University of Oxford, United Kingdom
- **Lana Ghuneim**
  Institute of Criminology, University of Cambridge, United Kingdom

- **Ferry Goossens**
  Trimbos Institute, Utrecht, The Netherlands
- **Nia Griffith**
  School of Psychology, Bangor University, Wales, United Kingdom
- **Akile Gürsoy**
  Yeni Yüzyil University, Istanbul, Turkey
  ESF Standing Committee for the Social Sciences
- **Anne Haataja**
  Division of Psychology, University of Turku, Finland
- **Leah Hamilton**
  Institute of Criminology, University of Cambridge, United Kingdom
- **Burkhard Hasenpusch**
  Crime Prevention Council of Lower Saxony, Germany
- **Helen Hearn**
  University of Nottingham, United Kingdom
- **Karin Hellfeldt**
  School of Law, Psychology & Social Work, Örebro Universitet, Sweden
- **Judy Hutchings**
  School of Psychology, Bangor University, Wales, United Kingdom
- **Mat Illic**
  Metropolitan Police (Greater London Authority), United Kingdom
- **Bjorn Johansson**
  School of Law, Psychology & Social Work, Örebro Universitet, Sweden
- **Angeliki Kallitsoglu**
  Institute of Psychiatry, Kings College London, United Kingdom
- **Friedrich Loesel**
  Institute of Criminology, University of Cambridge, United Kingdom
- **Tara McGee**
  School of Criminology and Criminal Justice, Griffith University, Australia
  Visiting Scholar, University of Cambridge
- **Edward Melhuish**
  Institute for the Study of Children, Families & Social Issues, Birkbeck College, University of London, United Kingdom
- **Ersilia Menesini**
  Department of Psychology, University of Florence, Italy
- **Josipa Mihic**
  Faculty of Education and Rehabilitation Sciences, University of Zagreb, Croatia
- **Joseph Murray**
  Department of Psychiatry, University of Cambridge, United Kingdom

Annex I: List of Participants

- **Amy Nivette**
  Institute of Criminology, University of Cambridge, United Kingdom
- **Gil Noam**
  Harvard Medical School, Harvard University, United States
- **Rosario Ortega Ruiz**
  Department of Psychology, Cordoba University, Spain
- **Benedetta Emanuela Palladino**
  Department of Psychology, University of Florence, Italy
- **Sonja Perren**
  Jacobs Centre for Productive Youth Development, University of Zurich, Switzerland
- **Phedi Phedonos**
  Educational, Cognitive and Developmental Psychology, University of Cyprus, Cyprus
- **Csaba Pléh**
  Budapest University of Technology and Economics, Hungary
  ESF Standing Committee for the Humanities
- **Denis Ribeaud**
  University of Zurich, Switzerland
- **Christina Salmivalli**
  Division of Psychology, University of Turku, Finland
- **Herbert Scheithauer**
  Department of Education Science and Psychology, Freie Universität Berlin, Germany
- **Marie-Therese Schultes**
  Department of Economic Psychology, Educational Psychology and Evaluation, University of Vienna, Austria
- **Stephen Scott**
  Department of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry, Kings College London, United Kingdom
- **Ivana Sekol**
  Institute of Criminology, University of Cambridge, United Kingdom
- **Simon Sommer**
  Jacobs Foundation, Zurich, Switzerland
- **Karen Souza**
  Institute of Criminology, University of Cambridge, United Kingdom
- **Christiane Spiel**
  Faculty of Psychology, University of Vienna, Austria
- **Pernette Steffen**
  Psychologist, Geneva, Switzerland
- **Fabio Sticca**
  Jacobs Centre for Productive Youth Development, University of Zurich, Switzerland
- **Knut Sundell**
  Department of Knowledge Based Policy and Guidance, National Board of Health and Welfare, Sweden

- **Alex Sutherland**
  Institute of Criminology, University of Cambridge, United Kingdom
- **Kaire Tamm**
  Criminal Policy Department, Estonian Ministry of Justice, Estonia
- **Kate Tobin**
  Dartington Social Research Unit, United Kingdom
- **Maria Ttofi**
  Institute of Criminology, University of Cambridge, United Kingdom
- **Thomas Vollmer**
  Unit for Child and Youth Affairs, Federal Department of Home Affairs FDHA, Switzerland
- **Rifka Weehuizen**
  European Science Foundation, France
- **Andreas Hein Willius**
  Department of Social Policy and Social Work, University of Oxford, United Kingdom
- **Ralf Wölfer**
  Department of Education Science and Psychology, Freie Universität Berlin, Germany
- **Paula Zilleruelo**
  National Public Safety Division, Chili

Conference on Evidence-Based Prevention of Bullying and Youth Violence: European Innovations and Experiences

University of Cambridge, 5-6 July 2011

Day 1: **Tuesday 5 July 2011**

A) The Broader Policy Framework

• **From Authority- to Evidence-Based Practice: The Case of Sweden**

Knut Sundell (Institute for Evidence-Based Social Work Practice, Sweden)

• **Parenting Interventions and General Literacy Programmes**

Stephen Scott (King's College London, UK)

• **Development and Implementation of a National Strategy for Violence Prevention in the Austrian Public School System: The Case of Austria**

Christiane Spiel (University of Vienna, Austria)

• **Inserting Evidence-based Prevention into Mainstream Services: The Birmingham Project**

Michael Little (Dartington Social Research Unit, UK)

B) The Early Years in Families and Schools

• **Early Years and Later Development: Consequences for Social Adjustment**

Edward Melhuish (Birkbeck College, University of London)

• **Transportability of Parenting Interventions across Cultures**

Frances Gardner (University of Oxford, England)

• **Effects and Implementation of the PAPILIO Programme: Preventing Behavioural Disorders, Fostering Prosocial Behaviour and Social Skills in Pre-School Children**

Herbert Scheithauer (Freie Universität Berlin, Germany)

• **Long-Term Effects of the EFFECT programme**

Friedrich Loesel (Universities of Cambridge and of Nürnberg-Erlangen)

• **Developing and Researching the Incredible Years Parent, Child and Teacher Programmes in Wales**

Judy Hutchings (Bangor University, Wales)

Day 2: **Wednesday 6 July 2011**

C) Bullying and School-Based Prevention

• **Effectiveness of Programs to Reduce Bullying: A Systematic Review**

Maria Ttofi and David Farrington (University of Cambridge, UK)

• **Evaluating the Effects of the KiVa Antibullying Program in a Randomized Controlled Trial and during Nationwide Implementation**

Christina Salmivalli (University of Turku, Finland)

• **Bullying Prevention in Spain**

Rosario Ortega Ruiz (Cordoba University, Spain)

• **Enhancing Students' Responsibility against Bullying in Italy: Evaluation of Peer Led Models**

Ersilia Menesini (University of Florence, Italy)

• **Current Research on Cyberbullying: Implications for Prevention and Intervention**

Sonja Perren (University of Zurich, Switzerland)

• **From Prevention Programs to Evidence-based Whole School Social-emotional Systems**

Gil Noam (Harvard University, USA)

D) What are the Active Ingredients of Interventions?

• **What are the Active Ingredients of Prevention Programmes: Moderators of Treatment Effectiveness in Social Skills Programmes**

Ferry Goossens (University of Utrecht, The Netherlands)

• **Which Programme Components Matter? A Moderator Analysis of the Zurich PATHS Study**

Tina Malti (University of Toronto, Canada) and Manuel Eisner (University of Cambridge, UK)

Conclusions and Recommendations:

The Future of Evidence-Based Violence Prevention in Europe

Poster Presentations

In addition to the main programme junior scholars presented their work in poster presentations. They represented diverse European experiences, coming from Austria, Finland, Germany, The Netherlands, Sweden, Switzerland, Italy, the UK, Spain, Croatia and Cyprus.

Posters were presented by Margit Averdijk (Federal Institute of Technology, Switzerland), Kirstie Cooper (Bangor University, United Kingdom), Rosario del Rey (Seville University, Spain), Martin Forster (Swedish National Board of Health and Welfare, Sweden), Ferry Goossens (Trimbos Institute, The Netherlands), Nia Griffith (Bangor University, United Kingdom), Anne Haataja (University of Turku, Finland), Mat Ilic (Greater London Authority, United Kingdom), Angeliki Kallitsoglou (King's College London, United Kingdom), Benedetta Palladino (University of Florence, Italy), Phedi Phedonos (University of Cyprus, Cyprus), Maria-Therese Schultes, University of Vienna (Austria), Ivana Sekol (University of Cambridge, United Kingdom), Fabio Sticca (University of Zurich, Switzerland), Kate Tobin (Dartington Social Research Unit, United Kingdom), Andreas Hein Willius University of Oxford, United Kingdom), Ralf Woelfer (Freie Universitaet Berlin, Germany).