Introducing and piloting the KiVa bullying prevention programme in the UK

Judy Hutchings & Susan Clarkson

The history of bullying research is summarised and the KiVa bullying prevention programme described. KiVa is a whole-school programme with universal and indicated actions for children aged 7 to 15 years in the Finnish comprehensive school system. It was developed at Turku University, Finland, by social psychologist Christina Salmivalli and colleagues. It has demonstrated significant benefits in a large-scale randomised controlled trial and a subsequent roll-out of the programme to 90 per cent of schools in the Finnish comprehensive system (www.kivakoulu.fi/). KiVa is based on research showing the important role played by bystanders in the bullying process. The universal and indicated actions within the programme are described. The universal actions consist of class lessons, whole school actions and a parent website. Evidence from the Finnish trials is summarised.

The paper describes the introduction of the programme to the UK in 2012 and the results from the first, psychologist led, UK pilot trial of the programme are reported. Seventeen schools participated in the trial of Unit 2, at the time the only material available in English (for children aged 9 to 11 years), and delivered KiVa lessons to year 5 and/or year 6 pupils. Children completed the online KiVa survey prior to programme commencement and at the end of the school year. Significant reductions were reported in bullying and victimisation. Teachers reported high levels of pupil acceptance and engagement with lessons. The paper concludes with reflections on the role that educational and other applied psychologists can play in further disseminating this programme.

Keywords: *Bullying; victimisation; intervention; schools; KiVa.*

BULLYING is an international problem (Olweus, 2010; Smith et al., 2004) with one-in-10 children worldwide reporting being bullied (Currie et al., 2012). For some time bullying has received national and international attention, with the publication of news reports on bullying related suicides, government reports and academic research (Kim, Koh & Leventhal, 2005; Olweus, 1993a; Ttofi & Farrington, 2011). Addressing bullying through school-wide interventions is an area where psychologists have played and can continue to play an important role in promoting key educational objectives (for example, Ttofi & Farrington, 2011).

Olweus was the first person to systematically research the anatomy of bullying in Norway in the early 1970s (Olweus, 1973). The most cited and internationally used definition proposed by Olweus defines bullying as a repeated and intentional aggressive act, which typically involves an imbalance of power (Olweus, 2001, 2005). Bullying behaviour is classified into four main categories: physical; verbal; relational; and cyber bullying (Nishana, 2004). Olweus' seminal research into bullying behaviour has prompted a global endeavour (Juvonen & Graham, 2001).

Eleven per cent of UK and 10 per cent of Welsh children report being regularly bullied (Currie et al., 2012). During primary school years, physical and verbal bullying predominate (Bjorkqvist et al., 1992; Rivers & Smith, 1994). Bullying has long-term consequences for both bullies and victims. For bullies it is a strong predictor of subsequent delinquency and anti-social behaviour (Merrel et al., 2008; Olweus, 2011; O'Moore, 2000; Ttofi et al., 2011) and these aggressive behaviour patterns can persist, increasing the likelihood of acting violently as an adult (Farrington, 1993). For victims repeated exposure to bulling undermines the health,

and wellbeing of more vulnerable pupils (Egan & Perry 1998; Rigby, 1999) significantly increasing the likelihood of psychiatric disorders in adulthood (Bond et al., 2001; Egan & Perry, 1998; Peter et al., 2008; Ttofi, 2011). The longer that victimisation persists, the greater the risk of maladjustment (Kochenderfer-Ladd, 2004).

Research on gender differences is inconsistent. Olweus (2010) reports large gender differences with girls reporting lower frequencies of all types of bullying and victims of both genders reporting that 83 per cent were bullied primarily by one or more boys and only 17 per cent by girls. Salmivalli et al. (2005) corroborate these findings, reporting that boys used all forms of aggression (physical, verbal and indirect) more than girls. Other recent research reports lower gender differences and that gender is not a significant predictor of bullying (Barboza et al., 2009; Reid et al., 2004; Stassen Berger, 2007).

School-based bullying

Many children regularly witness bullying at school (Eslea et al., 2003). It is widespread and frequent in most school settings (Pellegrini, 2002) and most bullying research has been conducted in schools (Olweus, 1978; Salmivalli et al., 1996). Salmivalli and colleagues were the first to explore the role of bystander in the bullying process. Bystanders influence bullying, by intervening and helping the victim, supporting the bully or choosing to ignore the situation (Salmivalli et al., 1996). Four participant bystander roles have been identified – 'assistant' of the bully, 'reinforcer' of the bully, 'outsider' and 'defender' of the victim (Salmivalli et al., 1996). However, from the perspective of the victim, outsiders, who walk away and fail to intervene, are viewed as supporting the bully by demonstrating silent complicity (Jeffrey et al., 2001).

Pupils report bullying as occuring more frequently than do teachers (Low et al., 2011). The likelihood of reporting bullying incidents, and the success with which they are dealt, is dependent on the teacher and school context (Kochender & Ladd, 1997). In one third of cases, pupils report that when teachers do intervene, either they do not alter the situation (Fekkes et al., 2005), or make the situation worse (Rigby & Bagshaw, 2003). The large discrepancy between teachers' and pupils' views on the severity and frequency of bullying (Low et al., 2011; Newman & Murray, 2005) highlights the need for staff training in awareness and for effective responses. The school context affects rates of bullying with frequency varying as much as four to six times across schools (Mellor, 1999; Olweus, 1993b; Rigby, 2002).

Bullying interventions

In 1982, following the suicide of three Norwegian boys, Olweus was commissioned by the Ministry of Education, to design and evaluate an intervention to prevent bullying, the 'Olweus Bullying Prevention Programme'. The programme targets the school culture, providing a sense of community and reducing opportunities for bullying behaviour. Pupils reported a 50 per cent reduction in bullying and victimisation (Olweus, 1991; Olweus et al., 1999) and significant reductions in self-reported anti-social behaviour, including truancy, alcohol use, theft, and vandalism (Olweus, 2005). The programme has since been implemented in many countries and has mostly demonstrated positive although more modest effects than the original study (Olweus et al., 1999; Smith et al., 2004). Elliot (1999) highlights the scarcity of evidence-based programmes to prevent or reduce bullying in the US. However, school-based bullying interventions, that incorporate a whole-school approach, appear to be the most effective and can reduce bullying behaviour significantly (Vreeman & Carroll, 2007).

Age has an impact on the effectiveness of bullying interventions, with the greatest effects being achieved at age 10 to 12 years (Menesini et al., 2003; Salmivalli et al., 2004).

KiVa

Despite excellent academic outcomes (Sahlberg 2011), the Finnish Government decided that a concerted effort would also be made to enhance child well-being. For many years the government relied upon legislative changes that placed obligations on schools to design their own action plans and required commitment from school staff to intervene immediately in bullying situations (the 'zero tolerance' method). However, this legislation did not impact on the prevalence figures. Recognising the work of Salmivalli and colleagues at Turku University on the architecture of bullying and the role of bystanders, the Finnish Ministry of Education and Culture contracted with the University to develop and evaluate a school-based bullying programme for schools within the Finnish comprehensive system (grades one to nine, children aged 7 to 15 years). The programme includes universal actions, directed at class and school level, and indicated actions, for addressing confirmed cases of bullying. The universal curriculum contains three lesson units suitable for ages 7 to 9, 10 to 12, and 13 to 15 years respectively.

KiVa is an acronym for 'Kiusaamista Vastaan' which, translated, means 'against bullying' and also 'kiva' is a Finnish adjective for nice (Salmivalli, 2010). KiVa is based on robust research, which suggests that the reactions of bystanders maintain or decrease bullying behaviours (Salmivalli et al., 1996). The KiVa programme provides training, resources, class lessons, online activities, and parental advice and support. It aims to affect norms and skills, behaviour, attitudes and the classroom and school climate.

The universal actions in Units 1 and 2 each consist of 10 structured lessons, each lasting approximately an hour-and-a-half. Typically, the lessons are split into two 45-minute lessons a month. Lessons cover being part of a team, learning about emotions, group interaction processes and group pressure. They also provide explanations about types of bullying, how it is influenced by the bystander, its consequences and how both individuals and the class as a group can reduce bullying. The lessons include: discussions (class and small groups), role-play, videos of people talking about having been bullied, group work and whole class activities. Both Units 1 and 2 have online games linked with lesson topics that teach pupils through a paradigm of 'I know, I can, I do'. The games can be played at school or at home. KiVa posters are displayed throughout the school and yellow, high visibility, KiVa vests are worn by staff at break and lunchtimes to remind both pupils and staff that they are in a KiVa school. Parent involvement and support is encouraged and KiVa provides a public access website for parents and others interested to learn more about KiVa, bullying and how to support children to speak up about or stand against bullying.

The programme promotes social skills, such as making friends, to support and protect a child from victimisation (Hanish et al., 2005). Providing bullied pupils with friendship skills reduces their risk of being bullied and increases the likelihood of their being accepted, and for other children it increases their empathy for their bullied peers (Pelegrini, 2002). Empathy provides children with the foundations for friendships, conflict resolutions and social responsibility. Pupils possessing higher levels of empathy are typically more socially skilled, liked by their peers, and less aggressive (Arsenio et al., 2000; Denham, 2006).

The programme includes detailed indicated actions undertaken by a KiVa team and the class teacher when a bullying incident is identified. The KiVa team can include teachers, members of school staff, educational psychologists, governors and others. Incidents that are brought to staff attention are screened against the KiVa definition of bullying. Cases that meet the criteria (the behaviour of a more powerful or high status child/children towards a lower status child and an intentional and repeated act) are dealt with by the KiVa team. In the Finnish

randomised controlled trial (RCT) approximately 60 per cent of referred cases were accepted by the KiVa team, on average nine cases per school per year.

Indicated actions are scripted and discussions are short and solution focused. A member of the KiVa team first meets the victim, to gain an understanding of the situation and offer support. The team then meet with the bully/bullies. In this meeting the bully is asked to commit to actions to help the victim. Follow-up meetings are arranged with both parties. The class teacher also arranges for one or two high status peers, whom the victim has identified as not having been involved in the bullying, to support the victim. This process encourages continued positive behaviour (Rigby, 1996). Pupils complete an annual survey at the end of the school year reporting on whether they have been victimised or have bullied others. The results are fed back to the school so that progress in reducing bullying can be evaluated.

Research on KiVa

The programme was developed, piloted and evaluated between 2006 and 2009, in an RCT involving 28,000 pupils in 234 schools (117 intervention and 117 control). Pupils completed a wide variety of assessments that included self-reports, peer reports and dyadic questions. Teachers also completed assessments concerning their attitudes towards, and effectiveness and effort in, dealing with bullying incidents (Salmivalli, 2010). After one year of implementation, KiVa was found to reduce both bullying and victimisation significantly for 7- to 11-year-old children. Results for children aged 12 to 15 years varied according to gender, with larger effects for boys than girls. The results also varied according to gender split of the class, with a larger effect when there was a higher proportion of boys in the class (Kärnä et al., 2011a). Outcomes from the KiVa team actions demonstrated a 98 per cent improvement in the victims' situation and that the bullying ceased in 86 per cent of reported incidents (Kärnä et al., 2011a). Other posi-

tive results included improvements in academic engagement and school liking (Salmivalli et al., 2012) and increased empathy towards victims and commitment to defend victims (Kärnä, 2011b) as well as reduced internalising problems and negative peer perceptions (Williford et al., 2012).

Following the successful RCT results, the Finnish national roll out of KiVa began in autumn 2009, initially with 1450 schools. Since then the programme has been disseminated to many more schools and is now delivered in over 90 per cent of comprehensive schools in Finland (approximately 2700 schools). It is showing year on year reductions in bullying.

KiVa in the UK

In England, Wales and Northern Ireland, schools are required by law to have a policy for dealing with bullying. However, like the situation in Finland prior to the development of KiVa, the law only provides guidance on what is required and the content and quality of work done varies considerably between schools (Smith et al., 2008). A wide range of interventions to reduce bullying are in use across the UK, including peer support programmes and the Safe to Learn initiative (Department for Children, Schools and Families, 2008). To date there has been relatively little systematic evaluation of anti-bullying interventions in the UK. Of the 44 studies identified in the Ttofi and Farrington review (2011) only three were conducted in the UK. One, the Short Video Intervention, was a secondary school intervention and one, the Social Skills Training Programme, was an intervention for bullies and victims. Only one intervention, the Sheffield Anti-bullying Project, evaluated a whole school approach that had some similarities to KiVa, in both primary and secondary schools. The project involved a Core Intervention, the whole school policy on bullying, and optional self-selected interventions from three categories, curriculum-based strategies, direct work with children and playground strategies. It was assessed using an

age cohort design. The project demon-strated positive impact, but this varied between schools, however, the project also revealed a significant relationship between the Input (effort and time) and the Output (improvements; Whitney et al., 1994).

In 2011 Professor Salmivalli spoke about KiVa at Cambridge University and the first author then presented the programme at a Welsh Government meeting for school improvement officers. In July 2011 the Welsh Government invited Directors of Education to apply for a 'Training in Behaviour Management Grant'. This funding was provide for training in 'well evaluated' approaches and KiVa was included on the list.

The Welsh Pilot Trial
Methods
Fourteen Welsh schools were recruited from across North and South Wales and three schools from the county of Cheshire (on the Welsh border) also signed up for training for delivery in the 2012–13 school year. The programme was offered to mainstream primary school Years 5 (age 9 to 10 years) and/or Year 6 (age 10 to 11 years) pupils. This was because, at commencement of the study, only Unit 2 (for children aged 9 to 11 years) of the KiVa programme had been translated into English. This was the first unit to be translated because, in the KiVa trials in Finland, this was the age at which the best results were obtained (Kärnä et al., 2011a).

Professor Salmivalli and a colleague came to Wales in May 2012 to train staff from the 17 schools. Training was delivered in both North and South Wales. This was a one-day training course with separate teaching sessions for any class teachers who would be delivering the lessons and for the personnel who would be the KiVa team lead and take responsibility for implementing the targeted actions when bullying was identified. A number of schools had recruited an educational psychologist to support the KiVa team. The authors supported the programme throughout the school year with telephone and email contact and with termly meetings for school representatives at three locations across Wales. Support covered responses to queries on the programme, implementation and data collection. The meetings were also used to gain feedback.

All school registration details were processed through Bangor University and funding from the training enabled the appointment of a part-time KiVa administrator. Training covered how to register and launch KiVa in the school, how to set up and undertake the pupil survey, introduction to lesson content, materials and the KiVa rules that are generated from the lessons and how to access the various online resources including the KiVa games. In the parallel session KiVa team members were introduced to the scripted process delineating how to deal with confirmed bullying incidents.

A European funded Knowledge Economy Skills Scholarship was obtained to support evaluation of this pilot trial by the second author in a partnership between Bangor University and Early Intervention Wales Training Ltd.

Measures and procedures
The pupil measure used in the evaluation was pupil report on the annual KiVa online internet-based survey. This incorporates two global variables from the Revised Olweus Bully/Victim Questionnaire (OBVQ; Olweus, 1996) that record whether pupils self-identify as victims, non-victims, bullies or non-bullies. The revised OBVQ has been used by hundreds of researchers world-wide, including in some large-scale studies (Currie et al., 2012), to measure the prevalence of bullying and victimisation. An analysis of this instrument by Kyriakides et al. (2006) indicates that it has satisfactory psychometric properties in terms of construct validity and reliability

Pupils responded to the revised OBVQ items on a five-point frequency scale (1='I have not been bullied during last couple of months', 2='Once or twice in the last couple of months', 3='2 or 3 times a

month', 4='About once a week', 5='Several times a week'. (A number of researchers code from 0 to 4, rather than 1 to 5.) The cut-off point, for identification of bully and victim, were based on the recommendations of Solberg and Olweus (2003) of two to three times a month.

The independent variable was the KiVa Programme, assessed as a within groups factor at pre- and post-test. There were two dependent variables, victimisation and bullying. Pupil online self-report scores for the global revised OBVQ items were employed as the measure of victimisation and bullying. The aggregated means for the participating schools pre- and post-test for both variables were compared for differences with a repeated measures *t*-test.

The pupil survey took approximately ten minutes to complete. Teachers or classroom assistants administered the survey. Staff administering the survey were advised not to move around the classroom whilst the survey was being completed, so that pupils did not feel pressurised to make particular responses. Staff were also informed to group children with low reading ability, so that they could offer additional reading help where required. Staff were requested to keep explanations to a minimum, if pupils requested information. Pupils were informed that all of their responses were confidential. They logged on to the survey with school-specific user names and passwords. The time and date of survey completion and the school's identity were automatically saved to the data set when each pupil logged on. Pupils were requested to provide their gender and year group from alternatives offered on the screen, followed by the OBVQ items. All of the instructions for survey completion, including the definition of bullying, were supplied and items appeared on the pupil's computer screen. The term bullying was defined prior to pupils completing the survey.

The Revised Olweus' Bully/Victim Questionnaire (OBVQ) definition was employed:

'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, 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 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.'

A concise version of the definition was additionally supplied before each item to remind the pupils of the definition of bullying within this study and the components of the definition, the requirement of repetition, intention and power imbalance between the victim and the bully.

Schools were asked to participate in the study by allowing the aggregated OBVQ data to be reported and all parents were informed by letter and/or email of the school's decision to deliver the KiVa programme as part of their Personal Social Emotional (PSHE in England) curriculum. The programme was mapped on to these curricula and shown to cover over half of the curriculum for the relevant age group. Pupils and parents were informed that the pupil survey data, the revised OVBQ, was anonymous, and that full confidentiality was guaranteed. The study was approved by Bangor University, School of Psychology, Research Ethics and Governance Committee, to ensure that all the British Psychological Society's guidelines were adhered to (Ethics code 2012_7522).

Owing to the late recruitment of some schools the survey was completed at the beginning of the 2012–2013 school year, prior to implementation of the programme.

On the basis of the aims of the intervention in terms of reducing victimisation and bullying, and of the reductions in these measures already reported in the Finnish RCT, it was hypothesised that self-reported measures of both victimisation and bullying on the revised OBVQ would reduce from pre-test to post-test.

Results

The programme was delivered in 17 schools, 14 from across Wales and three from Cheshire. Four schools delivered the programme to Year 5 pupils, eight to Year 6 pupils and five to pupils in Years 5 and 6. Key Stage 2 pupil numbers ranged from 72 to 290 (*M*=138); 748 pupils received the programme.

The online annual pupil survey that is part of the KiVa programme is anonymous and only linkable to school and year group. As this was an opportunistic and small-scale pilot study undertaken after schools had registered with KiVa Finland it was not possible to link individual pupil pre- and post-test data. For the purposes of pre- to post-test analyses, only the 13 schools that provided adequate pre-test and post-test measurements were included in the final sample. Four schools were excluded: two did not provide post-test data and two others provided post-test data for only 50 per cent and 10 per cent of pupils respectively. The pre-test response from the 13 schools was 473 and the post-test response was 472, representing 82 per cent of the pupils in the intervention classes.

Table 1 shows the total percentage of victims and bullies for each of the 13 schools at pre-test and post-test, and Table 2 shows these figures broken down by gender.

Table 1: Victimisation and bullying on the Revised OBVQ (percentage by school).

School code	Pre-test (*N*=473)		Post-test (*N*=472)	
	Victim	Bully	Victim	Bully
1	20	5	3	3
2	35	16	18	3
3	8	0	0	0
4	8	4	8	0
5	4	16	8	0
6	8	4	0	4
7	25	9	13	4
8	8	7	0	0
9	22	10	3	5
11	31	19	8	0
12	17	18	6	0
13	6	10	0	0
15	11	14	11	2

Table 2: Victimisation and bullying by gender on the Revised OBVQ (percentage by school).

School code	Girls				Boys			
	Pre-test (*N*=228)		Post-test (*N*=225)		Pre-test (*N*=245)		Post-test (*N*=247)	
	Victim	Bully	Victim	Bully	Victim	Bully	Victim	Bully
1	25	0	4	3	16	9	3	3
2	41	17	23	4	25	14	8	0
3	11	0	0	0	5	0	0	0
4	11	11	0	0	6	0	12	0
5	8	23	8	0	0	8	38	0
6	11	0	0	0	6	5	0	5
7	22	22	0	0	27	0	20	7
8	8	8	0	0	8	7	0	0
9	14	8	0	0	33	12	7	12
11	50	27	14	0	8	9	0	0
12	18	22	7	0	17	14	6	0
13	13	6	0	0	0	14	0	0
15	11	14	11	0	12	15	12	4

A comparison of pre-/post-test results for the total sample showed significant reductions both in victimisation ($t[12]=2.147$, p[one-tailed]=0.027) and in bullying ($t[12]=2.791$, p[one-tailed]=0.008). Similarly, a comparison of pre-/post-test results broken down by gender showed significant reductions for girls both in victimisation ($t[12]=1.951$, p[one-tailed]=0.038) and in bullying ($t[12]=2.540$, p[one-tailed]=0.013). For boys, a significant reduction was found for bullying ($t[12]=1.837$, p[one-tailed]=0.046) but not for victimisation ($t[12]=1.417$, p[one-tailed]=0.046). Teachers reported on the experience of delivering the programme in an online survey. Delivery of the lessons was reported to be 'Easy' by 73.3 per cent of respondents and they rated 75 to 100 per cent of pupils as engaged with, and enthusiastic about, the lessons. The suitability of lessons for reducing bullying was rated by teachers on a five-point scale: 1=Extremely unsuitable to 5=Extremely suit-

able. The mean response of 4.47 indicated that lessons were deemed very suitable for the purpose of reducing bullying. Teachers also gave very positive feedback about the level of discussion generated by the programme lessons and reported that pupils who were not so forthcoming in other lessons enjoyed contributing in KiVa lessons.

A recent 'Action on Bullying' report by the Welsh school inspection service, ESTYN (Her Majesty's Inspectorate for Education and Training in Wales, 2014), includes a case study on Marlborough School, Cardiff, one of the Welsh KiVa schools, as an example of good practice in addressing bullying (pp.19–20).

Discussion

It is clear that there is a need to support schools to address bullying in both Wales and the rest of the UK. Effective interventions draw on psychological research into the nature of bullying and teachers need

these tools to do this effectively. The UK is currently in the situation that Finland was prior to the Finnish Government funding the development and evaluation of KiVa. Our schools are required to address bullying but have not been given tools that have demonstrated effectiveness to achieve this. To date no RCTs of anti-bullying pro-grammes have been completed in the UK and only a limited number of RCTs on an international basis with minimal success. According to the Ttofi and Farrington review (2011) only one of the nine randomised experiments (Fonagy et al., 2009) found a significant effect of the programme on bullying, although one other evaluation (Hunt 2007) reported a near-significant effect. Overall, the nine randomised experi-ments yielded a weighted mean OR of 1.10, indicating a non-significant effect of these programmes on bullying. KiVa was selected for the trial in Wales owing to its strong evidence in the many trials by the pro-gramme developers from both a large-scale RCT and evaluation of the broader roll out of the programme across Finland.

There are a number of limitations to the study. Firstly, due to its opportunistic nature, the design was limited and lacked a control condition making a cause-effect conclusion tentative. However, there are no funda-mental reasons to expect that bullying levels would have reduced over the period of the study in this age group, so the intervention is likely to have contributed to the reported reductions.

Secondly, the study reports only on the subjective experience of bullying. However, subjectivity is important in its own right, as in some circumstances, bullying behaviour may be so subtle that only the victim is aware of it (Huitsing et al., 2010). Self-report question-naires are the most widely used method of assessing the prevalence of bullying and peer victimisation, as they yield information effi-ciently and with minimal cost (time and financial), when compared with other inde-pendent measures where evidence can be difficult to obtain and costly.

Thirdly, as the pupil survey data were not matched it prevented analysis at pupil and class level that could have contributed to greater understanding of the effects of the programme. Future studies should aim to match data so that a multi-level modelling analysis can be used, such as hierarchical linear modelling, whereby units within other units are analysed (Bryk & Raudenbush, 1992). Schools are an excellent fit for the nesting criteria (school, class, pupil) and this would clarify where, and for whom, any benefits primarily accrue.

Fourthly, this study reports data collected over one academic year. For a more compre-hensive understanding of bullying and to measure the effectiveness of interventions, longer-term follow-up is needed, ideally over a three-year period (Ryan & Smith, 2009).

In this first pilot trial of KiVa Unit 2 in the UK significant reductions were reported in the anonymous pupil self-report survey of both bullying and victimisation. Teachers also reported the acceptability of the mate-rials from both their own and their pupils' standpoints indicating the acceptability of the programme. The tentative findings of this pilot trial justify further more rigorous evaluation of KiVa to establish the short-term effectiveness and any possible longer-term benefits of the programme.

The positive findings during this first pilot trial year contributed to a decision to seek and obtain funding from the BIG Lottery innovation fund for Wales for a small RCT of the KiVa programme. This is being undertaken by a partnership between the Dartington Social Research Unit and Bangor University. In the meantime the translation into English of Unit 1 had been completed and this has enabled the RCT to target all Key Stage 2 pupils, Years 3 to 6 in the schools that were recruited. Twenty-two schools from across Wales were recruited and randomly allocated to intervention in 2013–2014 or a wait list control condition commencing in 2014–2015 (Axford et al., 2014).

The successful pilot data raise the issue of dissemination and how to provide support for effective roll out of the programme. First, a KiVa school lead needs to be trained and supported to take charge of the project within the school to launch the KiVa programme and ensure that teachers and all school staff are trained and resourced to deliver the universal aspects of the programme effectively. This person needs to ensure that parents are informed, that KiVa posters are displayed and that KiVa vests are worn by playground supervisors. Second, training is needed in terms of the administration of the online KiVa pupil survey and access to online resources for teachers, parents and children. This requires back-up support and was provided in the pilot trial by the authors, both psychologists. Third, KiVa team members require training in the strategies to address confirmed incidents of bullying.

As with any evidence-based programme the challenge is to implement it with fidelity in everyday service settings in order to ensure that results from RCTs are replicated. To do this requires a system that can support groups of schools in a locality. In the Welsh trials with small numbers this has been achieved through support directly from Finland and subsequently from the Bangor team.

However, for KiVa to achieve widescale roll out, creating the possibility of further evaluation in the UK, local trainers need to be identified and trained to support the schools in their area. In Powys, a rural county in Wales, this has been done by resourcing an educational psychologist to train and support school staff. The goal now is to identify and train local staff with a remit to support schools in their locality. Training for trainers is now available at Bangor University in the UK and this is a very suitable role for educational and other applied psychologists whose work increasingly involves working with whole school populations in achieving school-wide benefits.

Address for correspondence
Dr Judy Hutchings
Professor of Clinical Psychology,
Director, Centre for Evidence Based
Early Intervention,
School of Psychology,
College of Health and Behavioural
Sciences,
Nantlle Building, Normal Site,
Bangor University,
Gwynedd, LL57 2PX.
Email: j.hutchings@bangor.ac.uk.

References

Arsenio, W.F., Cooperman, S. & Lover, A. (2000). Affective predictors of preschoolers' aggression and peer acceptance: Direct and indirect effects. *Developmental Psychology, 36*, 438–448.

Axford, N., Hutchings, J., Bjornstad, G., Clarkson, S. & Hunt, A. (2014). KiVa: Helping schools and parents beat bullying. *Better Evidence-based Education, 6*(2), 14–15.

Barboza, G.E., Schiamberg, L.B., Oehmke, J., Korzeniewski, S.J., Post, L.A. & Heraux, C.G. (2009). Individual characteristics and the multiple contexts of adolescent bullying: An ecological perspective. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 38*, 101–121.

Björkqvist, K. Lagerspetz, K.M.J. & Kaukiainen, A. (1992). Do girls manipulate and boys fight? Developmental trends in regard to direct and indirect aggression. *Aggressive Behavior, 18*, 117–127.

Bond, L., Carlin, J.B., Thomas, L., Rubin, K. & Patton, G. (2001). Does bullying cause emotional problems? A prospective study of young teenagers. *British Medical Journal, 323*, 480–484.

Bryk, A.S. & Raudenbush, S.W. (1992). *Hierarchical linear models: Applications and data analysis methods.* Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Currie, C., Zanotti, C., Morgan, A. & Currie, D. (2012). *Social determinants of health and well-being among young people.* Geneva, Switzerland: World Health Organisation.

Denham, S.A. (2006). Social-emotional competence as support for school readiness: What is it and how do we assess it? *Early Education and Development, 17*(1), 57–89.

Egan, S.K. & Perry, D.G. (1998). Does low self-regard invite victimisation? *Developmental Psychology, 34*, 299–309.

Elliot, D.S. (1999). *Blueprints for Violence Prevention.* (I. of B.S. Center for the Study and Prevention of Violence, Ed.). Boulder, CO: University of Colorado.

Eslea, M., Menesini, E., Merita, Y., O'Moore, M., Mora-Merchan, J.A. & Pereira, B. (2003). Friendship and loneliness among bullies and victims: Data from seven countries. *Aggressive Behavior, 30*, 71–83.

Estyn (2014). *Action on bullying: A review of the effectiveness of action taken by schools to address bullying on the grounds of pupils' protected characteristics.* Estyn: Her Majesty's Inspectorate for Education and Training in Wales.

Farrington, D. (1993). Understanding and preventing bullying. In M. Tonry (Ed.), *Crime and Justice: A review of research* (pp.381–458). Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Fekkes, M., Pijpers, F.I.M. & Verloove-Vanhorick, S.P. (2005). Bullying: Who does what, when and where? Involvement of children, teachers and parents in bullying behavior. *Health Education Research, 20*(1), 81–91.

Hanish, L.D., Ryan, P., Martin, C.L. & Fabes, R.A. (2005). The social context of young children's peer victimisation. *Social Development, 14*(1), 2–19.

Huitsing, G., Veenstra, R., van Duijn, M.A.J., Sanio, M. & Salmivalli, C. (2010). *By whom are you bullied? Dyadic nominations identify 'invisible' bullying.* Poster presented at Biennal Meeting for the Society for Research on Adolescence, Philadelphia.

Jeffrey, L.R., Miller, D. & Linn, M. (2001). Middle school bullying as a context for the development of passive observers to the victimisation of others. *Journal of Emotional Abuse, 2*, 143–156.

Juvonen, J. & Graham, S. (2001). *Peer harassment in school: The plight of the vulnerable and victimised.* New York: Guilford Press.

Kärnä, A., Voeten, M., Little, T.D., Poskiparta, E., Kaljonen, A. & Salmivalli, C. (2011a). A large-scale evaluation of the KiVa anti-bullying program: Grades 4–6. *Child Development, 82*(1), 311–30.

Kärnä, A., Voeten, M., Little, T.D., Poskiparta, E., Alanen, E., Salmivalli, C. & Ka, A. (2011b). Going to scale: A non-randomised nationwide trial of the KiVa anti-bullying program for grades 1–9. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 79*(6), 796–805.

Kim, Y.S., Koh, Y.J. & Leventhal, B.L. (2005). School bullying and suicidal risk in Korean middle school students. *Pediatrics, 115*(2), 357–363.

Kochenderfer, B.J. & Ladd, G.W. (1997). Victimised children's responses to peers' aggression: Behaviors associated with reduced versus continued victimisation. *Developmental and Psychopathology, 9*(1), 59–73.

Kochenderfer-Ladd B. (2004) Peer victimisation: The role of emotions in adaptive and maladaptive coping. *Social Development, 13*(3), 329–249.

Kyriakides, L., Kaloyirou, C. & Lindsay, G. (2006). An analysis of the Revised Olweus Bully/Victim Questionnaire using the Rasch measurement model. *British Journal of Educational Psychology, 76*, 781–801.

Low, S., Smith, B.H., Brown, E.C., Fernandez, K., Hanson, K. & Haggerty, K.P. (2011). Design and analysis of a randomised controlled trial of steps to resect: A school-based bullying prevention program. In S.M. Espelage & E.L. Swearer (Eds.), *Bullying in North American schools* (pp.278–290). New York: Routledge.

Mellor, A. (1999). Scotland. In P.K. Smith, Y. Morita, J. Junger-Tas, D. Olweus, R. Catalano & P. Slee (Eds.), *The nature of school bullying* (pp.91–111). London: Routledge.

Menesini, E., Codecasa, E., Benelli, B. & Cowie, H. (2003). Enhancing children's responsibility to take action against bullying: Evaluation of a befriending intervention in Italian middle schools. *Aggressive Behavior, 29*(1), 1–14.

Merrell, K.W., Gueldner, B.A., Ross, S.W. & Isava, D.M. (2008). How effective are school bullying intervention programs? A meta-analysis of intervention research. *School Psychology Quarterly, 23*(1), 26–42.

Newman, R.S. & Murray, B.J. (2005). How students and teachers view the seriousness of peer harassment: When is it appropriate to seek help? *Journal of Educational Psychology, 97*, 347–365.

Nishina, A. (2004). A theoretical review of bullying: Can it be eliminated. In C.E. Sanders & G.D. Phye (Eds.), *Bullying: Implications for the classroom.* (pp.35–62). San Diego, CA: Elsevier.

Olweus, D. (1973). *Hackkycklingar och oversittare. Forskning om skolmobbing (Victims and bullies: Research on school bullying).* Stockholm: Almqvist & Wicksell.

Olweus, D. (1978). *Aggression in the schools: Bullies and whipping boys.* London: Wiley.

Olweus, D. (1991). Bully/victim problems among school children: Some basic facts and effects of a school-based intervention program. In K. Pepler & D. Rubin (Eds.), *The development and treatment of childhood aggression* (pp.411–448). Hillside, NJ: Erlbaum.

Olweus, D. (1993a). Bully/victim problems among school children: Long-term consequences and an effective intervention program. In S. Hodgins (Ed.), *Mental disorder and crime* (pp.317–349). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Olweus, D. (1993b). *Bullying at school: What we know and what we can do.* Oxford: Blackwell.

Olweus, D. (1996). Bully/victim problems in schools. *Prospects, 26*, 331–359.

Olweus, D. (2001). Peer harassment: A critical analysis and some important issues. *Peer harassment in school: The plight of the vulnerable and victimised*, 3–20.

Olweus, D. (2005). A useful evaluation design, and effects of the Olweus Bullying Prevention Program. *Pschology, Crime & Law [Special issue: Working with aggression and violence: Assessment, prevention and treatment], 11*, 389–402.

Olweus, D. (2010). Understanding and researching bullying some critical issues. In *Handbook of bullying in schools: An international perspective* (pp.9–33).

Olweus, D. (2011). Bullying at school and later criminality: Findings from three Swedish community samples of males. *Criminal Behavior and Mental Health, 21*(2), 151–156.

Olweus, D., Limber, S. & Mihalic, S.F. (1999). Bullying prevention program. Blueprints for Violence Prevention book nine. In D.S. Elliott (Ed.), *Center for the Study and Prevention of violence, Institute of Behavioural Science, University of Colorado.* Boulder, CO: University of Colorado.

O'Moore, M. (2000). Critical issues for teacher training to counter bullying and victimisation in Ireland. *Aggressive Behavior, 26*(26), 99–111.

Pellegrini, A.D. (2002). Bullying, victimisation, and sexual harassment during the transition to middle school. *Educational Psychology, 37*(3), 151–164.

Peter, T., Roberts, L.W. & Buzdugan, R. (2008). Suicidal ideation among Canadian Youth: A multivariate analysis. *Archives of Suicide Research*, 263–275.

Reid, P., Monsen, J. & Rivers, I. (2004). Psychology's contribution to understanding and managing bullying within schools. *Educational Psychology in Practice: Theory, research and practice in educational psychology, 20*(3), 241–258.

Rigby, K. (1996). *Bullying in schools.* London: Jessica Kingsley.

Rigby, K. (1999). Peer victimisation at school and the health of secondary school students British *Journal of Educational Psychology, 69*(1), 95–104.

Rigby, K. (2002). *New perspectives on bullying.* London: Jessica Kingsley.

Rigby, K. & Bagshaw, D. (2003). Prospects of adolescent students collaborating with teachers in addressing issues of bullying and conflict in sschools. *Educational Psychology, 23*, 535–546.

Rivers, I. & Smith, P.K. (1994). Types of bullying behavior and their correlates. *Aggressive Behavior, 20*(5), 359–368.

Ryan, W. & Smith, J.D. (2009). Anti-bullying programs in schools: How effective are evaluation practices? *Prevention Science: The official Journal of the Society for Prevention Research, 10*(3), 248–259.

Sahlberg, P. (2011). *Finnish lessons: What can the world learn from educational change in Finland?* New York: Teachers College Press.

Salmivalli, C. (2010). Bullying and the peer group: A review. *Aggression and Violent Behavior, 15*(2), 112–120.

Salmivalli, C, Kaukiainen, A. & Voeten, M. (2005). Anti-bullying intervention: Implementation and outcome. *British Journal of Educational Psychology, 75*, 465–487.

Salmivalli, C., Kaukiainen, A., Voeten, M. & Sinisammal, M. (2004). Targeting the group as a whole: The Finnish anti-bullying intervention. In P.K. Smith, D.J. Pepler & K. Rigby (Eds.), *Bullying in schools: How successful can interventions be?* (pp.251–273). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Salmivalli, C., Lagerspetz, K., Bjorkqvist, K., Osterman, K. & Kaukiainen, A. (1996). Bullying as a group process: Participant roles and their relations to social status within the group. *Aggressive Behavior, 22,* 1–15.

Salmivalli, C, Garandeau, C.F. & Veenstra, R. (2012). KiVa anti-bullying program: Implications for school adjustment. In A.M. Ryan & G.W. Ladd (Eds.), *Peer relationships and adjustment at school* (p.279). USA: Information Age Publishing Incorporated.

Smith, P., Pepler, D. & Rigby, K. (2004). Preface. In P.K. Smith, D.J. Pepler & K. Rigby (Eds.), *Bullying in schools: How successful can interventions be?* (pp.xvii–xviii). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Smith, P.K, Mahdavi, J., Carvalho, M., Fisher, S., Russell, S. & Tippett, N. (2008). Cyberbullying: Its nature and impact in secondary school pupils. *The Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry and Allied Disciplines, 49,* 376–385.

Society for Prevention Research (2004). *Standards of evidence: Criteria for efficacy, effectiveness and dissemination.* Available at: www.preventionresearch.org

Solberg, M.E. & Olweus, D. (2003). Prevalence estimation of school bullying with the Olweus Bully/Victim Questionnaire. *Aggressive Behavior, 29,* 239–268.

Stassen Berger, K. (2007). Update on bullying at school: Science forgotten? *Developmental Review, 27*(1), 90–126.

Ttofi, M.M. (2011). Do the victims of school bullies tend to become depressed in later life? A systematic review and meta-analysis of longitudal studies. *Journal of Aggression, Conflict and Peace Research, 3*(2), 63–73.

Ttofi, M.M. & Farrington, D.P. (2011). Effectiveness of school-based programs to reduce bullying: A systematic and meta-analytic review. *Journal of Experimental Criminology, 7,* 27–56.

Ttofi, M.M., Farrington, D.P., Losel, F. & Loeber, R. (2011). The predictive efficiency of school bullying versus later offending: A systematic/ meta-analytic review of longitudinal studies. *Criminal Behavior and Mental Health: 21*(2) 80–89.

Vreeman, R.C. & Carroll, A.E. (2007). A systematic review of school-based interventions to prevent bullying. *Archives of Pediatrics & Adolescent Medicine, 161*(1), 78–88.

Whitney, I., Rivers, I., Smith, P.K. & Sharp, S. (1994). The Sheffield Project methodology and findings. In P.K. Smith & S. Sharp (Eds.), *School bullying: Insights and perspectives* (pp.20–56). London: Routledge.

Williford, A., Boulton, A., Noland, B., Little, T.D., Karna, A. & Salmivalli, C. (2012). Effects of the KiVa anti-bullying program on adolescents' depression, anxiety, and perception of peers. *Journal of Abnormal Child Psychology, 40,* 289–300.