

Last reviewed: November 2019

Intervention website: <https://olweus.sites.clemson.edu>

GUIDEBOOK INTERVENTION INFORMATION SHEET

Olweus Bullying Prevention Programme

Please note that in the ‘Intervention summary’ table below, ‘child age’, ‘level of need’, and ‘race and ethnicities’ information is **as evaluated in studies**. Information in other fields describes the intervention as **offered/supported by the intervention provider**.

Intervention summary	
Description	<p>Olweus Bullying Prevention Programme (OBPP) is a school-based intervention for children aged between 5 and 18 years. It is delivered in primary schools and secondary schools to staff, students, parents, and the wider community on an ongoing/continuous basis.</p> <p>The OBPP addresses the problem of bullying at four levels: schoolwide, classroom, individual, and community.</p>
Evidence rating	3+
Cost rating	1
Child outcomes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Supporting children’s mental health and wellbeing <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Improved emotional wellbeing Reduced bullying victimisation. Preventing crime, violence and antisocial behaviour <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reduced antisocial behaviour Reduced bullying behaviour.
Child age (population characteristic)	5 to 18 years
Level of need (population characteristic)	Universal

Foundations Guidebook – Intervention information sheet

Visit the Foundations Guidebook | www.foundations.org.uk/guidebook

Intervention summary	
Race and ethnicities (population characteristic)	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Black or African American• Hispanic or Latino• White.
Type (model characteristic)	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Individual• Group.
Setting (model characteristic)	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Primary school• Secondary school <p>The intervention may also be delivered in these settings:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Sixth-form or FE college• Community centre.
Workforce (model characteristic)	School staff
UK available?	Yes
UK tested?	No

Model description

Olweus Bullying Prevention Programme (OBPP) is a school-based intervention targeting students aged between 5 to 18 years, as well as staff, parents, and the wider community to reduce bullying in schools. It adopts a whole-school approach to create systemic change, fostering a climate that prevents bullying and responds effectively when it occurs.

OBPP is designed to be fully implemented within 12 to 18 months, with regular class meetings being a core component. These meetings focus on bullying prevention, peer relationships, and prosocial behaviors, occurring weekly for primary grades (15 to 30 minutes) and biweekly for secondary grades (30 to 40 minutes).

The OBPP addresses the problem of bullying at four levels: schoolwide, classroom, individual, and community. School-level components include establishing a Bullying Prevention Coordinating Committee, which participates in a two-day training to build capacity for intervention implementation. Classroom-level components include defining and enforcing rules against bullying, as well as holding class meetings focused on bullying prevention, peer relations, and

Foundations Guidebook – Intervention information sheet

Visit the Foundations Guidebook | www.foundations.org.uk/guidebook

prosocial behaviours. Additionally, there are several individual-level components for dealing with individual bullying incidents. The OBPP encourages staff to intervene when bullying is witnessed, suspected, or reported, and provides training so all staff are well prepared to intervene, follow up, and communicate with parents. On-the-spot and follow-up interventions provide staff with actions to take when they witness bullying first-hand and when bullying is reported or suspected but not observed. Broader community-level components are designed to develop community support for the OBPP so students receive consistent anti-bullying messages in all areas of their lives.

Target population

Age of child	5 to 18 years
Target population	This intervention is a universal intervention targeting the general student population in primary and secondary schools

Please note that the information in this section on target population is as **offered/supported by the intervention provider**.



Theory of change

Why		Who	How	What		
Science-based assumption	Science-based assumption	Science-based assumption	Intervention	Short-term outcomes	Medium-term outcomes	Long-term outcomes
Children's social and emotional development is negatively impacted by bullying, leading to increased risks of anxiety, depression, poor academic performance, and social withdrawal.	A safe and positive school climate is essential for reducing bullying and the associated risks.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • School-aged children (elementary to high school) • Schools and teachers implementing the intervention • Parents involved in bullying prevention. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Schoolwide policies and training for staff on bullying prevention • Classroom activities teaching social-emotional skills, conflict resolution, and empathy • Individual interventions with students involved in bullying • Engagement with parents to reinforce anti-bullying messages. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increased staff knowledge and confidence in addressing bullying • Greater student awareness of bullying and its consequences • Improved student social skills and empathy • More effective responses to bullying incidents. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reduction in reported bullying incidents • Improved school climate and student relationships • Increased feelings of safety among students • Higher student engagement and attendance. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sustained reduction in bullying behaviour • Improved mental health and wellbeing for students • Stronger peer relationships and social cohesion • Reduced risk of long-term psychological and academic consequences.



Implementation requirements

Who is eligible?	All students in participating primary and secondary schools.
How is it delivered?	<p>While OBPP is a schoolwide intervention, a key component involves classroom teachers leading class meetings with students. These sessions, delivered weekly or biweekly, last between 30 and 45 minutes and take place in both primary and secondary school classrooms.</p> <p>Most of the intervention components are expected to have been implemented and in use within a period of 12 to 18 months.</p>
What happens during the intervention?	<p>The OBPP addresses the problem of bullying at four levels: schoolwide, classroom, individual, and community.</p> <p>School-Level Components: The eight school-level components include: (1) establishing a Bullying Prevention Coordinating Committee, which participates in a two-day training to build capacity for intervention implementation; (2) holding a one-day training for all staff; (3) convening ongoing staff discussion groups to ensure ongoing learning and engagement; (4) adoption of schoolwide rules against bullying and developmentally appropriate positive and negative consequences for following/not following rules; (5) administration of an anonymous questionnaire for students to assess the nature and prevalence of bullying at the school and to evaluate the intervention over time; (6) refinement of the school's supervisory system; (7) holding a schoolwide kick-off event to mark the start of the intervention; and (8) active engagement of parents.</p> <p>Classroom-Level Components: There are three classroom level components: (1) defining and enforcing rules against bullying; (2) holding class meetings focused on bullying prevention, peer relations, and prosocial behaviours (weekly meetings for primary grades for 15 to 30 minutes each, meetings every other week for secondary grades of 30 to 40 minutes); and (3) parental involvement through classroom- or grade-level meetings held periodically during the year. The OBPP also provides guidance about integrating bullying prevention themes across curriculum areas.</p> <p>Individual-Level Components: There are several individual-level components for dealing with individual bullying incidents. The OBPP encourages staff to intervene when bullying is witnessed, suspected, or reported, and provides training so all staff are well prepared to intervene, follow up, and communicate with parents. On-the-spot and follow-up interventions provide staff with actions to take when they witness bullying first-hand and when bullying is reported or suspected but not observed. Interventions are designed to ensure the cessation of the bullying behaviour, to provide support to students who are bullied, and to educate students about behavioural expectations. Individual meetings with student or students who bullied others and separate individual meetings with student who was bullied;</p>



	<p>one initial meeting after incident with follow-up meetings as needed; duration varies based on incident and development level of those involved.</p> <p>Community-Level Components: The community-level components are designed to develop community support for the OBPP so students receive consistent anti-bullying messages in all areas of their lives. Community members are partners in supporting the intervention and can also be members of the Bullying Prevention Coordinating Committee.</p>
Who can deliver it?	<p>OBPP is delivered by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Olweus Bullying Prevention Coordinating Committee (BPCC), a representative group from the school that serves as the leadership team for intervention implementation at the school. This team then meets at least monthly to plan bullying prevention activities; train and motivate staff, students, and parents; and ensure that efforts continue over time. The committee meets approximately one hour per month. • Classroom teachers, who conduct class meetings to discuss bullying, peer relations, and other social and emotional issues with students. Additionally, teacher representatives serve on the Bullying Prevention Coordinating Committee and all staff are encouraged to use a six-step on-the-spot intervention when bullying is witnessed, suspected, or reported. • An administrator, who serves on the Bullying Prevention Coordinating Committee. Additionally, the building administrator may be involved in follow-up discussions with students who were bullied, students who bullied others, and parents of students involved. • A representative from support services personnel should serve on the Bullying Prevention Coordinating Committee. Additionally, all staff are encouraged to use a six-step on-the-spot intervention when bullying is witnessed, suspected, or reported.
What are the training requirements?	<p>Committee members and the administrator have 12 hours of intervention training (followed by 12 to 18 hours of consultation). Classroom teachers and all staff have six hours of intervention training. Booster training of practitioners is recommended.</p>
How are practitioners supervised?	<p>It is recommended that practitioners are supervised through technical assistance consultation by one host-agency supervisor with 40 hours of intervention training.</p>
What are the systems for maintaining fidelity?	<p>Intervention fidelity is maintained through the following processes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Training manual • Other printed material • Other online material • Video or DVD training • Face-to-face training • Fidelity monitoring.



Implementation requirements (Cont.)

Is there a licensing requirement?	No
*Contact details	<p>Contact person: Jan Urbanski</p> <p>Organisation: Clemson University</p> <p>Email address: Jurbans@clemson.edu</p> <p>Website: https://olweus.sites.clemson.edu http://www.violencepreventionworks.org</p> <p>*Please note that this information may not be up to date. In this case, please visit the listed intervention website for up to date contact details.</p>

Evidence summary

Olweus Bullying Prevention Programme's most rigorous evidence comes from three quasi-experimental studies conducted in Norway and the United States, consistent with Foundations' Level 3 evidence strength threshold.

These studies identified statistically significant improvements in child wellbeing and satisfaction with school life, in addition to statistically significant reductions in reports of being bullied, reports of bullying others, and antisocial behaviour.

Olweus Bullying Prevention Programme can be described as evidence-based: it has evidence from at least one rigorously conducted RCT or QED demonstrating a statistically significant positive impact on at least one child outcome, as well as at least one or more RCT or QED.

Child outcomes			
Outcome	Improvement index	Interpretation	Study
Improved wellbeing and satisfaction with school life	N/A	Improvement on a two-item scale of well-being and satisfaction with school life (self-report) – Immediately after the intervention	3
Reduced reports of being bullied	N/A	Improvement on the Olweus Bullying Questionnaire (self-report) – Immediately after the intervention	1,2, 3



Reduced reports of bullying others	N/A	Improvement on the Olweus Bullying Questionnaire (self-report) – Immediately after the intervention	1, 3
Reduced reports of antisocial behaviour	N/A	Improvement on the Olweus Bullying Questionnaire (self-report) – Immediately after the intervention	2

Search and review

	Number of studies
Identified in search	18
Studies reviewed	3
Meeting the L2 threshold	0
Meeting the L3 threshold	3
Contributing to the L4 threshold	0
Ineligible	15

Individual study summary: Study 1

Study 1	
Study design	QED
Country	United States
Sample characteristics	70,998 children aged 8 to 17 years in 210 schools in 49 counties in central and Western Pennsylvania
Race, ethnicities, and nationalities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 62% White • 5% Black or African American • 4.5% Hispanic or Latino



Study 1	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 11.5% Other.
Population risk factors	None reported
Timing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Baseline 2 years post-baseline 3 years post-baseline (for a subset).
Child outcomes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reduced reports of being bullied (Child report) Reduced reports of bullying others (Child report).
Other outcomes	None
Study Rating	3
Citations	<p>Study 1a: Limber, S. P. & Olweus, D. (2019) Evaluation of the Olweus Bullying Prevention Program: A large scale study of U.S. students in Grades 3-11. In P. K. Smith (Ed.), <i>Ways to reduce offline and online bullying in schools: Interventions that work</i>. Routledge.</p> <p>Study 1b: Olweus, D., Limber, S. & Breivik, K. (2019) Addressing different forms of bullying: A large scale evaluation of the Olweus Bullying Prevention Program. <i>International Bullying Prevention Journal</i>. 1, pp. 70–84.</p>

Brief summary

Population characteristics

This study involved 70,998 children aged between 8 and 17 years living in central and Western Pennsylvania. 50.5% of participants were boys, and over half of students were White (62%), with a smaller proportion of Black/African American (5%) and Hispanic/Latino (4.5%) students who participated in the study. 76% of the counties were rural.

Study design

This study adopted a quasi-experimental study design using an extended age cohort design, which compared same-age cohorts within schools across multiple time points. Outcome data was collected both before and after the intervention's implementation from 210 schools. The pre-intervention group served as a comparison, while age-equivalent cohorts were assessed two years later to control for age-related changes in bullying behaviours. Additional data was gathered three years post-implementation from a subset of 92 schools to further evaluate the intervention's impact.

This design is an attempt to capture naturally occurring groups that are likely to be reasonably similar in terms of the outcome variable and related variables before the intervention is delivered.



By comparing age-equivalent cohorts, the study attempts to control for differences in age or ‘maturation’ threats to internal validity (as there is evidence that bully/victim problems change as a function of age).

Measurement

Assessments took place at baseline, post-intervention (two years post baseline), and three year follow-up for a subset of schools.

- **Child report measures** included the Olweus Bullying Questionnaire (OBQ).

Study retention

Two years post-baseline

94.9% (67,374) of children participated in the post-intervention (two years follow-up) assessment.

Three years post-baseline

45.2% (95) of the 210 schools from the initial sample took the survey for up to four consecutive years and were not missing data points, and were included in the three-year follow-up assessment.

Baseline levels of bullying and being bullied (two to three times a month or more) showed only marginal differences between attriters and those who remained in the study, compared to the larger school groups in the full-sample analyses.

In this subsample, 31,620 students completed baseline assessment and 94.1% (29,814) of students completed assessments at three-year follow-up.

Results

Data-analytic strategy

Multivariate analysis using Mplus with students nested within schools, was used to estimate the intervention’s effects on the intended outcomes.

The study addressed missing data by excluding participants with incomplete data at one or more timepoints, and omitting 12th-Grade students due to their smaller sample size. Schools with missing data across four consecutive years were also excluded from the longitudinal sub sample, leaving 95 schools for long-term analysis of changes over three years.

Findings

Participants showed statistically significant reductions in being bullied and bullying others at post-intervention and at three years follow-up.



Study 1: Outcomes table

Outcome	Measure	Effect size	Statistical significance	Number of participants	Measurement time point
Child outcomes					
Being bullied (Grade 3)	OBQ (child report)	OR = 1.20	Yes	16,653	Two years post-baseline
Being bullied (Grade 4)	OBQ (child report)	OR = 1.18	Yes	16,856	Two years post-baseline
Being bullied (Grade 5)	OBQ (child report)	OR = 1.23	Yes	17,630	Two years post-baseline
Being bullied (Grade 6)	OBQ (child report)	OR = 1.23	Yes	22,302	Two years post-baseline
Being bullied (Grade 7)	OBQ (child report)	OR = 1.25	Yes	23,257	Two years post-baseline
Being bullied (Grade 8)	OBQ (child report)	OR = 1.06	No	22, 801	Two years post-baseline
Being bullied (Grade 9)	OBQ (child report)	OR = 1.22	Yes	6,411	Two years post-baseline
Being bullied (Grade 10)	OBQ (child report)	OR = 1.17	No	5,481	Two years post-baseline
Being bullied (Grade 11)	OBQ (child report)	OR = 1.14	No	5,819	Two years post-baseline
Bullying others (Grade 3)	OBQ (child report)	OR = 1.49	Yes	16,386	Two years post-baseline



Outcome	Measure	Effect size	Statistical significance	Number of participants	Measurement time point
Bullying others (Grade 4)	OBQ (child report)	OR = 1.40	Yes	16,639	Two years post-baseline
Bullying others (Grade 5)	OBQ (child report)	OR = 1.64	Yes	17,497	Two years post-baseline
Bullying others (Grade 6)	OBQ (child report)	OR = 1.63	Yes	22,191	Two years post-baseline
Bullying others (Grade 7)	OBQ (child report)	OR = 1.44	Yes	23,163	Two years post-baseline
Bullying others (Grade 8)	OBQ (child report)	OR = 1.42	Yes	22,758	Two years post-baseline
Bullying others (Grade 9)	OBQ (child report)	OR = 1.58	Yes	6,375	Two years post-baseline
Bullying others (Grade 10)	OBQ (child report)	OR = 1.55	Yes	5,455	Two years post-baseline
Bullying others (Grade 11)	OBQ (child report)	OR = 1.47	Yes	5,799	Two years post-baseline
Child outcomes – subsample					
Being bullied (Grades 3–5)	OBQ (child report)	d=1.05	Yes	51,669	Three years post-baseline



Outcome	Measure	Effect size	Statistical significance	Number of participants	Measurement time point
Being bullied (Grades 6–8)	OBQ (child report)	d=0.94	Yes	49,964	Three years post-baseline
Being bullied (Grades 9–11)	OBQ (child report)	d=1.20	Yes	20,433	Three years post-baseline
Bullying others (Grades 3–5)	OBQ (child report)	d=0.75	No	50,996	Three years post-baseline
Bullying others (Grades 6–8)	OBQ (child report)	d=1.30	Yes	49,522	Three years post-baseline
Bullying others (Grades 9–11)	OBQ (child report)	d=1.27	Yes	20,249	Three years post-baseline

Individual study summary: Study 2

Study 2	
Study design	QED
Country	Norway
Sample characteristics	Approximately 2,500 children aged 11 to 14 from 112 Grade 4–7 classes in 42 junior and high schools
Race, ethnicities, and nationalities	Not reported
Population risk factors	None reported



Study 2	
Timing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Baseline (approx. 4 months before intervention) • 1 year post-baseline • 2 years post-baseline.
Child outcomes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reduced reports of being bullied (Child report) • Reduced antisocial behaviour (Child report).
Other outcomes	None
Study Rating	3
Citations	<p>Study 2a: Olweus, D. (1997) Bully/victim problems in school: Facts and intervention. <i>European Journal of Psychology of Education</i>. 12, 495–510.</p> <p>Study 2b: Olweus, D. (1994) Annotation: Bullying at school: Basic facts and effects of a school-based intervention program. <i>Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry</i>. 35, 1171–1190.</p> <p>Study 2c: Olweus, D. & Alsaker, F. D. (1991) Assessing change in a cohort-longitudinal study with hierarchical data. In Magnusson, D., Bergman, L. R., Rudinger, G. & Torestad, B. (Eds.), <i>Problems and methods in longitudinal research: Stability and change</i> (pp. 107–132). Cambridge University Press.</p> <p>Study 2d: Olweus, D. and Kallestad, J.H. (2010) The Olweus Bullying Prevention Program: Classroom effects at different grade levels. In Osterman, K. (Ed.), <i>Research on physical, verbal and indirect aggression</i> (pp. 115–131). Peter Lang.</p> <p>Study 2e: Olweus, D. (1991) Bully/victim problems among schoolchildren: Basic facts and effects of a school-based intervention program. In Pepler, D. and Rubin, K. (Eds.), <i>The development and treatment of childhood aggression</i> (pp. 411–448). Erlbaum.</p> <p>Study 2f: Olweus, D. (1993) <i>Bullying at school: What we know and what we can do</i>. Blackwell.</p> <p>Study 2g: Olweus, D. (1992) Bullying among school children: Intervention and prevention. In Peters, R. D., McMahon, R. J. & Quinsey, V. L. (Eds.) <i>Aggression and violence throughout the life span</i> (pp. 100–125). Sage Publications.</p>



Brief summary

Population characteristics

This study involved approximately 2,500 children aged 11, 12, 13, and 14 for each of the four age/grade cohorts in the study, across 42 schools in Bergen, Norway. There was roughly an equal distribution of boys and girls.

Study design

This study adopted a quasi-experimental study design using an extended age cohort design, which compared same-age cohorts within schools across multiple timepoints. Outcome data was collected on young people before the intervention was implemented – this group acted as a comparison group, and their outcomes were compared to age-equivalent cohorts – whose outcome data was collected almost a year later, after these cohorts had been exposed to the intervention and had become the same age as the comparison group. Data was also collected at a later timepoint, after the intervention had been implemented for approximately two years. There were 600 to 700 children in each of the four grade/age cohorts.

This design is an attempt to capture naturally occurring groups that are likely to be reasonably similar in terms of the outcome variable and related variables before the intervention is delivered. By comparing age-equivalent cohorts, the study attempts to control for differences in age or ‘maturation’ threats to internal validity (as there is evidence that bully/victim problems change as a function of age).

Measurement

Assessments were administered at baseline, post-intervention, and two years post-intervention.

- **Child report measures** included the Olweus Bullying Questionnaire (OBQ) and an antisocial behaviour scale (Olweus, 1989).

Study retention

Study retention was not reported.

Results

Data-analytic strategy

ANOVAs were used to estimate the intervention’s effects on the intended outcomes, with students nested within classes within schools. Complete case analysis was used to handle missing data.

Findings

Participants showed statistically significant reductions in being bullied and antisocial behaviour.



Study 2: Outcomes table

Outcome	Measure	Effect size	Statistical significance	Number of participants	Measurement time point
Child outcomes					
Being bullied	OBQ (Child report)	d = 1.42	Yes	Unclear	One year post-baseline
Being bullied	OBQ (Child report)	Not reported	Yes	Unclear	2 years post-baseline
Antisocial behaviour	antisocial behaviour scale (Child report)	d = 1.12	Yes	Unclear	One year post-baseline
Antisocial behaviour	antisocial behaviour scale (Child report)	Not reported	Yes	Unclear	2 years post-baseline

Individual study summary: Study 3

Study 3	
Study design	QED
Country	Norway
Sample characteristics	27,139 children from 225 elementary schools, between 9 and 14 years old
Race, ethnicities, and nationalities	Not reported
Population risk factors	None reported
Timing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Baseline • 1 year post-baseline.



Study 3	
Child outcomes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Improved wellbeing & satisfaction with school life (Child report) Reduced reports of being bullied (Child report) Reduced reports of bullying others (Child report).
Other outcomes	None
Study Rating	3
Citations	<p>Study 3a: Olweus, D. (2004) The Olweus Bullying Prevention Program: Design and implementation issues and a new national initiative in Norway. In Smith, P. K., Pepler, D. & Rigby, K. (Eds.), <i>Bullying in schools: How successful can interventions be?</i> (pp. 13-36). Cambridge University Press.</p> <p>Study 3b: Olweus, D. (2004b) Bullying at school: Prevalence estimation, a useful evaluation design, and a new national initiative in Norway. <i>Association for Child Psychology and Psychiatry Occasional Papers</i>. 23, 5–17.</p> <p>Study 3c: Olweus, D. (2005) A useful evaluation design, and effects of the Olweus Bullying Prevention Program. <i>Psychology, Crime & Law</i>. 11, 389–402.</p> <p>Study 3d: Olweus, D. & Limber, S. P. (2010b) The Olweus Bullying Prevention Program: Implementation and evaluation over two decades. In Jimerson, S. R., Swearer, S. M. & Espelage, D. L. (Eds.), <i>Handbook of bullying in schools: An international perspective</i> (pp. 377–401). Routledge.</p> <p>Study 3e: Olweus, D. & Limber, S. (2010a) Bullying in school: Evaluation and dissemination. <i>American Journal of Orthopsychiatry</i>. 80 (1), 124–134.</p> <p>Study 3f: Olweus, D. & Limber, S. P. (2019) The Olweus Bullying Prevention Program (OBPP). In Smith, P. K. (Ed.), <i>Making an impact on school bullying: Interventions and recommendations</i> (pp. 23–44). Routledge.</p> <p>Study 3g: Olweus, D., Solberg, M. & Breivik, K. (2020) Long-term school-level effects of the Olweus Bullying Prevention Program (OBPP). <i>Scandinavian Journal of Psychology</i>. 61 (1), 108–116.</p>

Brief summary

Population characteristics

This study involved 27,139 children aged 9 to 14 years across 225 elementary schools in Norway.

Study design

This study adopted a quasi-experimental design using an extended age cohort design, which compared same-age children from six school cohorts across multiple timepoints. For these cohorts, outcome data was collected on young people before the intervention was implemented – this group



acted as a comparison group, and their outcomes were compared to an age-equivalent group, whose outcome data was collected almost a year later, after the children in the group had been exposed to the intervention for eight months and had become the same age as the comparison group.

This design is an attempt to capture naturally occurring groups that are likely to be reasonably similar in terms of the outcome variable and related variables before the intervention is delivered. By comparing age-equivalent cohorts, the study attempts to control for differences in age or ‘maturation’ threats to internal validity (as there is evidence that bully/victim problems change as a function of age).

A follow-up of this study is also included, comparing a subset of the schools two to eight years after original implementation. These schools are organised into treatment group and comparison on the basis of whether they have continued (70 schools) or discontinued (102 schools) use of the Olweus Bully/Victim Questionnaire (where continuation is taken as an indicator that the intervention or at least parts of it are being implemented, and discontinuation is taken as an indicator that the intervention has in subsequent years been implemented to a lesser extent or not at all).

Measurement

Assessments took place at baseline, one year post-baseline, and two to eight years post-implementation.

The following assessments were undertaken at baseline and one year post-baseline:

- **Child report measures** included the Olweus Bullying Questionnaire (OBQ) and a two-item scale of wellbeing/satisfaction with school life.

The following assessments were undertaken at two to eight years post-baseline:

- **Child report measures** included a single item on the National Pupil Survey.

Study retention

99% (26,947) of children participated in the one-year post-baseline assessment.

The number of participants who participated in the two to eight years post-intervention assessment is not reported; 45% (102) of the initial school sample were included in the follow-up study.

Results

Data-analytic strategy

An extended selection cohorts design was used to estimate the intervention’s effects on the intended outcomes, in which developmental or maturational effects are controlled.

For the two to eight years post-intervention, bullying prevalence was analysed using school-level data from the National Pupil Survey by disaggregating the ‘percentage of bullied students’ variable to estimate individual-level distributions. Schools were weighted based on student participation and tested whether bullying rates differed between two school groups over time. Missing data was handled by excluding schools with incomplete implementation data, irregularities (e.g. grade



structure changes), or missing follow-up data from the National Pupil Survey due to non-participation, low student numbers, or school closures. While more B-schools (without continued OBQ use) had missing follow-up data than A-schools, a chi-square test found no significant differences between the two groups.

Findings

Participants showed statistically significant reductions in being bullied and in bullying others at one-year post-baseline, and improved wellbeing and satisfaction with school life, also at one-year post-baseline.

The results from the longitudinal study suggest that schools that continued the routines and principles of the intervention had markedly reduced bullying compared to schools that did not, and also in comparison to the national average for corresponding age groups.

Study 3: Outcomes table

Outcome	Measure	Effect size	Statistical significance	Number of participants	Measurement time point
Child outcomes					
Being bullied	OBQ (child report)	$d = 1.33$	Yes	27,139 (baseline) 26,947 (one year post-baseline)	One year post-baseline
Bullying other students	OBQ (child report)	$d = 1.19$	Yes	27,139 (baseline) 26,947 (one year post-baseline)	One year post-baseline
Improved wellbeing and satisfaction with school life	Two item scale of wellbeing/satisfaction with school life (child report)	$d = .69$	Yes	26,947	One year post-baseline



Other studies

The following studies were identified for this intervention but did not count towards the intervention's overall evidence rating. An intervention receives the same rating as its most robust study or studies.

Amundsen, E. J. & Ravndal, E. (2010) Does successful school-based prevention of bullying influence substance use among 13- to 16-year-olds? *Drugs: Education, Prevention and Policy*. 17 (1), 42–54.

Bauer, N. S., Lozano, P. & Rivara, F. P. (2007) The effectiveness of the Olweus Bullying Prevention Program in public middle schools: A controlled trial. *Journal of Adolescent Health*. 40 (3), 266–274.

Black, S. A. & Jackson, E. (2007) Using bullying incident density to evaluate the Olweus Bullying Prevention Programme. *School Psychology International*. 28, 623–638.

Bowllan, N. M. (2011) Implementation and evaluation of a comprehensive, school-wide bullying prevention program in an urban/suburban middle school. *Journal of School Health*. 81 (4), 167–173.

Eslea, M. (1998) The long-term effectiveness of anti-bullying work in primary schools. *Educational Research*. 40, 203–218.

Limber, S. P., Nation, M., Tracy, A. J., Melton, G. B. & Flerx, V. (2004) Implementation of the Olweus Bullying Prevention programme in the southeastern United States. In Smith, P. K. Pepler, D. & Rigby, K. (eds.) *Bullying in schools: How successful can interventions be?* (pp. 55–79). Cambridge University Press.

Limber, S. P., Olweus, D., Masiello, M., Molnar-Main, S. & Moore, D. (2012) *Evaluation of the Olweus Bullying Prevention Program in a large scale study in Pennsylvania* (Unpublished report).

Melton, G. B., Limber, S. P., Cunningham, P., Osgood, D. W., Chambers, J., et al. (1998) *Violence among rural youth. Final report to the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention*. US Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention.

Olweus, D. (2005) A useful evaluation design, and effects of the Olweus Bullying Prevention Program. *Psychology, Crime & Law*. 11, 389–402.

Olweus, D. (1999) Noen hovedresultater fra Det nye Bergensprosjektet mot mobbing og antisosial atferd. [Some key results from The New Bergen Project against Bullying and Antisocial Behaviour.] Manuscript. HEMIL-senteret, Universitetet i Bergen.

Olweus, D. (2005) *New positive results with the Olweus Bullying Prevention Program in 37 Oslo schools*. The HEMIL-Center, University of Bergen.

O'Moore, A. M. & Minton, S. J. (2005) Evaluation of the effectiveness of an anti-bullying programme in primary schools. *Aggressive Behavior*. 31, 609–622.



Pagliocca, P. M., Limber, S. P. & Hashima, P. (2007) *Evaluation report for the Chula Vista Olweus Bullying Prevention Program*. Chula Vista Police Department.

Schroeder, B. A., Messina, A., Schroeder, D., Good, K., Barto, S., Saylor, J. & Masiello, M. (2011) The implementation of a statewide bullying prevention program: Preliminary findings from the field and the importance of coalitions. *Health Promotion Practice*. 13 (4), 489–95.

Smith, P. K. (1997) Bullying in schools: The UK experience and the Sheffield anti-bullying project. *The Irish Journal of Psychology*. 18, 191–201.

Whitney, I., & Smith, P. K. (1993) A survey of the nature and extent of bullying in junior/middle and secondary schools. *Educational Research*. 35, 3–25.

Yaakub, N. F., Haron, F. & Leong, G. C. (2010) Examining the efficacy of the Olweus prevention programme in reducing bullying: The Malaysian experience. *Procedia Social and Behavioral Sciences*. 5, 595–598.

—

Note on provider involvement: This provider has agreed to Foundations’ terms of reference (or the Early Intervention Foundation’s terms of reference), and the assessment has been conducted and published with the full cooperation of the intervention provider.