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MACROSYSTEM (overarching beliefs and values, social and cultural norms)

EXOSYSTEM (community environments, networks, and formal systems)

MESOSYSTEM (interactions between microsystems, indirect influence)

MICROSYSTEM (context directly influencing youth: family, peers)

INDIVIDUAL (sex, age)

(Bronfenbrenner, 1979)
Presentation Overview

- Current research on the effectiveness of community-based bullying prevention and related fields
  - Social and cultural norms

- Challenges to community-based participatory research (CBPR)

- Translating knowledge into policy or practice
Most community-based programs are not evidence-based programs
  - Glasgow, Lichtenstein, & Marcus, 2003; Ringwalt et al., 2009; Saul et al., 2008; Woolf, 2008

What works is not effectively communicated to practitioners
  - Kerner & Hall, 2009; Saul et al., 2008

Limited research on which community-level factors most affect bullying outcomes
  - Swearer et al., 2006
• **Promising:** meets minimum standard of effectiveness
  - Intervention specificity, evaluation quality, intervention impact, dissemination readiness

• **Model:** meets a higher standard and provides greater confidence in the program’s impact on outcomes
  - Minimum of (a) two high quality randomized controlled trials (RCT) or (b) one high quality RCT and one high quality quasi-experimental evaluation
  - Positive intervention impact sustained for a minimum of 12 months after the program intervention ends
Evidence Based Community Programs

- **Big Brothers/Big Sisters of America (BBBSA)**
  - (Tierney et al., 1995, 1998)
  - Indicated, promising to effective

- **Communities that Care (CTC)**
  - (Hawkins et al., 2012, 2007; Feinberg et al., 2007)
  - Universal, promising

- **Multidimensional Treatment Foster Care (MTFC)**
  - (e.g., Leve, Kerr, & Harold, 2013; Rhoades et al., 2013; VanRyzin & Leve, 2012)
  - Indicated, model/effective
BBBSA Outcomes

- Cuts illicit drug initiation 46%
- Reduces alcohol initiation 27%*
- Less likely to hit someone.
- Significant reductions in truancy and cutting class.
- Significant program effects on risk and protective factors:
  - Improvements in quality of relationship with parents and marginally significant improvements for peer emotional support.
  - Positive effects on competency about schoolwork

*marginally significant

Tierney, Grossman, and Resch, 1995
COMMUNITIES THAT CARE
CTC Outcomes

- Reductions in self-reported violent behaviors at the 1-year follow up
  - 13.2% CTC vs. 17.7% control; OR = .71
    - Hawkins et al., 2012

- Compared to youths in the comparison group, CTC youth were
  - 25% less likely to have initiated delinquent behavior
  - 32% less likely to have initiated alcohol use
  - 33% less likely to have initiated cigarette use

  Brown et al., 2013; Feinberg et al., 2010; Hawkins, Brown, et al., 2008
The goal of the MTFC program is to decrease problem behavior and to increase developmentally appropriate normative and prosocial behavior in children and adolescents who are in need of out-of-home placement. Youth come to MTFC via referrals from the juvenile justice, foster care, and mental health systems.
### MTFC Outcomes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Boys</th>
<th>Girls</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>12 months after baseline</strong></td>
<td><strong>12 months after baseline</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Incarcerated 60% fewer days</td>
<td>- Fewer days in locked settings, fewer criminal referrals, lower caregiver-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Fewer subsequent arrests</td>
<td>reported delinquency, and more time on homework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Two years after enrollment</strong></td>
<td><strong>24 months after baseline</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Fewer violent offense referrals (21% in MTFC vs. 38% of controls)</td>
<td>- Reductions on a combined measure of days spent in locked settings, criminal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Fewer self-reported violent offenses (10.5 incidents for MTFC</td>
<td>referrals, and self-reported delinquency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>group vs. 32.6 incidents for control group)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Kerr et al. 2009
Community-Based Participatory Research Factors

- **Buy-in**
  - relationship building, engaging gatekeepers, trust, communication, ROI

- **Capacity**

- **Sustainable**

- **Cultural responsive**
  - PARTNERS youth violence prevention program
  - Leff et al., 2010
Challenges to Community Based Participatory Research

- Meeting standards of effectiveness
  - Balancing demands for systematic implementation of community-based interventions while being responsive to the immediate needs of the community.

- Generalizability across contexts and communities
  - Strict monitoring of the integrity of the intervention implementation are necessary to arrive at a scientifically successful and generalizable program.

- Community defined success

(Leff et al., 2010; Leff, Hoffman, Gullan, 2009)
Translating knowledge into policy or practice

- Teacher credentialing initiative
- Voluntary accreditation process for community based organizations
- Movements like STRYVE