

# Lesson Learned From the Olweus Bullying Prevention Program and KiVa: A Narrative Review

Ihsana Sabriani Borualogo<sup>\*1</sup>,  
Sulisworo Kusdiyati<sup>2</sup>, Hedi Wahyudi<sup>3</sup>  
<sup>1,2,3</sup>Faculty of Psychology, Universitas Islam Bandung

Submitted 25 March 2021 Accepted 8 August 2021 Published 27 June 2022

**Abstract.** Bullying is a severe problem that affects students' mental health. The number of bullying incidents in Indonesia is still high, most likely because the country has not had bullying prevention and intervention programs implemented holistically in all aspects at school. Indonesia's bullying prevention and intervention programs have been primarily implemented sectorally, only for certain students when incidents have been observed. Two bullying prevention intervention programs that have been tested multinationally, the Olweus Bullying Prevention Program and KiVa, have been proven effective. The aims of this study are twofold: to explain the effectiveness and evaluation of these two stated programs and to give insights for Indonesian researchers interested in developing comprehensive bullying intervention and prevention programs. Discussions are focused on developing the prevention and intervention programs, the implementation of the programs, and the evaluation to test program effectiveness. Results show the importance of involving all school components, integration with the school curriculum, national implementation, and using the programs over an extended period. Evaluation of the programs' effectiveness is also essential, with a randomized controlled trial recommended for doing so.

**Keywords:** bullying; intervention; KiVa; OBPP; school

## Introduction

Studies on school bullying originated in the Scandinavian countries with the publication of Olweus (1978) book *Aggression in the Schools: Bullies and Whipping Boys*. Since then, research has expanded into several European (i.e., Finland, the United Kingdom, and Ireland) and Asian countries (e.g., Japan) (P. K. Smith & Brain, 2000). Studies on bullying have become more global due to the increasing numbers of bullying incidents in many countries worldwide (Haner & Lee, 2017).

Although school bullying has become a global problem, researchers still debate the definition of bullying (Volk et al., 2014; Younan, 2019). As a pioneer of the study, Olweus (1978, 1993) stated, "a student is being bullied or victimized when he or she is exposed repeatedly and over time to negative actions on the part of one or more other students. This definition is the most commonly used in bullying studies (Volk et al., 2014). Researchers have agreed that bullying is an aggressive behavior intended to harm

\*Address for correspondence: ihsana.sabriani@unisba.ac.id

another person, that is done repeatedly in interpersonal relationships, characterized by an imbalance of power between the perpetrator and the victim (Menesini & Salmivalli, 2017; Olweus & Limber, 2010a, 2010b; P. K. Smith, 2016; Ttofi & Farrington, 2010; Volk et al., 2014). Olweus (1993) emphasized three characteristics in determining bullying behavior: intended harmful behavior, repetition of that behavior, and an imbalance of power between the perpetrators and the victims. P. K. Smith (2016) emphasized two defining criteria to separate bullying from the more ordinary aggressive behaviors, such as fights between persons who are relatively equally matched.

Through a systematic literature review, Younan (2019) found that researchers consistently agreed that to label behaviors as bullying, they need to be aggressive, intentional, repetitive, involve a power imbalance, and be unprovoked—all in favor of the perpetrator. Although not all researchers included all five characteristics in defining bullying, they all used at least one of the five in their definitions (Younan, 2019).

Debate on the definition of bullying is also related to perspectives of participants in bullying studies. Differences in definition could affect the results of studies (Younan, 2019). Younan (2019) found that the definitions that come from younger participants (4–8 years old) are different from definitions that come from older participants (14 years and older). Younger participants could only differentiate aggressive and nonaggressive behavior, while older participants were able to differentiate aggressive and nonaggressive behavior, physical and nonphysical bullying. Older participants could also identify power imbalance and repetition.

Since there are different perspectives on the definition of bullying among researchers and participants in bullying studies, it is essential to include the definition of bullying in the questionnaires used in any given study (Younan, 2019). It is also recommended that researchers conduct bullying interventions to assure participants' understanding of the definition of bullying used in the study. Therefore, researchers need to explain the definition of bullying and its characteristics to participants (Younan, 2019).

Bullying is a severe problem for children worldwide. Studies have shown that bullying affects individuals' lives negatively. Bullying increases individual problems (Lebrun-Harris et al., 2018; Reijntjes et al., 2010) and loneliness (Eslea et al., 2004; Juvonen et al., 2000; Schäfer et al., 2004), decreases children's self-esteem, causes a negative perception of the self (Boulton et al., 2010; Choi & Park, 2021), lowers the subjective well-being of victims (Borualogo, 2021; Borualogo & Casas, 2021), increases symptoms of post-traumatic stress (Baldry et al., 2018), and even increases suicidal ideation (Baiden & Tadeo, 2020; Barzilay et al., 2017; Ford et al., 2017; Hinduja & Patchin, 2018).

Moore et al. (2017) explained the results of a systematic literature review and a meta-analysis of 165 articles on the consequences of bullying on children and youths. They found that child and youth bullying victims experience mental illness, including depression, anxiety, psychotic symptoms, suicidal ideas and attempts, drug abuse, somatic symptoms (e.g., stomachache, headache, and sleeping difficulties), and lower academic achievement. Children and youths who experienced victimization more frequently showed a greater possibility (32.6%) of being depressed than those who were only sometimes victimized (17.8%) (Moore et al., 2017). Suicide attempts increased by 37.7% in children

and youths who experienced more frequent bullying victimization (Moore et al., 2017). These results show how severe bullying can affect children's and youths' mental health; therefore, it is essential to take steps to decrease the number of bullying incidents.

Bullying is also related to human rights. The Convention on the Rights of the Child (CRC), (United Nations Human Rights, 1989) article 19, paragraph 1 states, "*States Parties shall take all appropriate legislative, administrative, social and educational measures to protect the child from all forms of physical or mental violence, injury or abuse, neglect or negligent treatment, maltreatment or exploitation, including sexual abuse, while in the care of parent(s), legal guardian(s), or other person who has care of the child.*"

The Finnish Basic Education Act of 1998 states that each and every student has the right to a safe school environment (Herkama et al., 2017). In 2003, the law was further amended to specify that "*the education provider shall draw up a plan, in connection with curriculum design, for safeguarding pupils against violence, bullying, and harassment, execute the plan, and supervise adherence to it and its implementation.*" (Finlex, 2010).

The Indonesian government also takes the number of school bullying incidents in the country seriously, which is among the highest in Asia (Borualogo & Gumilang, 2019; Borualogo et al., 2020a). The Indonesian government regulates prevention and overcoming violence in school through the Regulation of Ministry of Education and Culture number 82 of 2015 (Indonesian Ministry of Education and Culture, 2015). Moreover, Article 9 of Law Number 35 of 2014 concerning child protection states that every child has the right to protection from sexual harassment and violence by teachers, education staff, other students, and/or other parties in any educational institution (Setyawan, 2014). These ministerial regulations and laws show that the Indonesian government is very serious about preventing bullying.

Studies on bullying have been conducted for more than 40 years, following up on concerns of the United Nations and several countries, including Indonesia, regarding child protection. But studies on the effectiveness of intervention programs to overcome bullying are still scarce. Among these programs are the Olweus Bullying Prevention Program (OBPP; Olweus and Limber (2010a, 2010b), the Finnish Anti-Bullying Program (Salmivalli et al., 2005), the Greek Anti-Bullying Program (Andreou et al., 2007), the Kiusaamista Vastan KiVa (Salmivalli et al., 2010a; Salmivalli et al., 2011) and the Respect program (Ertesvåg & Vaaland, 2007).

Through a meta-analysis of 66 studies, Zych et al. (2015) uncovered inconsistent findings on the effectiveness of anti-bullying programs. According to Gaffney et al. (2019), these inconsistent findings were associated with differences in methodological designs, types of programs, and geographical areas where the programs were implemented. A meta-analysis on the effectiveness of OBPP in Norway and the United States by Gaffney et al. (2021) showed significant variations in effectiveness between the US and Norway programs. Gaffney et al. (2021) found that cultural differences impacted the success of anti-bullying programs, particularly OBPP and KiVa. According to Gaffney et al. (2021), OBPP was designed and implemented in Norway; therefore, it is not surprising that the OBPP is very effective in decreasing the number of bullying incidents in Norway, compared to the effectiveness of

the program in the United States. OBPP did show effectiveness when implemented in the United States; however, it decreased by only 11–25% the number of bullying incidents by perpetrators against victims, significantly lower than the 29–35% reduction in cases of bullying in Norway (Gaffney et al., 2021).

Gaffney et al. (2021) suspected that, in addition to cultural factors, these differences could be attributed to different evaluation methodologies implemented to examine the effectiveness of OBPP in these two countries. However, the discrepancies most likely reflect cultural and societal differences between children and youths in Norway and the United States (Gaffney et al., 2021).

In contrast, studies on KiVa show different interesting findings. The evaluation of KiVa in Finland (a country origin of KiVa) shows that the program was effective in decreasing by 4–6% the number of bullying incidents for perpetrators and victims (Gaffney et al., 2021). However, when the program was implemented in Italy, the effect sizes were much larger, with a decrease of 15–25% in the number of bullying incidents for perpetrators and victims (Gaffney et al., 2021).

Gaffney et al. (2021) reported that OBPP and KiVa significantly decreased the number of bullying incidents, with variation in the effect size because of different evaluation methodologies and implementation. Therefore, according to Gaffney et al. (2021), further studies are needed to investigate why OBPP and KiVa are more effective in certain sample groups than in others.

In a meta-analysis, Gaffney et al. (2021) examined four intervention programs (KiVa, NoTrap!, OBPP, and ViSC) and found that, collectively, the OBPP is the most effective program in decreasing the amount of school bullying perpetration by 26%. KiVa decreases the amount of school bullying perpetration by 9% and school bullying victimization by 11%. NoTrap! decreases the amount of school bullying perpetration by 22%; however, this result is not statistically significant (Gaffney et al., 2021). In contrast, ViSC increases the number of cases by 4%, although it is also not statistically significant.

Zych et al. (2015) conducted a meta-analysis to investigate the effectiveness of the components of several anti-bullying programs. According to Zych et al. (2015), the highly effective components of anti-bullying programs for victims are programs that do not include working with peers assignments, that use discipline methods, that include training and meetings with parents, that have a teacher-training piece that lasts four or more days, that use videos, that include cooperative group works, and that have a duration of 270 days or more for the children, an intensity of 20 hours or more for the children, and an intensity for teachers of 10 hours or more. Lee et al. (2013) found elements with a significant effect size for the anti-bullying program for victims: emotional control training, counseling with peers, and a school's anti-bullying policy.

Zych et al. (2015) also explained the effectiveness of program components for perpetrators. Highly effective programs for perpetrators include training and meetings with parents, playground supervision, intensity for children of 20 hours or more, intensity for teachers of 10 hours or more, a duration for children of 270 days or more, use of discipline methods, a duration for teachers of four days or more, incorporating classroom management, including training for teachers, applying class rules and school policy, conducting school conferences, providing information to parents, and including cooperative group works. Zych et al. (2015) noted that these high effect size components are

found in OBPP and KiVa.

Based on studies by Gaffney et al. (2021) and Zych et al. (2015), it can be concluded that among several anti-bullying intervention programs, OBPP and KiVa have high effect size and success in decreasing the number of bullying incidents. This conclusion also supports studies conducted by Olweus et al. (2019) and P. K. Smith (2016). They reported that two programs have been tested internationally using randomized control trials (RCTs); they have effectively decreased by 50% of the number of bullying incidents and have been implemented in many European countries and the United States. These two programs are OBPP (Olweus & Limber, 2010a, 2010b) and KiVa (Herkama et al., 2017; Salmivalli et al., 2010a; Salmivalli et al., 2011). Therefore, this paper aims to compare the two programs, learn about their effective methods of decreasing the number of bullying incidents, and implement them in developing anti-bullying intervention programs for Indonesian contexts.

#### *Olweus Bullying Prevention Program (OBPP)*

The Norway Ministry of Education initiated a national campaign against school bullying. Later, Olweus developed the OBPP (Olweus & Limber, 2010a, 2010b) in 1983 to address bullying cases in Norway. There are four critical principles of OBPP. Adults (both parents and teachers) should (1) function as positive role models who (2) show warmth and positive interest in their students/children but (3) also set firm limits regarding unacceptable behavior and (4) consistently use nonphysical and non-hostile negative consequences when rules are broken (Olweus & Limber, 2010a, 2010b; P. K. Smith, 2016).

The OBPP was initially implemented in Bergen in the First Bergen Project Against Bullying. Because this project was part of a national campaign, it was not possible to conduct an RCT experimental study with schools randomly chosen as treatment and control groups (Olweus & Limber, 2010a, 2010b). Therefore, the initially implemented longitudinal study followed approximately 2,500 students for 2.5 years, from 1983 to 1985 (Olweus & Limber, 2010a). After eight months of intervention, bullying victimization decreased by 62% and bullying perpetration decreased by 33%. After 20 months of intervention, bullying victimization had decreased by 64% and bullying perpetration had decreased by 52% (Olweus & Limber, 2010a). The results also show a decreasing amount of antisocial behavior and improvement in the school climate, including improved student satisfaction with school life, improved order and discipline, more positive social relationships, and a more positive attitude toward school (Olweus & Limber, 2010a). These results indicate that OBPP effectively decreases the number of bullying incidents (Ttofi & Farrington, 2010) dramatically and that researchers should be encouraged to implement the program in the UK, Canada, and Belgium (P. K. Smith, 2016). OBPP is a multilevel program implemented for students, schools, classrooms, and the community. OBPP was specifically designed as a school bullying intervention program with three main goals: (1) decreasing the number of bullying incidents between students at school, (2) preventing the new bullying incidents, and (3) improving good relationships among peers at school (Olweus & Limber, 2010a, 2010b). These three main goals can be achieved by restructuring the school environment to reduce opportunities for bullying and strengthening relationships and togetherness between students and teachers and other

adults in the school environment (Olweus & Limber, 2010a, 2010b).

OBPP is based on four main principles by which adults at school, as well as adults at home, should (1) show warmth and positive interest in students, (2) set firm boundaries against unacceptable behavior, (3) consistently use nonphysical consequences and harmless negative consequences when rules are violated, and (4) demonstrate the function of authority and positive role models (Olweus & Limber, 2010a, 2010b). These four principles have been translated into several specific interventions at four levels, namely school, the classroom, individual, and community (Olweus & Limber, 2010a). OBPP provides two pieces of intervention literature, namely manuals for teachers and information for parents and families (Ttofi & Farrington, 2009). OBPP also provides: (1) CD program used to conduct pre-test data assessment and analysis, so that specific intervention can be implemented; (2) bullying videos; (3) perpetrator/victim questionnaire revised by Olweus; (4) a book by Olweus (1993) on bullying in school (Ttofi & Farrington, 2009).

Table 1 presents components of the OBPP at each level as explained by Olweus and Limber (2010a). Although these four principles and components are constants, several studies have been conducted to adapt the program for different cultural contexts (Olweus & Limber, 2010a).

**Table 1**  
*Components of The Olweus Bullying Prevention Program (Olweus & Limber, 2010a)*

---

School-Level Components	
	Establish A Bullying Prevention Coordinating Committee (BPCC).
	Conduct Training for The BPCC and All Staff.
	Administer The Olweus Bullying Questionnaire (for students in grades 3–12).
	Hold Staff Discussion Group Meetings.
	Introduce The School Rules Against Bullying.
	Review And Refine The School’s Supervisory System, For Example, Increasing Supervision in Playground Areas, Supervising Break Times, and Improving Facilities in The Playground Areas.
	Hold A School-Wide Event to Launch The Program.
	Involve Parents in Discussing Bullying.
Classroom-Level Components	
	Deliver and Enforce School-Wide Rules Against Bullying.
	Hold Regular (weekly) Class Meetings to Discuss Bullying and Related Topics.
	Hold Class-Level Meetings With Students’ Parents.
Individual-Level Components	
	Supervise Students’ Activities.
	Ensure That All Staff Intervene on The Spot When Bullying is Observed.
	Meet With Students Involved in Bullying (separately for those who are bullied and who bully).
	Meet With Parents of Involved Students.
	Develop Individual Intervention Plans for Involved Students, as Needed.

**Table 1 (Continued)**

*Components of The Olweus Bullying Prevention Program (Olweus & Limber, 2010a)*

---

Community-Level Components

Involve Community Members on The Bullying Prevention Coordinating Committee (BPCC).

Develop School-Community Partnerships to Support The School's Program.

Help to Spread Anti-Bullying Messages and Principles of Best Practice in The Community.

---

*Evaluation on OBPP*

Results of a three-year longitudinal study by Olweus et al. (2019) with 30,000 students in grades 3–11 from 95 schools in Pennsylvania showed that OBPP significantly decreased the number of bullying incidents in all bullying indicators (verbal, physical, relational, and cyberbullying).

*KiVa*

KiVa stands for *Kiusaamista Vastaan*, which is the Finnish for “against bullying” (Salmivalli & Poskiparta, 2012). KiVa was developed by Salmivalli and colleagues from the University of Turku in Finland in 2006 (Salmivalli et al., 2011).

KiVa was developed based on studies on the roles of peers as bystanders. Results of these studies showed that the ways bystanders witness bullying affect and strengthen bullying perpetration (Sainio et al., 2019). KiVa was developed to influence the entire peer group, reduce the social reinforcement of bullies, and increase support for victims. Bullying should be discussed with all students to make them aware that they may become involved in bullying, allow bullying to occur, or even increase the incidence of bullying; therefore, all students need to make changes to stop bullying (Sainio et al., 2019).

KiVa includes universal interventions (for all students), targeted intervention (for students involved in bullying), and monitoring the school climate (Sainio et al., 2019).

The universal intervention is for all school components, including all students, school staff, teachers, and parents (Sainio et al., 2019). The universal intervention involves student lessons (for primary school students) and theme days (for secondary school students), involving discussions, videos, and exercises done in dyads or small groups (P. K. Smith, 2016). A KiVa lesson is delivered to students three times during primary school: in the first grade (unit 1), in the fourth grade (unit 2), and in the seventh grade (unit 3) during the transition to secondary school (Sainio et al., 2019). The lessons aim to improve awareness of bullying and that everybody has the responsibility to provide constructive responses while witnessing bullying, to increase empathy toward victims, and to support the victims (Sainio et al., 2019). Methods used are discussion, watching short videos, exercise, and playing age-appropriate individual online games (Sainio et al., 2019). Students also use an anti-bullying virtual learning environment (a computer game for primary school students) and internet forum (for secondary school students) closely connected to the topics of the student lessons (for primary school students) and themes (for secondary school students) (P. K. Smith, 2016). Each level of the KiVa computer game includes three modules: (1) *I know* (students are presented with facts about

bullying), (2) *I can* (students practice the skills they have learned), and (3) *I do* (encourages students to transfer knowledge and skills acquired in the virtual environment into real-life interactions with their peers) (P. K. Smith, 2016).

For teachers, KiVa provides online training to introduce the program. Schools recommend routine teacher and school staff meetings to discuss how to implement KiVa. For parents, KiVa provides a presentation that introduces the program, leaflets with information about KiVa, and online and printed book guidelines (Sainio et al., 2019).

The targeted interventions utilize school-based KiVa teams of three adults who deal with incidents referred to them. In addition, each classroom teacher meets with selected high-status classmates of the victims, asking them to support the victims. The reasons for asking for support from the high-status classmates are that they can have much more influence and impact as defenders of the victims than those with a lower status (P. K. Smith, 2016).

KiVa uses the internet (including online questionnaires with a password and web-based forum for teachers) and teaches about the environment visually (for example, computer games about bullying) to change students' attitudes toward bullying (Ttofi & Farrington, 2010). All materials are well-structured and connected with learning activities with specific goals. The KiVa program includes discussion in the classroom, teamwork, short movies about bullying, and role-playing. Teachers are trained and wear a particular vest in school areas to increase their visibility (Sainio et al., 2019). The program also involves peer support for victims and cooperative groups involving experts to assist in dealing with students involved in bullying. Parents are informed and advised about bullying to guide students to avoid bullying behavior (Sainio et al., 2019).

KiVa provides an online survey for students and teachers to monitor the program. The survey for students asks about bullying and school well-being. Students and teachers are also asked about how KiVa is implemented at school. The survey results are used for feedback for schools to improve the anti-bullying program (Sainio et al., 2019).

#### *Evaluation of KiVa*

KiVa was examined using RCT in 2007–2008, and it managed to decrease the number of bullying incidents nationally in Finland (P. K. Smith, 2016). This assessment involved 30,000 students from 117 schools as treatment groups and 117 as control groups (Sainio et al., 2019). The most significant effect has been observed among fourth-grade students (aged 10). In addition, teachers also feel the impact of the intervention and improve their competency in dealing with bullying, and students perceive that teachers are more disapproving of bullying (Sainio et al., 2019).



**Table 2**  
*Summary of The Comparison Between OBPP and KiVa*

	OBPP	KiVa
Production year	1983	2006
Designers	The Norway Ministry of Education initiated it through a school anti-bullying campaign. Dan Olweus developed OBPP.	The University of Turku in Finland developed the program, which was a collaboration between the department of psychology and the research center of that university. The Finnish Ministry of Education and Culture funded the project.
Target of age	7-18-year-olds (Grades 1-12)	7-15-year-olds (Grades 1-9)
The first experiment	It was tested at the First Bergen Project Against Bullying. A longitudinal study with 2,500 students participated for 2.5 years, from 1983 to 1985. Participants were students in grades 5-8 from 112 classes of 28 elementary schools and 14 secondary schools in Bergen, Norway.	In 2007-2008, the first experiment was conducted using a randomized controlled trial (RCT). Participants were more than 8,000 grades 4-6 elementary school students from 78 schools in Finland.
Bullying contexts	School anti-bullying program	School anti-bullying program
Goals	Three main goals: (1) decreasing the number of bullying incidents that have happened between students at school, (2) preventing new bullying incidents, and (3) improving good relationships among peers at school.	Three main goals: (1) bullying prevention, (2) effectively dealing with acute bullying cases, (3) minimizing the negative effects of bullying.
Basic approach	The restructuring of the school environment is based on four key principles that translate into several specific interventions at four levels: school, classroom, individual, and community context.	A participant-role approach by giving it to all students (universal actions) and to students who are involved both as perpetrators and victims (indicated actions) based on three main elements: (1) prevention, (2) intervention, and (3) monitoring.

## Discussion

Results show that OBPP and KiVa are two school bullying prevention programs that decrease bullying incidents by more than 50% (P. K. Smith, 2016; Ttofi & Farrington, 2009). Although results are inconsistent in several countries (Gaffney et al., 2021; Zych et al., 2015), several meta-analyses and literature reviews show that OBPP and KiVa are two of the most successful bullying prevention program internationally (Gaffney et al., 2021; P. K. Smith, 2016; Ttofi & Farrington, 2009, 2010; Vreeman & Carroll, 2007; Zych et al., 2015) because they have already been implemented in many elementary and secondary schools and analyzed using RCT. For example, KiVa has been put into practice in the Netherlands (Huitsing et al., 2020), Chile (Gaete et al., 2017), Wales, the UK (Axford et al., 2020), New Zealand (Green et al., 2019), and France (Garandeau & Salmivalli, 2018). OBPP is in use in Latin America (Limber et al., 2018; Olweus et al., 2019) and Germany (Ossa et al., 2020). Even though media reports may give the impression that the number of school bullying incidents is increasing, bullying actually appears to be on decline in many countries that have implemented OBPP and/or KiVa (P. K. Smith, 2016). This paper aims to discuss factors that contribute to OBPP and KiVa so that they can be used as lessons for developing a bullying prevention intervention program in Indonesia. The discussion will focus on developing the intervention programs, program implementation, intervention components that are effective in reducing the number of incidents, and evaluation to test program effectiveness.

### *Developing The Intervention Program*

#### *The Importance of Theoretical Background*

Ttofi and Farrington (2009) criticized several anti-bullying programs developed without a strong theoretical background. They noted that several anti-bullying programs use only common sense; therefore, they fail to overcome bullying.

Ttofi and Farrington (2009, 2010) conducted a meta-analysis to evaluate 30 anti-bullying programs. Their study identified OBPP and KiVa as two programs that had garnered positive reviews (Ttofi & Farrington, 2009, 2010). These two programs are based on a solid theoretical background and the results of bullying research conducted by researchers who designed the programs (Olweus & Limber, 2010a; Sainio et al., 2019).

Olweus studied bullying since 1978, and based on those studies, he developed OBPP in 1983 (Olweus & Limber, 2010a). Ttofi and Farrington (2009) called OBPP the most effective bullying intervention program because it is based on a strong theoretical background and supported by research results. They suggested that OBPP can be used as the basis for developing anti-bullying programs in the future.

OBPP is aligned with KiVa, which was developed using data from years of studies undertaken by Salmivalli and colleagues, particularly studies on the role of peers as bystanders (Salmivalli et al., 2010b; Salmivalli, 1999; Salmivalli et al., 2004; Salmivalli et al., 1998).

Based on these results, Indonesian researchers need to use a robust theoretical background on

bullying and victimization when developing prevention and anti-bullying programs. Heirman and Walrave (2012) suggested using the theory of planned behavior, while Bickmore (2010) recommended using programming and policy theories. P. K. Smith (2017) proposed using the theory of mind to explain the roles of students involved in bullying. This theory can explain antisocial behaviors and student skill deficiencies that produce bullying victims.

#### *Involving All School Components*

Olweus and Limber (2010a) explained several causes of bullying: (1) characteristics of personality or typical reaction patterns, (2) individual physical strengths or weaknesses, (3) environmental factors, such as attitudes and behaviors of adults in a school that play essential roles in determining the extent to which bullying will occur, and (4) peer attitudes and behavior as a manifestation of group processes and mechanisms. Brewer et al. (2018) stated that fear of violence and observing hate words and symbols are also predictors of school bullying. A meta-analysis Zych et al. (2015) also revealed aligned results in which individual factors (such as empathy) and school climate are protective factors of bullying.

OBPP and KiVa included these predictors in developing bullying intervention programs. OBPP and KiVa are oriented to students and involve all school components and designing programs for students, school staff, teachers, and parents (Olweus & Limber, 2010a; P. K. Smith, 2016). A meta-analysis by Zych et al. (2015) also showed teachers' and parents' high effectiveness in anti-bullying programs. Brewer et al. (2018) also emphasized the importance of the involvement of all school components, communities, and all students to succeed in the prevention programs. Based on a meta-analysis, Lee et al. (2013) found that including an anti-bullying school policy was one of the elements that worked to help the program achieve success. A study in Indonesia also shows that parents are a significant predictor of children's involvement in bullying (Borualogo et al., 2020b). Parenting styles and children's perception that parents adequately hear them relate to children's involvement in bullying (Borualogo, 2021). A Study in Indonesia shows that perpetrators perceive their parents rejected them, while victims perceive overprotective parents (Borualogo, 2021). Researchers are encouraged to take these different parenting styles into account in developing anti-bullying programs involving parents, mainly to provide parents with significant ways to contribute and to participate actively in decreasing bullying incidents.

One factor that makes OBPP and KiVa successful is that these two programs are part of the school curriculum (Olweus & Limber, 2010a; P. K. Smith, 2016). Ttofi and Farrington (2010) suggest that researchers who develop bullying prevention programs should also consider the costs incurred in implementing the programs into the school curriculum so that policymakers are willing to implement the prevention program in the educational curriculum.

For Indonesian contexts, involving all school components in the anti-bullying programs is essential. Involved parents are also needed in the programs so that parents can understand the problem and stop their children from perpetrating bullying (Borualogo, 2021). Researchers need to include anti-bullying school rules and make the programs a part of the school curriculum, or to at least make

anti-bullying programs regular events that are evaluated regularly.

#### *Action Against Perpetrators of Bullying*

Apart from being designed to decrease the number of bullying incidents, OBPP and KiVa are also intended to achieve a deterrent effect against perpetrators of bullying. There is still debate about what to do with perpetrators when bullying occurs. Some researchers have agreed that the perpetrators should be given negative sanctions for discipline, which is considered a natural consequence. However, some psychologists and educators believe that giving punishment is counter-productive, resulting in perpetrators hating schools and anti-bullying programs implemented in schools (P. K. Smith, 2016). Rigby (2010) suggested another way, namely ignoring bullying behavior. At the same time, Burger et al. (2015) stressed that victims need to act assertively toward perpetrators and contact adults to get help when a bullying incident occurs. Farrington and Ttofi (2009) explained that the imposition of sanctions can be accomplished by reprimanding perpetrators, sending perpetrators to the principal, supervising perpetrators during break time by ensuring that they are always close to the teacher, and revoking their privileges. In addition, Farrington and Ttofi (2009) also suggested reporting incidents to parents. Perpetrators often do not communicate their problems to parents because they feel that their parents do not listen to them (Borualogo, 2021), while parents and teachers do not discuss the problems perpetrators face. Zych et al. (2015) also found that involving parents in training and meetings in an anti-bullying program for perpetrators significantly decreased the number of bullying incidents.

KiVa imposes sanctions by empowering peers, particularly classmates who have a high social position in class, and inviting all students to stand up in helping victims so that the perpetrators will not continue their bullying actions (Sainio et al., 2019). Seeing teachers in recognizable vests also reminds students not to bully because they are constantly under supervision by teachers (Sainio et al., 2019). The meta-analysis presented by Zych et al. (2015) also found that monitoring playground areas provides a significant decrease in the number of acts of bullying.

Learning from this, in developing anti-bullying programs in Indonesia, researchers also need to develop programs for perpetrators. Involving parents in the program is an essential component that researchers need to consider in developing anti-bullying programs, including in Indonesia.

#### *Help for Bullying Victims*

Various studies have shown the negative effect of school bullying on students. Bullying has a direct impact on students' mental health, social relationships, and academic achievement (Moore et al., 2017; Olweus & Breivik, 2014; Wolke & Lereya, 2015) and lowers subjective well-being (Borualogo & Casas, 2021; Savahl et al., 2018; Tiliouine, 2014). Programs also need to be designed to help victims overcome psychological problems caused by victimhood.

This also underlies the OBPP and KiVa, which aim to decrease the number of bullying incidents and help victims overcome their problems. OBPP designs activities at the individual level by holding separate meetings with students involved in bullying (both perpetrators and victims) and also by calling the parents of the students involved so that problems that arise can be handled individually

and on a case-by-case basis (Olweus & Limber, 2010a). Similarly, KiVa provides targeted intervention components for students involved in bullying (Sainio et al., 2019).

Concern about helping students overcome their psychological problems is essential in developing a bullying intervention program in Indonesia. Students need to talk with someone they trust, both at home and at school, and it is the responsibility of adults to help. OBPP and KiVa emphasize the importance of a student becoming a victim. A meta-analysis by Lee et al. (2013) also revealed the large effect size of emotional regulation training and peer counseling in helping victims. Several studies also found that school bullying victims tend to become perpetrators if they are not immediately assisted in overcoming their psychological problems (Kar, 2019; Walters & Espelage, 2018; Zimmerman et al., 2017; Zych et al., 2018).

#### *Implementation of The Program*

Learning from OBPP and KiVa, bullying prevention programs cannot be implemented sectorally and incidentally. The programs must involve all school components over an extended period. Intervention programs that focus only on victims or perpetrators do not succeed in preventing bullying (da Silva et al., 2017). Successful programs are school-based and involve all school components (Gaffney et al., 2019, 2021; Lee et al., 2013; Zych et al., 2015). A three-year study implemented by Olweus et al. (2019) with 30,000 students in grades 3–11 from 95 schools in Pennsylvania showed the effect of the programs growing stronger as the programs are implemented over a longer period. The duration of the program is one of the essential components for successful implementation (P. K. Smith, 2016; Ttofi & Farrington, 2009). Zych et al. (2015) explained the most effective duration for victims and perpetrators is 270 days or more, with four or more days for teacher training.

One factor that makes OBPP and KiVa successful is that these two programs are part of the national school curriculum in their respective countries (Olweus & Limber, 2010a; P. K. Smith, 2016). Other researchers should involve decision-makers (both at the school level and country level) in designing bullying prevention programs.

Sainio et al. (2019) explained that KiVa was initially implemented only sectorally in selected schools and not nationally in Finland. The effort of each school to stop bullying was appreciated; however, it was not enough to deal with bullying without good prevention programs (Sainio et al., 2019). A collaboration between the Finland Ministry of Education and the University of Turku in 2006 responded to the need to develop a bullying prevention program. Therefore, KiVa was implemented nationally in Finland (Sainio et al., 2019). Learning from KiVa, it is essential to develop a bullying prevention program implemented nationally and included in the national school curriculum for the Indonesian context.

All school components need to commit to implementing the program (Sainio et al., 2019). One of the keys to success is the role of the school in combating bullying. Teachers play important parts in implementing the program. Teachers need to understand that children's subjective well-being at school and good relationships with friends are essential elements to be built into the program.

In KiVa, students' perception of teachers' attitudes toward bullying significantly predicts the

possibility of students being victimized (Saarento et al., 2013). In OBPP, the most critical school-level predictor is teachers' willingness to communicate to students and administrators their concerns about bullying (Olweus, 2004). In comparison, the most important predictor at the class level is the teacher's assessment of bullying. These components revealed the importance of the teacher's role in program implementation success, both in OBPP and KiVa (P. K. Smith, 2016). Support from the school principal is also essential because it determines policies, resources, and the direction of activities.

Learning from the importance of the roles of teachers in implementing OBPP and KiVa, it is crucial to train teachers to improve their knowledge about school bullying and how to deal with victims and perpetrators when the bullying occurs. It is essential to see bullying prevention programs as long-term programs that are continuously implemented. It is also crucial to consider the school schedule and teacher resources in implementing the program in the curriculum. A school needs to set priorities in making decisions regarding empowering the school curriculum and the bullying prevention program.

Indonesian researchers should consider the limitations of human resources and school schedules. Therefore, it is essential to determine whether the school will incorporate the fundamental components of an anti-bullying program or choose only the most relevant ones to be implemented, as aligned with school needs.

Ttofi and Farrington (2009) proposed examining a program's results for victims and perpetrators at least twice or more each month. P. K. Smith et al. (2012) analyzed the effectiveness of OBPP and KiVa. Their results showed that both programs were more effective while implemented in elementary students, with decreased effectiveness for teenage groups. Yeager et al. (2015) found aligned results, noting the program was effective for students until grade 7, with effectiveness dropping for students in grade 8.

#### *Evaluation and Testing of Program Effectiveness*

The implementation of an anti-bullying program must be evaluated to determine its effectiveness. The best way to conduct an evaluation is to use an RCT, in which schools and classes are randomly selected as the treated group (intervention) and the untreated group (control) (P. K. Smith, 2016). RCT is the most powerful research method for determining the causes and effects of interventions (Bhide et al., 2018; Deaton & Cartwright, 2018; Fraguas et al., 2021; Kaul et al., 2021), so it can clearly explain the differences that emerge in the two groups (Smith, 2016). However, RCT requires schools or classes to follow all the procedures designed for the program. Therefore, schools cannot choose the class independently, making the intervention process unnatural (P. K. Smith, 2016). In addition, according to P. K. Smith (2016), difficulties in evaluation using RCT have caused many researchers to select schools and classes nonrandomly.

If the researchers use RCT, they need to be concerned about ethical issues as they do not provide the intervention to the control group. However, the intervention can be provided to the control groups after the research is finished (P. K. Smith, 2016). In this case, researchers need to write in the informed consent document that the respondents of control groups will still have the benefits of the intervention.

To evaluate a program's effectiveness, P. K. Smith (2016) suggested measuring not just the decreasing number of bullying incidents, which can be ambiguous. In several studies, students reported that the number of bullying victims decreases as students get older (Salmivalli, 2002; P. K. Smith, 1999). Salmivalli (2002) recommended two alternative measurements to avoid the ambiguity of decreasing bullying incidents. First, as Salmivalli (2002) indicated, researchers should refer to peers' and teachers' reports. Second, they should use time-lagged contrasts between age-equivalent groups as suggested by Olweus (P. K. Smith, 2016). For example, students who were in grade 4 at time 1 and moved into grade 5 at time 2 had now experienced one year of intervention; they could be compared with those who had been in grade 5 at time 1 before the intervention started.

Ryan and Smith (2009) also suggested using various assessment measures (for example, to measure behavior and attitude) from multiple informants (for example, from the students themselves, peers, and teachers), measuring sustainability, using qualitative data, and conducting multilevel statistics for quantitative analysis (P. K. Smith, 2016).

## Conclusion

In an effort to decrease bullying incidents in Indonesia, it is necessary to develop bullying prevention programs based on scientific studies and relevant theoretical backgrounds. The programs should be school-based and involve all school components, including students, teachers, school staff, and parents. Policymakers should be involved in implementing the program. Researchers can take the lessons learned from OBPP and KiVa in developing, implementing, testing, and evaluating programs.

## Acknowledgment

The research team would like to thank Lembaga Penelitian dan Pengabdian Kepada Masyarakat (LPPM) Universitas Islam Bandung that funded this study.

### *Funding*

LPPM Universitas Islam Bandung funded this study through Penelitian Dosen Utama (PDU) scheme with Research Implementation Agreement number 100/B.04/LPPM/XII/2020.

### *Authors Contribution*

All authors have contributed equally in the process of writing this article.

### *Conflict of Interest Statement*

All authors declare that there is no conflict of interest to disclose.

### *ORCID ID:*

Ihsana Sabriani Borualogo  <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-8590-9701>

Sulisworo Kusdiyati  <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-9513-8499>

Hedi Wahyudi  <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-6526-5654>

## References

- Andreou, E., Didaskalou, E., & Vlachou, A. (2007). Evaluating the effectiveness of a curriculum-based anti-bullying intervention program in greek primary schools. *Educational Psychology, 27*(5), 693–711. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01443410601159993>
- Axford, N., Bjornstad, G., Clarkson, S., Ukoumunne, O. C., Wrigley, Z., Matthews, J., Berry, V., & Hutchings, J. (2020). The effectiveness of the (KiVa) bullying prevention program in Wales, (UK): Results from a pragmatic cluster randomized controlled trial. *Prevention Science, 21*(5), 615–626. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11121-020-01103-9>
- Baiden, P., & Tadeo, S. K. (2020). Investigating the association between bullying victimization and suicidal ideation among adolescents: Evidence from the 2017 youth risk behavior survey. *Child Abuse & Neglect, 102*. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chiabu.2020.104417>
- Baldry, A. C., Sorrentino, A., & Farrington, D. P. (2018). Post-traumatic stress symptoms among italian preadolescents involved in school and cyber bullying and victimization. *Journal of Child and Family Studies, 28*(9), 2358–2364. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10826-018-1122-4>
- Barzilay, S., Klomek, A. B., Apter, A., Carli, V., Wasserman, C., Hadlaczky, G., Hoven, C. W., Sarchiapone, M., Balazs, J., Keresztesy, A., Brunner, R., Kaess, M., Bobes, J., Saiz, P., Cosman, D., Haring, C., Banzer, R., Corcoran, P., Kahn, J.-P., . . . Wasserman, D. (2017). Bullying victimization and suicide ideation and behavior among adolescents in europe: A 10-country study. *Journal of Adolescent Health, 61*(2), 179–186. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jadohealth.2017.02.002>
- Bhide, A., Shah, P. S., & Acharya, G. (2018). A simplified guide to randomized controlled trials. *Acta Obstetrica et Gynecologica Scandinavica, 97*(4), 380–387. <https://doi.org/10.1111/aogs.13309>
- Bickmore, K. (2010). Policies and programming for safer schools: Are “anti-bullying” approaches impeding education for peacebuilding? *Educational Policy, 25*(4), 648–687. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0895904810374849>
- Borualogo, I. S. (2021). The role of parenting style to the feeling of adequately heard and subjective well-being in perpetrators and bullying victims. *Jurnal Psikologi, 48*(1), 96. <https://doi.org/10.22146/jpsi.61860>
- Borualogo, I. S., & Casas, F. (2021). The relationship between frequent bullying and subjective well-being in indonesian children. *Population Review, 60*(1). <https://doi.org/10.1353/prv.2021.0002>
- Borualogo, I. S., & Gumilang, E. (2019). Kasus perundungan anak di jawa barat: Temuan awal children’s worlds survey di indonesia [cases of child bullying in west java: Preliminary findings of the children’s worlds survey in indonesia]. *Psymphathic : Jurnal Ilmiah Psikologi, 6*(1), 15–30. <https://doi.org/10.15575/psy.v6i1.4439>
- Borualogo, I. S., Wahyudi, H., & Kusdiyati, S. (2020a). Bullying victimisation in elementary school students in bandung city, In *Proceedings of the 2nd social and humaniora research symposium (SoRes 2019)*, Atlantis Press. <https://doi.org/10.2991/assehr.k.200225.024>
- Borualogo, I. S., Wahyudi, H., & Kusdiyati, S. (2020b). Prediktor perundungan siswa sekolah dasar [predictors of bullying in elementary school students]. *Jurnal Ilmiah Psikologi Terapan, 8*(1), 35. <https://doi.org/10.22219/jipt.v8i1.9841>
- Boulton, M. J., Smith, P. K., & Cowie, H. (2010). Short-term longitudinal relationships between children’s peer victimization/bullying experiences and self-perceptions. *School Psychology International, 31*(3), 296–311. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0143034310362329>



- Brewer, S. L., Brewer, H. J., & Kulik, K. S. (2018). Bullying victimization in schools: Why the whole school, whole community, whole child model is essential. *Journal of School Health, 88*(11), 794–802. <https://doi.org/10.1111/josh.12686>
- Burger, C., Strohmeier, D., Spröber, N., Bauman, S., & Rigby, K. (2015). How teachers respond to school bullying: An examination of self-reported intervention strategy use, moderator effects, and concurrent use of multiple strategies. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 51*, 191–202. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2015.07.004>
- Choi, B., & Park, S. (2021). Bullying perpetration, victimization, and low self-esteem: Examining their relationship over time. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 50*(4), 739–752. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10964-020-01379-8>
- da Silva, J. L., de Oliveira, W. A., de Mello, F. C. M., de Andrade, L. S., Bazon, M. R., & Silva, M. A. I. (2017). Revisão sistemática da literatura sobre intervenções antibullying em escolas. *Ciência & Saúde Coletiva, 22*(7), 2329–2340. <https://doi.org/10.1590/1413-81232017227.16242015>
- Deaton, A., & Cartwright, N. (2018). Understanding and misunderstanding randomized controlled trials. *Social Science & Medicine, 210*, 2–21. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.socscimed.2017.12.005>
- Ertesvåg, S. K., & Vaaland, G. S. (2007). Prevention and reduction of behavioural problems in school: An evaluation of the respect program. *Educational Psychology, 27*(6), 713–736. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01443410701309258>
- Eslea, M., Menesini, E., Morita, Y., O'Moore, M., Mora-Merchán, J. A., Pereira, B., & Smith, P. K. (2004). Friendship and loneliness among bullies and victims: Data from seven countries. *Aggressive Behavior, 30*(1), 71–83. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ab.20006>
- Farrington, D. P., & Ttofi, M. M. (2009). How to reduce school bullying. *Victims & Offenders, 4*(4), 321–326. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15564880903227255>
- Finlex. (2010). Basic education act 628/1998: Amendments up to 1136/2010. <http://www.finlex.fi/en/laki/kaannokset/1998/en19980628.pdf>
- Ford, R., King, T., Priest, N., & Kavanagh, A. (2017). Bullying and mental health and suicidal behaviour among 14- to 15-year-olds in a representative sample of Australian children. *Australian & New Zealand Journal of Psychiatry, 51*(9), 897–908. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0004867417700275>
- Fraguas, D., Diaz-Caneja, C. M., Ayora, M., Durán-Cutilla, M., Abregú-Crespo, R., Ezquiaga-Bravo, I., Martín-Babarro, J., & Arango, C. (2021). Assessment of school anti-bullying interventions. *JAMA Pediatrics, 175*(1), 44. <https://doi.org/10.1001/jamapediatrics.2020.3541>
- Gaete, J., Valenzuela, D., Rojas-Barahona, C., Valenzuela, E., Araya, R., & Salmivalli, C. (2017). The (KiVa) antibullying program in primary schools in Chile, with and without the digital game component: Study protocol for a randomized controlled trial. *Trials, 18*(1). <https://doi.org/10.1186/s13063-017-1810-1>
- Gaffney, H., Ttofi, M. M., & Farrington, D. P. (2019). Evaluating the effectiveness of school-bullying prevention programs: An updated meta-analytical review. *Aggression and Violent Behavior, 45*, 111–133. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.avb.2018.07.001>
- Gaffney, H., Ttofi, M. M., & Farrington, D. P. (2021). Effectiveness of school-based programs to reduce bullying perpetration and victimization: An updated systematic review and meta-analysis. *Campbell Systematic Reviews, 17*(2). <https://doi.org/10.1002/cl2.1143>
- Garandeau, C. F., & Salmivalli, C. (2018). Le programme anti-harcèlement kiva. *Enfance, 3*(30), 491–501.
- Green, V. A., Woods, L., Wegerhoff, D., Harcourt, S., & Tannahill, S. (2019). An evaluation of the (KiVa) anti-bullying program in New Zealand. *International Journal of Bullying Prevention, 2*(3), 225–237. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s42380-019-00034-6>

- Haner, M., & Lee, H. (2017). Placing school victimization in a global context. *Victims and Offenders*, 12(6), 845–867. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15564886.2017.1361675>
- Heirman, W., & Walrave, M. (2012). Predicting adolescent perpetration in cyberbullying: An application of the theory of planned behavior. *Psicothema*, 24(4), 614–620.
- Herkama, S., Saarento, S., & Salmivalli, C. (2017). The (KiVa) antibullying program: Lessons learned and future directions. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781119057574.whbva124>
- Hinduja, S., & Patchin, J. W. (2018). Connecting adolescent suicide to the severity of bullying and cyberbullying. *Journal of School Violence*, 18(3), 333–346. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15388220.2018.1492417>
- Huitsing, G., Lodder, G. M. A., Browne, W. J., Oldenburg, B., der Ploeg, R. V., & Veenstra, R. (2020). A large-scale replication of the effectiveness of the (kiva) antibullying program: A randomized controlled trial in the netherlands. *Prevention Science*, 21(5), 627–638. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11121-020-01116-4>
- Indonesian Ministry of Education and Culture. (2015). Peraturan menteri pendidikan dan kebudayaan indonesia nomor 82 tahun 2015 tentang pencegahan dan penanggulangan tindak kekerasan di lingkungan satuan pendidikan.
- Juvonen, J., Nishina, A., & Graham, S. (2000). Peer harassment, psychological adjustment, and school functioning in early adolescence. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 92(2), 349–359. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-0663.92.2.349>
- Kar, H. L. (2019). Acknowledging the victim to perpetrator trajectory: Integrating a mental health focused trauma-based approach into global violence programs. *Aggression and Violent Behavior*, 47, 293–297. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.avb.2018.10.004>
- Kaul, P., Bose, B., Kumar, R., Ilahi, I., & Garg, P. K. (2021). The strength of a randomized controlled trial lies in its design—randomization. *Supportive Care in Cancer*. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00520-021-06163-3>
- Lebrun-Harris, L. A., Sherman, L. J., Limber, S. P., Miller, B. D., & Edgerton, E. A. (2018). Bullying victimization and perpetration among u.s. children and adolescents: 2016 national survey of children’s health. *Journal of Child and Family Studies*, 28(9), 2543–2557. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10826-018-1170-9>
- Lee, S., Kim, C.-J., & Kim, D. H. (2013). A meta-analysis of the effect of school-based anti-bullying programs. *Journal of Child Health Care*, 19(2), 136–153. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1367493513503581>
- Limber, S. P., Olweus, D., Wang, W., Masiello, M., & Breivik, K. (2018). Evaluation of the olweus bullying prevention program: A large scale study of u.s. students in grades 3–11. *Journal of School Psychology*, 69, 56–72. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jsp.2018.04.004>
- Menesini, E., & Salmivalli, C. (2017). Bullying in schools: The state of knowledge and effective interventions. *Psychology, Health & Medicine*, 22(sup1), 240–253. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13548506.2017.1279740>
- Moore, S. E., Norman, R. E., Suetani, S., Thomas, H. J., Sly, P. D., & Scott, J. G. (2017). Consequences of bullying victimization in childhood and adolescence: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *World Journal of Psychiatry*, 7(1), 60. <https://doi.org/10.5498/wjp.v7.i1.60>
- Olweus, D. (1978). *Aggression in the schools: Bullies and whipping boys*. Hemisphere.
- Olweus, D. (1993). *Bullying at school: What we know and what we can do*. Blackwell Publishing.
- Olweus, D., & Breivik, K. (2014). The opposite of well-being. In A. Ben-Arieh, F. Casas, I. Fronès, & J. E. Korbin (Eds.) Springer.

- Olweus, D. (2004). Bullying in schools. <https://doi.org/10.1017/cbo9780511584466.003>
- Olweus, D., & Limber, S. P. (2010a). Bullying in school: Evaluation and dissemination of the olweus bullying prevention program. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry*, 80(1), 124–134. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1939-0025.2010.01015.x>
- Olweus, D., & Limber, S. P. (2010b). The olweus bullying prevention program: Implementation and evaluation over two decades. *Handbook of Bullying in Schools: An International Perspective*, 377–401.
- Olweus, D., Limber, S. P., & Breivik, K. (2019). Addressing specific forms of bullying: A large-scale evaluation of the olweus bullying prevention program. *International Journal of Bullying Prevention*, 1(1), 70–84. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s42380-019-00009-7>
- Ossa, F. C., Jantzer, V., Eppelmann, L., Parzer, P., Resch, F., & Kaess, M. (2020). Effects and moderators of the Olweus bullying prevention program (OBPP) in Germany. *European Child & Adolescent Psychiatry*, 30(11), 1745–1754. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00787-020-01647-9>
- Reijntjes, A., Kamphuis, J. H., Prinzie, P., & Telch, M. J. (2010). Peer victimization and internalizing problems in children: A meta-analysis of longitudinal studies. *Child Abuse & Neglect*, 34(4), 244–252. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chiabu.2009.07.009>
- Rigby, K. (2010). *Bullying interventions in schools: Six basic approaches*. Australian Council for Educational Research Press.
- Ryan, W., & Smith, J. D. (2009). Antibullying programs in schools: How effective are evaluation practices? *Prevention Science*, 10(3), 248–259. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11121-009-0128-y>
- Saarento, S., Kärnä, A., Hodges, E. V., & Christina. (2013). Student-, classroom-, and school-level risk factors for victimization. *Journal of School Psychology*, 51(3), 421–434. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jsp.2013.02.002>
- Sainio, M., Herkama, S., Kontio, M., & Salmivalli, C. (2019). KiVa anti-bullying programme. In *Making an impact on school bullying* (pp. 45–66). <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781351201957-3>
- Salmivalli, C., Kärnä, A., & Poskiparta, E. (2010a). Development, evaluation, and diffusion of a national anti-bullying program, kiva. *Handbook of youth prevention science*, 238–252.
- Salmivalli, C., Kärnä, A., & Poskiparta, E. (2010b). From peer putdowns to peer support: A theoretical model and how it translated into a national anti-bullying program. In *Handbook of bullying in schools: An international perspective* (p. Routledge).
- Salmivalli, C. (1999). Participant role approach to school bullying: Implications for interventions. *Journal of Adolescence*, 22(4), 453–459. <https://doi.org/10.1006/jado.1999.0239>
- Salmivalli, C. (2002). Is there an age decline in victimization by peers at school? *Educational Research*, 44(3), 269–277. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00131880210135331>
- Salmivalli, C., Kärnä, A., & Poskiparta, E. (2011). Counteracting bullying in Finland: The (KiVa) program and its effects on different forms of being bullied. *International Journal of Behavioral Development*, 35(5), 405–411. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0165025411407457>
- Salmivalli, C., Kaukiainen, A., & Voeten, M. (2005). Anti-bullying intervention: Implementation and outcome. *British Journal of Educational Psychology*, 75(3), 465–487. <https://doi.org/10.1348/000709905x26011>
- Salmivalli, C., Kaukiainen, A., Voeten, M., & Sinisammal, M. (2004). Targeting the group as a whole: The finnish anti-bullying intervention. In *Bullying in schools* (pp. 251–274). <https://doi.org/10.1017/cbo9780511584466.014>

- Salmivalli, C., Lagerspetz, K., Björkqvist, K., Österman, K., & Kaukiainen, A. (1998). Bullying as a group process: Participant roles and their relations to social status within the group. *Aggressive Behavior*, 22(1), 1–15. [https://doi.org/10.1002/\(sici\)1098-2337\(1996\)22:1<1::aid-ab1>3.0.co;2-t](https://doi.org/10.1002/(sici)1098-2337(1996)22:1<1::aid-ab1>3.0.co;2-t)
- Salmivalli, C., & 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 (IJCV)*, (2). <https://doi.org/10.4119/IJCV-2920>
- Savahl, S., Montserrat, C., Casas, F., Adams, S., Tiliouine, H., Benninger, E., & Jackson, K. (2018). Children’s experiences of bullying victimization and the influence on their subjective well-being: A multinational comparison. *Child Development*, 90(2), 414–431. <https://doi.org/10.1111/cdev.13135>
- Schäfer, M., Korn, S., Smith, P. K., Hunter, S. C., Mora-Merchán, J. A., Singer, M. M., & Meulen, K. (2004). Lonely in the crowd: Recollections of bullying. *British Journal of Developmental Psychology*, 22(3), 379–394. <https://doi.org/10.1348/0261510041552756>
- Setyawan, D. (2014). *Undang-undang republik indonesia nomor 35 tahun 2014 tentang perubahan undang-undang nomor 23 tahun 2002 tentang perlindungan anak*. Komisi Perlindungan Anak Indonesia. <https://www.kpai.go.id/hukum/undang-undang-republik-indonesia-nomor-35-tahun-2014-tentang-perubahan-atas-undang-undang-nomor-23-tahun-2002-tentang-perlindungan-anak>
- Smith, P. K. (1999). England and wales. In *The nature of school bullying: A cross-national perspective* (pp. Routledge).
- Smith, P. K. (2016). School-based interventions to address bullying. *Eesti Haridusteaduste Ajakiri. Estonian Journal of Education*, 4(2), 142–164. <https://doi.org/10.12697/eha.2016.4.2.06a>
- Smith, P. K. (2017). Bullying and theory of mind: A review. *Current Psychiatry Reviews*, 13(2). <https://doi.org/10.2174/1573400513666170502123214>
- Smith, P. K., & Brain, P. (2000). Bullying in schools: Lessons from two decades of research. *Aggressive Behavior*, 26(1), 1–9. [https://doi.org/10.1002/\(sici\)1098-2337\(2000\)26:1<1::aid-ab1>3.0.co;2-7](https://doi.org/10.1002/(sici)1098-2337(2000)26:1<1::aid-ab1>3.0.co;2-7)
- Smith, P. K., Salmivalli, C., & Cowie, H. (2012). Effectiveness of school-based programs to reduce bullying: A commentary. *Journal of Experimental Criminology*, 8(4), 433–441. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11292-012-9142-3>
- Tiliouine, H. (2014). School bullying victimisation and subjective well-being in algeria. *Child Indicators Research*, 8(1), 133–150. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12187-014-9286-y>
- Ttofi, M. M., & Farrington, D. P. (2009). What works in preventing bullying: Effective elements of anti-bullying programmes. *Journal of Aggression, Conflict and Peace Research*, 1(1), 13–24. <https://doi.org/10.1108/17596599200900003>
- Ttofi, M. M., & Farrington, D. P. (2010). Effectiveness of school-based programs to reduce bullying: A systematic and meta-analytic review. *Journal of Experimental Criminology*, 7(1), 27–56. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11292-010-9109-1>
- United Nations Human Rights. (1989). *Convention on the rights of the child*. <https://ohchr.org/en/pprofessionalinterest/pages/crc.aspx>
- Volk, A. A., Dane, A. V., & Marini, Z. A. (2014). What is bullying? a theoretical redefinition. *Developmental Review*, 34(4), 327–343. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.dr.2014.09.001>
- 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. <https://doi.org/10.1001/archpedi.161.1.78>

- Walters, G. D., & Espelage, D. L. (2018). From victim to victimizer: Hostility, anger, and depression as mediators of the bullying victimization–bullying perpetration association. *Journal of School Psychology, 68*, 73–83. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jsp.2017.12.003>
- Wolke, D., & Lereya, S. T. (2015). Long-term effects of bullying. *Archives of Disease in Childhood, 100*(9), 879–885. <https://doi.org/10.1136/archdischild-2014-306667>
- Yeager, D. S., Fong, C. J., Lee, H. Y., & Espelage, D. L. (2015). Declines in efficacy of anti-bullying programs among older adolescents: Theory and a three-level meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Developmental Psychology, 37*, 36–51. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.appdev.2014.11.005>
- Younan, B. (2019). A systematic review of bullying definitions: How definition and format affect study outcome. *Journal of Aggression, Conflict and Peace Research, 11*(2), 109–115. <https://doi.org/10.1108/jacpr-02-2018-0347>
- Zimmerman, G. M., Farrell, C., & Posick, C. (2017). Does the strength of the victim-offender overlap depend on the relationship between the victim and perpetrator? *Journal of Criminal Justice, 48*, 21–29. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcrimjus.2016.11.003>
- Zych, I., Ortega-Ruiz, R., & Rey, R. D. (2015). Systematic review of theoretical studies on bullying and cyberbullying: Facts, knowledge, prevention, and intervention. *Aggression and Violent Behavior, 23*, 1–21. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.avb.2015.10.001>
- Zych, I., Ttofi, M. M., Llorent, V. J., Farrington, D. P., Ribeaud, D., & Eisner, M. P. (2018). A longitudinal study on stability and transitions among bullying roles. *Child Development, 91*(2), 527–545. <https://doi.org/10.1111/cdev.13195>