Enter your keyword(s)　　　　　Search Site　　[Advanced Search](#)

Practice Profile

Universal School-Based Prevention and Intervention Programs for Aggressive and Disruptive Behavior

Evidence Ratings for Outcomes:

　 Juvenile Problem & At-Risk Behaviors

Practice Description

Practice Goals/Target Population
Universal school-based prevention and intervention programs for aggressive and disruptive behavior target elementary, middle, and high school students with the intention of preventing or reducing violent, aggressive, or disruptive behaviors. Universal programs are delivered in general classroom settings to all the students in the class, rather than only selected students considered at risk or in need of program services. Students are taught different skills and coping mechanisms to reduce violent, aggressive, or disruptive behavior.

Practice Components
There are a number of school-based intervention modalities that focus on reducing aggressive or disruptive behavior of students, including cognitively oriented strategies, social skills training, behavioral strategies, counseling (group, individual, and family), anger management programs, and social problem-solving programs (Wilson and Lipsey 2007). Intervention components also include

- Conflict resolution
- Skills training
- Parent training and support
- Character building
- School environment modifications
- Empathy training
- Impulse control (Park-Higgerson et al. 2008)

Other universal school-based programs teach students topics and skills such as emotional self-awareness, emotional control, self-esteem, positive social skills, social problem solving, conflict resolution, and teamwork (Hahn et al. 2007). In addition to the classroom components, many of these intervention modalities use multi-approach methods in which parents, peers, or community members are involved in the intervention (Park-Higgerson et al. 2008).

Key Personnel
Typically, school-based interventions are taught by the classroom teachers, but some programs can also be taught by program specialists who are independent from school personnel.

Meta-Analysis Outcomes

Juvenile Problem & At-Risk Behaviors
Wilson and Lipsey (2007) analyzed effect sizes from 77 studies and found that universal school-based programs had a significant effect on aggressive/disruptive behaviors in treatment students (mean effect size=0.21). This means that the programs led to 25 percent reduction in aggressive/disruptive behavior of students. Park-Higgerson and colleagues (2008) analyzed effect sizes from seven randomized controlled studies and found that universal school-based interventions reduced violent behavior in treatment students; however this effect was not statistically significant.

Meta-Analysis Methodology

Meta-Analysis Snapshot			
	Literature Coverage Dates	Number of Studies	Number of Study Participants
Meta-Analysis 1	1970 - 2006	77	0
Meta-Analysis 2	1996 - 2004	7	0

Meta-Analysis 1
Wilson and Lipsey (2007) analyzed 249 studies, published in 1960 or later, of school-based prevention programs and their effects on students' aggressive and disruptive behaviors. Eligible studies had to be reported in English; involve a school-based program for youth in pre–K through 12th grade; assess effects on at least one outcome related to aggressive, violent, or disruptive behaviors; and use at least one quasi-experimental design with either random assignment to conditions or reported initial equivalence.

Practice Snapshot

Age: 6 - 18

Gender: Both

Race/Ethnicity: Black, Hispanic, Other, White

Settings: School

Practice Type: Classroom Curricula, Cognitive Behavioral Treatment, Conflict Resolution/Interpersonal Skills, Parent Training, School/Classroom Environment, Violence Prevention

Unit of Analysis: Persons

Researcher:
Sandra Jo Wilson
Vanderbilt Institute for Public Policy Studies
1207 18th Ave. South
Nashville TN 37212
Email

Included studies came from journals (61 percent), dissertations or theses (30 percent), and other unpublished work (9 percent). Study participants were boys and girls predominantly ages 6–10 (43 percent), and ethnicities included white (33 percent), black (25 percent), Hispanic (8 percent), other (2 percent), and mixed (4 percent). No information on the number of students in the treatment and control groups was reported. While various intervention formats were analyzed separately, the focus of this review was on 77 studies that examined universal programs.

Authors reported the effect size as a standardized mean difference with 95 percent confidence intervals. The inverse variance weights were computed using the subject-level sample size for each effect. Only one effect size from each subject sample was used in the analysis. Authors used a random effects analysis.

Meta-Analysis 2
Park-Higgerson and colleagues (2008) analyzed 26 studies of school-based intervention programs on outcomes of aggressive and violent behaviors with students from grades 1–12. All of the studies used randomized controlled designs and were published between 1970 and 2004.

To be included, studies had to involve school-based programs designed to prevent aggression or violence in children and adolescents by providing education, improving social skills, or changing the environment; had to include students enrolled in grades 1–11; had to use a randomized assignment procedure for treatment and control groups; and had to examine aggression or violent behavior measures that were reported with necessary statistical information to measure effect. No demographic information was provided for students in the analyzed studies. Authors analyzed studies on five program characteristics related to program success: 1) the application of theory, 2) universal or selective programming, 3) single- or multiple-approach intervention, 4) characteristics of target population, and 5) type of instructor. For this review, the focus was on the seven studies that examined universal programs.

The overall effect size was calculated for the full sample. Pooled results were expressed as standardized mean differences with 95 percent confidence intervals. The analysis makes no mention of weighting.

Cost

There is no cost information available for this practice.

Evidence-Base (Meta-Analyses Reviewed)

These sources were used in the development of the practice profile:

Meta-Analysis 1
Wilson, Sandra Jo, and Mark Lipsey. 2007. "School-Based Interventions for Aggressive and Disruptive Behavior: Update of a Meta-Analysis." *American Journal of Preventive Medicine* 33(2 Suppl):S130–43.
http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC2246021/

Meta-Analysis 2
Park-Higgerson, Hyoun-Kyoung, Suzanne E. Perumean-Chaney, Alfred A. Bartolucci, Diane M. Grimley, and Karan P. Singh. 2008. "The Evaluation of School-Based Violence Prevention Programs: A Meta-Analysis." *Journal of School Health* 78(9): 465–79.

Additional References

These sources were used in the development of the practice profile:

Hahn, Robert, Dawna Fuqua-Whitley, Holly Wethington, Jessica Lowy, Alex Crosby, Mindy Fullilove, Robert Johnson, Akiva Leiberman, Eve Moscicki, LeShawndra Price, Susan Snyder, Farris Tuma, Stella Cory, Glenda Stone, Kaushik Mukhopadhaya, Sajal Chattopadhyay, and Linda Dahlberg. 2007. "Effectiveness of Universal School-Based Programs to Prevent Violent and Aggressive Behavior: A Systematic Review." *American Journal of Preventative Medicine* 33(2S):S114–29. (This study was reviewed but did not meet CrimeSolutions criteria for inclusion in the overall practice rating.)
http://www.cdc.gov/mmwr/preview/mmwrhtml/rr5607a1.htm

Enter your keyword(s)   Search Site   Advanced Search

All Programs & Practices

A Program is a specific set of activities carried out according to guidelines to achieve a defined purpose. Program profiles on CrimeSolutions.gov tell us whether a specific program was found to achieve its goals when it was carefully evaluated. The results apply to the exact set of activities and procedures used for that one program as it was implemented at the time of evaluation. Thus, the program profile tells us that a program is likely to produce the observed result if implemented in exactly the same way. A hypothetical question that might be answered by a program profile is: Did the ABC Mentoring Program in Anytown, USA achieve its goals?

A Practice is a general category of programs, strategies, or procedures that share similar characteristics with regard to the issues they address and how they address them. Practice profiles tell us about the average results from multiple evaluations of similar programs, strategies, or procedures. The programs, strategies, or procedures within a practice are similar because they share certain defining characteristics that are described for each practice profile on CrimeSolutions.gov. Thus, practice profiles tell us the average result across multiple evaluations. A hypothetical question that might be answered by a practice profile is: Does mentoring usually achieve its goals?

- View Programs
- View Practices

Programs (Filter Results)

View All Programs (542)	☑ View Effective (96)	☑ View Promising (321)	⊘ View No Effects (125)	Filter Results

By Evidence Rating:
Select options

Extent of Evidence:
Select options

By Topic:
Select options

By Program Type:
Select options

By Setting (Delivery):
Select options

By Geography:
Select options

By Age:
Select options

By Race/Ethnicity:
Select options

By Gender:
Select options

By Targeted Population:
Select options

Clear   Filter

Practices (Filter Results)

View All Practices (19)	☑ View Effective (8)	☑ View Promising (12)	⊘ View No Effects (6)	Filter Results

Showing 6 to 10 of 19 entries   Records per Page: 5 ▾

Title	Evidence Rating (by Outcomes)	Summary
Targeted School-Based Social Information-Processing Interventions for Aggression	☑ Juvenile Problem & At-Risk Behaviors - Aggression	This practice examines targeted prevention efforts for particular students that attempt to improve one or more aspects of the students' social information processing, aiming to prevent and/or reduce aggressive or violent behavior in school-aged children. The practice is rated Effective for reducing aggressive behavior in school-aged children.

Title	Evidence Rating (by Outcomes)	Summary
Treatment in Secure Corrections for Serious Juvenile Offenders	☑️ Crime & Delinquency - Multiple crime/offense types ☑️ Crime & Delinquency - Serious recidivism	This practice includes interventions targeting serious (violent and chronic) juvenile offenders sentenced to serve time in secure corrections. The overall goal is to decrease recidivism rates when juveniles are released and return to the community. The practice is rated Effective for reducing general recidivism and serious recidivism of violent and chronic juvenile offenders.
Universal School-Based Prevention and Intervention Programs for Aggressive and Disruptive Behavior	☑️ Juvenile Problem & At-Risk Behaviors	Universal school-based prevention and intervention programs for aggressive and disruptive behavior target elementary, middle, and high school students in a universal setting, rather than focusing on only a selective group of students, with the intention of preventing or reducing violent, aggressive, or disruptive behaviors. The practice is rated Effective in reducing violent, aggressive, and/or disruptive behaviors in students.
Adult Reentry Programs	☑️ Crime & Delinquency - Multiple crime/offense types	This practice involves correctional programs that focus on the transition of individuals from prison into the community. Reentry programs involve treatment or services that have been initiated while the individual is in custody and a follow-up component after the individual is released. The practice is rated Promising for reducing recidivism.
Adult Sex Offender Treatment	☑️ Crime & Delinquency - Multiple crime/offense types ☑️ Crime & Delinquency - Sex-related offenses 🚫 Crime & Delinquency - Violent offenses	A variety of psychological interventions, cognitive–behavioral treatments, and behavioral therapies targeting adult sex offenders with the overall aim of reducing the risk and potential harm associated with releasing this population back into the community. The practice is rated Promising for reducing rates of general recidivism and sexual recidivism, but rated No Effects on violent recidivism rates.

Showing 6 to 10 of 19 entries

Records per Page: 5 ▾