Note from the Editor

Dear EARA Members,

Starting this issue, EARA Newsletter will publish short papers around a specific topic. National representatives and members are welcome to propose topics and nominate guest editors for special issues (Self-nominations are also welcome).

Dr. Dagmar Strohmeier and Dr. Olga Solomontos-Kountouri were the guest editors of the current issue. They have put together a very interesting collection of papers about evidence based bullying prevention programs.

I hope you will enjoy the Newsletter!

From the President

EARA between Spetses and Cesme/Izmir

During the fall and winter 2012/2013 we lost two of our prominent members: Professor Margaret Kerr and Professor Silvia Ciairano. We will continue to read their important contributions to our field and cherish our personal memories of them. I also hope and believe that our colleagues from Torino and Örebro will be able to keep up their excellent contribution to our association and to adolescent psychology.

We successfully organized the elections for a new president and we were fortunate that Professor Figen Cok was willing to stand once again for election. She was voted in with an overwhelming majority, and I am really happy
that she will serve as our president 2014-2016. Congratulations again Figen, and thank you!

The uneven EARA years are years of a lot of organizational work. We have selected the young European and US scholars for the EARA/SRA summer school 2013, which is to be held in Kent (Ohio), USA, from June 16th to June 23rd. The Senior Scholars selected for this year include (in alphabetical order): Deborah Capaldi, Toon Cillessen, W. Andrew Collins, Joanne Davila, Carolyn Tucker Halpern, Patrick Heaven, Geert-Jan Overbeek, Sally Powers, Katarina Salmela-Aro, and Christiane Spiel. I hope to have the report from our EARA scholars on the school in the next issue of the newsletter.

At the same time we are now working to set up a two workshops for Latin American and European senior and junior scholars in 2013 and 2014. This endeavor was initiated by our past president, Peter Noack, who organized a successful Latin American workshop in Mexico City in 2011. I think this initiative to be very important to reach a better understanding of adolescence across the globe. Main goals of the workshops will be to discuss western and majority world conceptualizations (see Special Issue Adolescents in the Majority World of JRA, March 2013) of adolescence and adolescent development and to scrutinize possibilities to accelerate adolescent research under less favorable conditions. Mutual benefits for European and Latin American researchers will be to have a better understanding of limitations of each other’s concepts of adolescence, and also to learn that a set of relatively simple tools can lead to major advancements and leaps forward of adolescent research in less favorable regions or countries.

The preparations for the 14th Biennial Conference of EARA in Cesme/Izmir are well underway. We have selected an exciting site for the conference and invited a number of key note speakers and convenors of invited symposia. Our invitations were very well met.

In March our British colleagues organized a special meeting for John Coleman to celebrate the EARA life time honorary achievement award that was given to him in Spetses 2012. Peter Noack attended the meeting on behalf of our association.

EARA is contributing to setting up an international consortium for developmental science. Twelve developmental societies across the globe (for instance SRCD, ISSBD SRA, EADP) are cooperating in this endeavor. Michel Born and I attended the starting meeting in snowy Marbach in December 2012 and we had a follow up meeting during the last SRCD conference in April 2013.

Finally, I’m happy to announce that our newsletter will feature short papers from this edition on. Thank you Fabrizia for this innovation!

This was all for now.

Best wishes,

Wim Meeus
Adolescent Development Utrecht University and Developmental Psychology Tilburg University

---

Special Issue: Evidence Based Bullying Prevention Programs: The Challenges of Cross-National Dissemination

Dagmar Strohmeier (University of Upper Austria, Austria) & Olga Solomontos-Kountouri, (Neapolis University Pafos, Cyprus)

International research on school bullying has grown considerably in the last decades (Smith, 2011) demonstrating that bullying is a severe problem in schools all over the world (Currie et al., 2012). Bullying is considered to be a complex relationship issue (Pepler, 2006) and a group phenomenon (Salmivalli, 2010) characterized by (1) intentional harm-doing, (2) repetition, and (3) imbalance of power (e.g., Olweus, 1991; Roland, 1989; Sharp & Smith, 1993). Bullying includes a variety of negative acts which can be delivered face-to-face, by indirect or relational means (Crick & Grot彼得, 1995) or by using electronic forms of contact (Smith et al., 2008).

As a recent meta-analytic review shows, more than 40 school-based anti-bullying programs have been developed, implemented and evaluated during recent decades. On average, these research based intervention
programs were successful in substantially reducing bullying and victimization (Ttofi & Farrington, 2011). However, not all of these programs are ready for dissemination. Prevention science distinguishes between the efficacy and the effectiveness of a program (Flay et al., 2005). While the goal of efficacy trials is to establish causal effects by utilizing the strongest possible design under optimal conditions, the goal of effectiveness trials is to demonstrate that the program works under real world conditions. The most striking difference between these two kinds of research designs is the emphasis on implementation in effectiveness trials. Whilst in efficacy trials most often the program developers or other highly skilled and motivated trainers are delivering the program, in effectiveness trials the training is delivered by existing multipliers already working in the field, e.g. educators or other health professionals. Thus, to establish that a program is ready for dissemination, research on both the theoretical model and the implementation model is needed. As Flay and colleagues (2005) point out, dissemination is the ultimate purpose for which evidence based prevention programs are developed, yet little empirical research has focused on the processes through which high quality programs are adopted, implemented and sustained. Cross national dissemination studies offer unique possibilities to investigate (a) whether the original implementation model is universally applicable or needs to be changed, (b) whether the program outcomes achieved in a particular implementation model can be replicated in a different national context and (c) whether the theoretical model is universally valid.

Because the cross national dissemination of a prevention program is highly challenging but also offers unique possibilities for research, this special section is devoted to this topic. Two evidence based anti-bullying programs – KiVa and ViSC – are currently disseminated cross nationally. The KiVa program has been developed at the University of Turku, Finland with strong backing from both the Ministry of Education and the Finnish National Board of Education (Salmivalli, Kärnä & Poskiparta, 2011). Since 2006, KiVa has been implemented in 82% of all compulsory schools located in Finland (Salmivalli & Poskiparta, 2012). The ViSC program has been developed at the University of Vienna, Austria and been implemented in approximately 50 Austrian schools within the national strategy “Together against violence” since 2008 (Spiel, Wagner & Strohmeier, 2012; Strohmeier, Hoffmann, Schiller, Stefanek & Spiel, 2012). This issue gives an overview of the challenges of international dissemination of these two programs.

I. The KiVa antibullying Program
Christina Salmivalli (University of Turku, Finland)

KiVa antibullying program has been developed at the University of Turku with funding from the Finnish Ministry of Education and Culture. KiVa is an acronym for “Kiusaamista Vastaan”, that is “Against bullying” or “Anti-bullying”. The Finnish word kiva also means a person being nice, kind, or friendly. The KiVa program was evaluated during 2007–2009 in a large randomized control trial involving approximately 30 000 students and their teachers. Since 2009 the program has been disseminated to Finnish schools and currently 90% of all Finnish comprehensive schools have registered as users of the program (Salmivalli & Poskiparta, 2012).

KiVa is a theory-based intervention program based on the notion that bullying is a group phenomenon. Rather than consisting of separate aggressive acts towards a student, bullying is a rather stable relationship between the victim and the perpetrator(s), further embedded within the larger peer group. KiVa is founded on the idea that the way in which peer bystanders, who are neither bullies nor victims, behave when witnessing bullying is crucial for either maintaining bullying or putting an end to it. By bullying others the perpetrator may gain and sustain status in the peer group. If the peer group does not provide rewards to the perpetrator, for example by laughing when a child gets bullied, the perpetrator does not get the social rewards he or she is after. Influencing the peer context is thus essential in preventing and reducing school bullying.

The KiVa program includes both universal and indicated actions. Universal actions are targeted at all students, in order to raise awareness of bullying and of the role that the peer group often plays in maintaining it, to enhance anti-bullying attitudes, and to provide safe strategies to support and defend victimized peers. Ten age-appropriate double lessons are
KiVa antibullying program is an example how commitment on the part of politicians, researchers, and educators can work together in order to reduce bullying and improve school well-being. After demonstrating that the program works in its country of origin, Finland (Kärnä et al., 2011a, 2011b, 2012), a logical next question is whether it produces the desired outcomes in other contexts as well.

Antibullying programs, as well as other school-based prevention and intervention programs, that were proven to be effective in one context have often produced little or no effects in international replication studies. The reasons for this may include different school systems, cultures, and ethnic contexts. Finland, for instance, is a fairly homogenous country where ethnic variability among students is small (about 97% being native Finns) and the comprehensive school system provides equal education for all students in grades 1 to 9. Between-school differences in educational outcomes are small and teacher education is of high quality, a Master’s degree being the norm among teachers. All such factors may have implications for the implementation process of school-based programs and consequently, for the effects obtained. Besides such differences in populations and school systems, there are numerous other aspects that need to be taken into consideration (and preferably assessed) in international evaluation studies in order to understand the reasons for cross-national variation in the effects that may be found. In the following paragraphs, we discuss some challenges related to cross-national dissemination and evaluation of school-based programs in general, and KiVa antibullying program in particular, from the perspective of program developers.

**Testing an evidence-based program in a new context: General requirements**

KiVa has generated a lot of international interest and consequently, several evaluation studies have been initiated in countries outside of Finland. The program materials have so far been (partly or completely) translated into English, Dutch, French, German, and Japanese; Estonian and Welsh translations are underway. The ongoing international evaluations of KiVa include randomized controlled trials in the Netherlands, Wales, and United States (see articles by Veenstra, Hutchings, and Hubbard in this newsletter), and smaller scale pilot studies in...
two Japanese schools and in the English, French, and German divisions of the European school in Luxembourg. The aim of the latter two pilots is to explore the cultural adaptability/acceptability of the program rather than testing its effects on bullying and victimization.

From our viewpoint, it is important that there is real demand for a program in the new context and, ideally, also support at the level of stakeholders and politicians. It is also necessary to have collaborators who are, in addition to being competent, highly motivated and ready to put effort into the implementation process and evaluation trial. The required expertise of collaborators includes a good understanding of the theory of change on which the program is based, ability to implement the program with high quality (including, but not limited to, teacher training in the new context), skills to modify the program to the specific culture and school system (when necessary) in collaboration with program developers and expertise in conducting rigorous evaluation studies. Implementing a complex intervention program deeply rooted in theory but at the same time offering very concrete tools to tackle bullying necessitates a lot of discussion, planning, and sharing of experiences between program developers and collaborators in the new context.

**Adaptation or fidelity: Deep structure, surface structure, and implementation model**

We believe that whether (and to what extent) the contents of a school-based program such as KiVa should be adapted to a new context (e.g., new country) or implemented with high fidelity is an empirical question. Already having evidence that KiVa works in Finland, it is in our interest to see the program first tested in fairly similar cultures with only minimal adaptation. It is important to ensure that the deep structure, or key elements of the program that are assumed to lead to intended outcomes, remain unchanged. Modifications to the surface structure, such as language, photographs included in the materials, or stories used during the student lessons (i.e., making them more culturally relevant) are, however, necessary (Resnikov et al., 2000; Sundell et al., 2013).

Besides program content, the implementation model may need to be adapted to new contexts: the way the program is delivered in one country might not be possible in another context. Also, it is not self-evident that the concrete tools or exercises that have been used in Finland are the ones that are most suitable (or even possible) elsewhere. For instance, the KiVa program includes computer games that are connected to the topics of the student lessons. The students play the games during the lessons, but also between the lessons in their free time. The utilization of such games is dependent on the technical facilities of the schools (and homes) in different countries.

Discussions with our collaborators in Osaka, Japan, have suggested that the same learning-by-doing activities included in the student lessons might be perceived as highly demanding, even embarrassing by Japanese students, who are not used to talking about their experiences or feelings in front of their peer group (e.g., in classroom). The small pilot in Japan will help us to evaluate (together with the Japanese collaborators) the extent to which such exercises need to be altered and how this could be done.

Another example concerns the indicated actions of KiVa, originally consisting of two alternative approaches (confronting vs. non-confronting) that the KiVa teams may use in discussion with students who have been bullying others. In Finland, the KiVa team of each school chooses one of the two approaches. The majority of Finnish schools have chosen to use the confronting approach, despite the fact that we have found no evidence for either of the two approaches being more efficient than the other. Our Dutch collaborators, however, have chosen to introduce only the non-confrontational approach to the KiVa teams, as this approach fits the cultural context better and school personnel are already familiar and experienced with it. Based on our discussion with Japanese collaborators, the same is likely to happen in the Japanese pilot study as well.

**Challenges in evaluation studies**

In order to have findings that are comparable with those obtained in Finnish evaluations, the measurement instruments as well as the timing of assessments should be the same, at least for the core measures that we want to compare. Other issues that cannot be influenced (but can be taken into account) are country-specific policies and current practices in bullying prevention that result in differences in “treatment as usual” control conditions in each country.
Intervention effects are likely to be weaker in countries where treatment as usual is more effective, in other words, where schools are already doing more to prevent bullying and to intervene in it.

Careful assessment of implementation fidelity, in the same way as it was done in Finland, is informative. We also need to collect data on the “buy-in” on the part of school personnel (e.g., belief in the program and its basic premises) as well as students (e.g., responsiveness to student lessons), and their experiences of the different components of KiVa. In addition, the general societal attitude towards antibullying work (e.g. a public pressure or laws or policies requiring schools to take action against bullying), overall school structure (e.g. pedagogical approach, classroom size, the age of school entry, the length of the school day), and the way that bullying is generally understood in each culture may help understand potential differences in the implementation of the program as well as outcomes obtained.

The ongoing evaluations will offer us more detailed information on which further adaptations can be done. At the moment we, as program developers, are at an exciting moment, finding out how and under which conditions the KiVa program works in different cultural environments. Overall, it is clear that research on the generalizability of evidence-based programs across (culturally) diverse groups, countries, and contexts is still in its infancy, and we are proud to be part of efforts to advance this field.

3. Implementation of KiVa in the Netherlands

René Veenstra, Gijs Huitsing, René Koens,
Femke Munniksma, Beau Oldenburg,
Rozemarijn van der Ploeg, Miranda Sentse, and Freek Velthausz
(University of Groningen, The Netherlands)

The success of KiVa in Finland led to the submission of a proposal to the Dutch government to examine the effectiveness of KiVa in the Netherlands. This proposal was submitted to a program called Onderwijs Bewijs (Evidence-Based Education) that subsidizes projects that make use of experiments to examine whether an intervention works or not. In December 2010 the Department of Sociology at the University of Groningen received a one million euro grant to examine KiVa in the Netherlands.

Besides examining the translated KiVa program from Finland, a new additional element to KiVa was included. The additional element in the so-called KiVa+ condition is that teachers will receive feedback about the social structure of their class. The feedback report contains information based on social networks of bullying (Which classmates always start bullying you?) friendships (Who are your best friends?) and popularity (Who are the most popular in your class?). Besides network information the report provides information on school wellbeing. The rationale behind providing schools with a short report about the social status of the class is that teachers will be better able to intervene when children are being bullied. In order to examine the effectiveness of KiVa and KiVa+ there is a three armed research trial: KiVa group, KiVa+ group and the control group.

Preparation

In order to implement KiVa in the Netherlands several steps were taken. The first step was to establish the KiVa consortium. The KiVa consortium comprises scholars and people who are working in the field of education (e.g., professional trainers). Together they participate in monthly meetings about how KiVa can be practically implemented and scientifically evaluated. An asset and important feature of the KiVa consortium is the collaboration of scientists and practitioners.

Secondly, before implementing KiVa in the Netherlands the Finnish teaching materials had to be translated into Dutch. The translation process started in January 2011 and was finished in October 2012. The time span of translating all the materials was rather long in order to further improve the KiVa material and to adjust the Finnish material to the Dutch educational context.

A third step in the implementation process of KiVa was to develop an online tool to facilitate the data collection. The development of the questionnaire started in September 2011. The questionnaire was largely based on the questionnaire from Finland, but also contained several added measurement scales to measure for instance depression, anxiety, and parenting practices. The online questionnaire was finalized in April 2012 after several pilots.
The fourth step was to raise awareness in schools about KiVa and the possibility of participating in the evaluation. In October 2011 the website www.kivaschool.nl was launched and a letter was send to schools to inform them about KiVa. The schools were invited to participate for free. School who wanted to participate could register via the website. In the end, 99 schools registered to participate. In the registration form several questions were asked about the current anti-bullying actions the schools were taking. It appeared that 34 out of 99 schools had already an anti-bullying program, but wanted something new. The registration period stopped in April 2012. The schools received information about the research design, the upcoming measurement, and KiVa training days.

The fifth step was to develop a teacher training program. The training program was mainly developed by practitioners and repeatedly discussed during the monthly KiVa meetings. Besides developing the content of the training days, different conference centers had been contacted as locations for the KiVa training days and the KiVa material (e.g., manual for the teachers, KiVa posters, parent leaflets, and so on) was prepared and transported to the training locations. In April and May 2012 train-the-trainer days were organized to familiarize professional trainers with KiVa.

**Implementation**

The KiVa evaluation in the Netherlands started, in May 2012, with a pre-assessment in grades 2–5 (with children aged 8–11) at all 99 schools. Almost 10,000 children participated in the first wave of data collection. As soon as the data collection finished, the CPB Netherlands Bureau for Economic Policy Analysis, an independent research institute, randomly selected 66 KiVa or KiVa+ schools and 33 control schools. The control schools were asked to continue their ‘business as usual’ and do not participate in the KiVa program until the summer of 2014. The KiVa and KiVa+ schools were trained and started with the KiVa lessons at the beginning of the new school year in August 2012.

Before teaching the KiVa lessons, teachers, principals, school counselors were invited for the training days in June 2012. The training took place in groups of about 25 participants. These groups were trained by duos, composed of a practitioner and a scientist. On the first day the participants were informed about the mechanisms behind bullying and the crucial role of the group in this and then introduced to the KiVa lessons. On the second day participants practiced the indicated actions they should take when there was, despite the prevention, bullying going on at their school.

In August 2012 schools started to introduce KiVa to children and parents. Information evenings for parents were organized, the whole school team got familiarized with KiVa, the school was decorated with some KiVa posters, and the lessons started. KiVa schools were obliged to give KiVa to children aged 8 or 9. The main reason for introducing KiVa to these children is that bullying is most prevalent in this age group. Besides that, the different roles in bullying are less established and at that age. It appeared, however, that many schools were very enthusiastic about the program and therefore also implemented KiVa in the higher grades.

In October 2012 the second wave of data collection was undertaken. The third wave will be in May 2013. That wave will provide the first insights as to whether or not KiVa works in the Netherlands. In the meantime schools discuss, their experiences with KiVa twice a year, under supervision of a practitioner and scientist. The experiences of the KiVa teachers are used as input for further development of the program. Both teachers and children are positive about KiVa. Now the big question is will the Kiva or KiVa+ schools show less bullying than the control schools.

4. Wales leads the way in the UK in trialling the KiVa programme

**Professor Judy Hutchings** (Bangor University, Wales)

I was fortunate to hear Christina Salmivalli speak about KiVa at Cambridge University in June 2011. I had done a considerable amount of work in schools in Wales, including randomised controlled trials of a classroom management programme and a social-emotional curriculum with the focus on children aged 4–7. I knew, immediately, that there would be interest in KiVa in Wales particularly since the programme was developed for children from the age of seven and complemented the work that we were already doing with our younger school aged populations in Wales. Furthermore bullying and
its prevention had been acknowledged as important by the Welsh Government and schools were discussing it as an issue that they needed to address.

Two things enabled this project to move forward in Wales, first Christina came to Wales in November 2011, between talks in Dublin and London, to speak at our Centre for Evidence Based Early intervention and to meet with a number of school-based staff. Second, after a presentation from myself to the Welsh Government, KiVa was added to a list of approved programmes for a small pot of Welsh Government funding.

To our delight 14 schools in Wales, seven from north and seven from south Wales accessed the funding and applied to take part in a pilot trial of KiVa. A further three schools from across the border in Cheshire also signed up to be trained and to work with us on the pilot trial. Christina and her colleague Virpi came to Wales in May 2012 and trained the class teachers and school KiVa teams in both north and south Wales.

Our application for a KESS European funded Master’s project to evaluate the outcomes for these early starter schools was successful and Suzy Clarkson was appointed in September 2012. After completing the on-line pupil survey the schools started delivering the unit 2 programme in Autumn 2012 to their year 5 and/or year 6 children, aged between 9 and 11. At that time this was the only material that had been translated into English.

Based on our previous work we knew that it was important to support the schools and, with Suzy’s help, we arranged termly meetings in three centres across Wales to collect feedback regarding problems and successes in delivering the programme. We also produced material from the teacher manual, that was needed for some of the lessons, to make delivery even easier. The support that we have been able to provide has included translating some materials into Welsh and helping to resolve difficulties around undertaking the on-line survey and enabling the children to access the KiVa games, which they can now play in school and at home.

There have been other challenges along the way, firstly we did not realise that the on-line survey was designed to support unit 2 and we asked our schools to use it with all pupils from age 7 – 11. Secondly our schools have varied access to computers and, unlike in Finland, it is often not possible for a whole class to work on computers at the same time, meaning that completing the survey or playing the computer games requires splitting classes and doubling up.

The very good news is that the teachers and pupils love the lessons. Teachers report extremely positive responses from the children, although they are finding it hard to get through all of the lesson material in a couple of hours a month. They are particularly pleased that the material produces positive contributions from children that do not always contribute in class lessons. The teachers also report that children have a much better understanding of what bullying is and all schools are keen to continue with the programme next year and to make use of the newly translated unit 1 material with their seven and eight year old pupils.

Suzy’s small pilot evaluation will report on the child survey data and on the teacher data on the extent to which the schools have delivered the components of the programme. We are also meeting with all of the pilot schools during the summer term to review ways in which the programme can be made more user friendly for Wales by reviewing the survey, the lessons and the online games.

In 2012 a successful joint bid with Dartington Social Research Unit was made to the Welsh BIG Lottery Innovation Fund to further support the roll out of KiVa in Wales and a randomised controlled trial evaluation of KiVa in 20 schools was funded. This grant comes on stream in April 2013. In this trial we will be using both Units 1 and 2 with all four school years of children from age 7 to 11. This project will benefit from all that we have learned from the initial pilot trial. Christina visited in March 2013 to help to recruit the schools and it is clear that we will have no problem in recruiting the 20 schools. This trial will run for two years with ten schools randomly allocated to intervention and ten to control, with the control schools receiving the training in year 2.

BIG lottery funding will enable further translation of materials into welsh and we are delighted that Christina is allowing us to deliver the training and support in Wales, providing us with the experience and resources that will hopefully enable us to move forward to larger scale roll out of the programme.
In 2007, the State of Delaware, in the United States, passed a law mandating all school districts to implement school-wide bullying prevention programs. This was a daunting task for our educators, who face many such mandates, limited resources in terms of time and money, and a lack of knowledge about the most efficacious programs available. After a few years, it became evident that many districts were failing to comply with the law or were complying in minimal ways. At that point, officials from three agencies within the State of Delaware (Division of Public Health; Department of Services for Children, Youth, and their Families; Department of Education) approached us wanting to learn more about state-of-the-art evidence-based bullying prevention programming. We told them about the KiVa Antibullying Program and its strong empirical support in Finland, and there was considerable interest in the idea of bringing the program to Delaware schools.

As a next step, we approached Christina Salmivalli and her colleagues and introduced the idea of implementing the program in Delaware schools and evaluating its effectiveness here. Those conversations led to the project that we are currently conducting, a randomized trial of the KiVa Program in 12 schools within one school district in the Delaware. During the 2012-2013 school year, we are implementing the KiVa Program in the fourth- and fifth-grade classrooms of 6 of these schools (N = 50 classrooms), while the same-grade classrooms in the remaining 6 schools serve as controls (N = 45 classrooms). We began with fourth and fifth grades because the Unit 2 version of the KiVa program was the first to be translated to English, but we hope to introduce the Unit 1 version of the program to lower grades in the coming years.

We have implemented the program with minimal adaptation from the Finnish version because our first goal is to determine how well the program works as it was originally developed. In later iterations, it is likely that we will introduce cultural-specific modifications.

To evaluate the effectiveness of the KiVa Program in these Delaware schools, we collected data closely mirroring that collected in Finland in these 95 classrooms at the beginning of the school year (“pre” data collection). We will soon begin our end-of-the-year data collection. Thus, we do not yet have empirical results to share, although we are awaiting those results quite eagerly. However, at this point, we can share thoughts on the challenges that we have faced, and future adaptations that we may consider, based on our experiences over the past year.

Implementation Challenges

Schools in the US differ from Finnish schools in a number of important respects that impact the implementation of the KiVa Program. First, our schools are quite racially and ethnically diverse, both within schools and across schools. In fact, the racial/ethnic breakdown of students in our KiVa project is 47% European American, 21% African American, 18% Latino American, 6% Asian American and 7% mixed race. While this diversity is largely very positive, it does sometimes lead to bullying that emphasizes racial/ethnic differences. We have begun to consider the possibility that an American adaptation of the KiVa Program may need to address this very sensitive form of bullying directly.

Second, teachers in Delaware struggle to find time to be trained in the KiVa Program and to implement the program. We initially requested that the school district grant us two full days to train teacher in the KiVa Program prior to the start of the school year. After extensive negotiation, we settled on five hours of training, not because we felt that that was sufficient, but because it became clear that we were not going to do better. In addition, we have seen some teachers struggle to find the time to implement the KiVa lessons, given the many, and very standardized, curriculum requirements that they face. We have succeeded in problem-solving most of these time issues, but my sense is that the issues and the negotiation process have been considerably more extensive than that faced in Finland.

Third, although many teachers and schools in the US are exceptional, there is quite a bit more variability in teacher education, training, and expertise in the US than in Finland. To accommodate this variability, as well as teachers’ time demands, we have introduced “tip sheets” that simplify the presentation of the main points of each KiVa lesson. We have also introduced monthly 30-minute consultations with the teachers in each grade in each school. These
consultations help minimize the time that teachers need to spend prepping for each lesson and help ensure that lessons are implemented on time and with fidelity. The downside, of course, is that this consultation is quite labor-intensive. We are currently working on creative ways to provide teachers with the support that they need whilst reducing time demands on our staff, such as Skype consultation meetings.

Fourth, we’ve found that computer resources are much more limited in US schools than in Finnish schools. This issue makes it difficult for children to play the KiVa Game as frequently as desired. While children can of course also play the game at home, the lack of school-based time for the KiVa Game is a major challenge that we’ve faced this year.

Evaluation Challenges

We have also faced several issues as we have worked to collect data to evaluate the effectiveness of the KiVa Program in Delaware schools in a way that mirrors the process in Finland. In Finland, data are collected through an online survey administered by classroom teachers. This approach is not possible in Delaware, because schools do not have the computer resources to support it. While each school is, of course, equipped with computers, the time available for each class to use them is not sufficient to allow data to be collected in a timely manner. Thus, we have continued to collect our data, as we have in all previous projects in Delaware, with teams of students administering paper-and-pencil measures in each classroom and then hand-entering the resulting data into computerized data bases. While this approach is feasible with a small project such as this one, the prospect of larger-scale evaluation feels quite daunting.

The second way in which we have deviated from the evaluation approach used in Finland is in the timing of data collection. In Finland, data are collected at the end of each school year. Thus, in the initial trial of KiVa in Finland, data were collected at the end of one school year, the program was implemented during the following school year, and data were then collected at the end of that school year. This approach is possible in Finland because the composition of classrooms is stable, with children remaining in largely unchanged peer groups year-after-year. In contrast, in the US, schools include many classrooms at the same grade level, and these classrooms are “shuffled” each year. Moreover, children move between schools and school districts quite frequently. For these reasons, we have found it necessary to collect our “pre” data at the beginning of the same school year in which we first implement the KiVa Program. Of course, we worry about this deviation from the Finnish research design, but we decided, after extensive debate, that it was unavoidable.

Looking to the Future

In spite of these challenges, we remain enormously enthusiastic about the promise of the KiVa Program in Delaware schools. Anecdotal data suggest that most teachers are implementing the program with fidelity and have “bought in” to its importance as they have seen its positive effects on the children in their classrooms. We are hopeful that empirical results will reflect these anecdotal findings. If so, our next step will be to seek funding to disseminate the KiVa Program more broadly throughout the State of Delaware and the United States.

6. The Implementation of the ViSC Program in Cyprus

Olga Solomontos-Kountouri, (Neapolis University Pafos, Cyprus) & Dagmar Strohmeier (University of Upper Austria, Austria)

The goal was to implement the ViSC program with the highest possible program fidelity in Cyprus. Thus, no changes regarding the theoretical model or the program content were made. Moreover, it was intended not to fundamentally change the implementation model of the ViSC program. The background in Cyprus and the steps necessary for implementing the ViSC program are described and the evaluation study is outlined.

Background in Cyprus:
Bullying research has emerged as a significant topic amongst many Cypriot researchers. However, bullying prevention is fragmented and incoherent, which means that the problem is acknowledged but not efficiently and uniformly tackled. The prevalence of bullying and victimization amongst elementary and secondary school children is 17%; bullies represent 5.4%, victims represent 7.4% and bully-victims represent 4.2% (Stavrinides, et. al., 2010). Bullying prevention in primary and secondary schools is tached through some general health education lessons with no clear anti-bullying
framework or assisted policies. Bullying intervention is guided by two centralized institutions of Cyprus Ministry of Education named “Emergency Intervention Group” and “Observatory of school violence.” Both institutions employ very good professionals, who could make suggestions to schools that asked for general help, but were not able to offer any effective program. Thus, both institutions have been working as fire brigades than in the prevention field. At the same time, evaluation results from anti-bullying programs implemented in other countries (e.g., KiVa, ViSC, etc.) were encouraging. The growing awareness of victimization cases amongst educators, the reported serious cases in media and the search of good anti-bullying programs from the two institutions put policy makers under pressure to consider some actions against bullying. At that time our initiative to implement the ViSC program in Cyprus matured and the chance to implement it was realized. Three important reasons for the choice of ViSC were (a) the long and strong collaboration between the program developers in Austria and the researcher located in Cyprus; (b) the translation of the ViSC materials was manageable and the materials were face valid also in Cypriot culture; (c) although the funding in Cyprus, due to the big economic crisis, was scarce we were able to implement the ViSC program on a low resources basis.

Step 1: Partnerships with Stakeholders in Cyprus

A proposal to the Ministry of Education and Culture of Cyprus for piloting and implementing ViSC in secondary schools in Cyprus was approved on the 10th of September 2012. The approval was not an easy and straightforward process. Many meetings and much official correspondence had taken place in order to convince the Ministry of the important and relevant institutions to collaborate in this common goal. Our partner institutions are: (1) Directorate of Secondary education, (2) Pedagogical Institute of Cyprus, (3) Observatory of school violence, and (4) Emergency Intervention Group.

In Austria, the ViSC program has been implemented using a cascaded train-the-trainer model in which the program developers trained multipliers; multipliers trained teachers and teachers trained their students (for details see Strohmeier et al, 2012). To be able to implement a similar cascaded train-the-trainer model in Cyprus, it was necessary to involve members of the referred partner institutions to act as multipliers. The group of Cyprus trainers consists of six members of the Emergency Intervention Group (counsellors and educational psychologists), one member of the Observatory of school violence (teacher-researcher) and two members of the Pedagogical Institute (teacher trainers). These people are all highly qualified and experienced in dealing with school violence. Moreover, it was necessary to involve the chief officers of each institution, who acted as facilitators regarding the cascaded train-the-trainer model and the implementation of the ViSC program in three Gymnasiums. Thus, as in Austria, the goal was to train permanent staff working at the institutions of the Ministry of Education to enable a sustainable knowledge transfer between research and practice.

Step 2: Training of the ViSC Multipliers in Cyprus

The ViSC train-the-trainer course aims to provide the ViSC multipliers with state of the art knowledge about bullying research, introduce them to the philosophy and the concrete tools of the ViSC program, and offer them detailed instructions how to best implement the ViSC program in schools. To implement the ViSC course in Cyprus, all training materials had to be translated from German to Greek. This laborious task was undertaken by a professional translator who worked on a voluntary basis. The ViSC course consisted of two-days of face-to-face workshops held by the Austrian-Cypriot research team at the Pedagogical Institute in Nicosia, Cyprus in September 2012, three two-hour seminars were held before each major school training by the Cypriot group and two-half day workshops in June 2013 by both groups. Attendance at the ViSC course was free of charge for the multipliers whilst their work in the schools is part of their usual duties.

Step 3: Program Implementation in Cyprus

In the 2012/13 school year the ViSC program has been implemented in three Cypriot schools located in three different cities: Nicosia, Larnaca and Pafos.

The original implementation of the ViSC program in Austrian schools was carried out by one trained multiplier who organized three pedagogical conferences, two in school-trainings and several supervision meetings with the
teachers during the school year (for details see Strohmeier, et al. 2012). In Cyprus, the pilot implementation was carried out by three trained multipliers for each school (total number of multipliers is nine). They organized four teachers-trainings and several supervision meetings with the teachers during the school year for each school. Table 1 gives an overview of the program implementation between September 2012 and June 2013 in the three Gymnasiums in Cyprus.

Table 1. ViSC implementation program in Cyprus Gymnasiums

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Content</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>September</td>
<td>Two days ViSC course at the Pedagogical Institute in Nicosia for ViSC trainers</td>
<td>Overview of the ViSC program content and objectives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Detailed instruction on how to implement the program on school level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(in-school trainings)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Detailed instruction on how to tackle acute cases</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Detailed instructions on how to implement the program at class level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(class project units)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October</td>
<td>1st teacher training in the school</td>
<td>General information about the program to all teachers and definition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>and recognition of the problem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October</td>
<td>Seminar in Pedagogical Institute for ViSC trainers</td>
<td>Detailed organisation of the 2nd teachers training and ViSC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>group training in Greek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November</td>
<td>Presentation to the parents and discussion</td>
<td>Bullying consequences and the value of the implementation of the ViSC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>program in the school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November</td>
<td>2st teacher training in the school</td>
<td>Tackling acute cases.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Recognised and evaluate bullying incidences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November -</td>
<td>Coaching the ViSC team of the school</td>
<td>How to engage as many people as possible in the school.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January</td>
<td>Three times</td>
<td>How to involve parents.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Use of the ViSC poster</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January</td>
<td>Seminar in the Pedagogical Institute for ViSC trainers</td>
<td>Detailed organisation of the 3rd and 4th teacher training in Greek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January</td>
<td>3rd and 4th teacher</td>
<td>How to best</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comparing the implementation of the original ViSC program in Austria (Table 1 presented in Strohmeier, Hoffmann et al., 2012) and the implementation of the ViSC program in Cyprus there are only a few differences. Firstly, ViSC trainers felt that they need more training and they would like to hear the English medium contents provided by the Austrian researchers in Greek. Thus, before any major school training, the Cypriot research group offered them a revision seminar. Second, in Cyprus the teacher trainings were split in four parts and took place during the available school time; of special use were two obligatory in-service-training days for teachers. In Austria, teachers training took the form of pedagogical conferences in combination with in-school teacher trainings. In Cyprus, we added a presentation to all parents; because it was necessary to formally inform them and allow them time for discussion. It proved to be a helpful activity for the program.

**Step 4: Evaluation study in Cyprus**

Like in Austria, the evaluation study consists of a formative and a summative part. Within the summative evaluation study, data concerning the proximal and distal outcomes and potential mediator variables have been gathered. Thus, the main goals of the summative evaluation are to investigate (1) the cross national efficacy of the program and (2) the cross
national validity of the theoretical model. Due to the small number of intervention schools, it was not feasible to undertake a randomized control trial in Cyprus. Instead, a quasi-experimental longitudinal design was applied. Data from all students located in the three intervention and in three control schools has been collected at pre-test (September 2012), post-test (May 2013) and follow-up (December 2013). Moreover, data from all teachers in the intervention and control schools has been collected at pre-test (September 2012) and post-test (May 2013).

Within the formative evaluation study, data regarding the program elements were gathered from the teachers and students. The main goal of the formative evaluations was to investigate whether the original implementation model could also be implemented with fidelity in Cyprus.

7. The REBE-ViSC Program: Implementation and Evaluation in Romania
Simona Trip, Carmen Bora, Sebastian Sipos-Gug, Ioana Tocai
(University of Oradea, Romania)

The goal was to add a REBE component to the ViSC class project to increase its aggression reducing effects. Thus, the theoretical model and the program content of the original ViSC class project were substantially extended. Due to practical considerations, the implementation model was also changed. The background in Romania and the steps necessary to develop and implement the REBE-ViSC program are described. The combined REBE-ViSC program is currently implemented and evaluated in 11 schools in Romania.

Background in Romania

Bullying among students has emerged as a major concern in most European countries. The results of The Health Behaviour in School-aged Children (HBSC) study support the importance of evidence based prevention school programs to reduce bullying in Romania because very high prevalence rates have been reported. Between 17 and 26% of 11 to 15 year old girls and between 26 and 35% of the of 11 to 15 year old boys report having bullied others at least two times in the last couple of months (Currie, et al., 2012).

The REBE Program

The REBE Program was developed at the University of Oradea, Romania in 2010 and is based on rational emotive behavioral theory (Ellis, 1994). According to this theory, information processing determines the way in which people feel and behave. The presence of anger and self-control problems (aggressive behaviors) in peoples’ lives are due to a specific cognition called low frustration tolerance. Low frustration tolerance is the belief that one ‘cannot stand’ having unmet demands, and a refusal to accept the reality of frustration and discomfort.

The main purpose of the REBE Program is to teach students how to identify, challenge and change their low frustration tolerance beliefs in order to control their anger and aggressive behaviors. The program is structured in six modules, seven class activities for each one. The first module called “triggers for anger” helps students to identify possible internal and external stimuli that activate anger. “Anger – personal experience and patterns of expression” is content of the second module in which personal experiences of students are used to recognize anger and its expressions and to differentiate anger from other emotions. The next three modules target the cognitive level, teaching students how to identify, challenge and find rational alternatives for low frustration tolerance to discomfort, others’ behaviors, rules and emotional discomfort. Module 6 is dedicated to other strategies for dealing with anger (problem solving, forgiveness) (Trip & Bora, 2010).

These modules have been implemented by well-trained research assistants in classes. Through the activities, trainers use different scenarios, stories, role-play, drama, and art in order to guide students to recall their personal experience with anger or aggressive behaviors, helping them make the connection between thoughts, emotions and behaviors. Once this link has been made, students work together, under the supervision of the trainer, to develop alternative perspectives for their thoughts, by developing rational stories, giving rational vs. irrational alternatives, role-playing, and group discussions.

The ViSC Program

In the ViSC program activities operate at the school, class, and individual level (for details see Spiel & Strohmeier, 2011). To develop the combined REBE-ViSC Program, only the class level component has been used because it best fits the original REBE program. The ViSC class
The project consists of 13 units divided into two parts. During the units 1 to 8, the students work together to find ways to prevent aggressive behaviour in their class. Students learn alternative ways to perceive, interpret, and deal with critical situations using vignette stories, discussions and role-plays. During units 9 to 13, students work together to achieve a positive, common goal. Thus, a group process is created in the class that enables cooperative learning and the experience of a common success.

The REBE-ViSC Mechanisms of Change

The combination of the main theoretical ideas of the REBE and the ViSC Programs led to an extension of the original underlying theoretical model of the ViSC program (see Figure 1). Besides the factors empathy, responsibility and pro-social behavior options considered important in the ViSC class project, the two REBE mechanisms entitlement and discomfort intolerance, considered important to manage anger, are targeted in the REBE-ViSC intervention. Entitlement is the belief that our desires must meet and other people should not frustrate these desires. Discomfort intolerance is the demand that life must be easy, comfortable, and free of hassle (Harrington, 2005).

Figure 1: Theoretical Model of the REBE-ViSC Program

Implementation of the REBE-ViSC Program in Romania

Implementation of the REBE-ViSC Program in Romania started in 2012 along with a small research grant for bilateral cooperation between Romania and Austria. Activities from the REBE Program selected included: Anger triggers (first module), Anger and other emotions, Lets draw anger and Anger scale, Consequences of anger (second module), I don’t feel like it!, “I can tolerate it” mask, A story about tolerance (third module), Class necklace and The miracle of the necklace, Teacher accuses and The teacher and fairness (forth module), I am well behaved in class, Behavior chart, I have a final!, The school without rules (fifth module). From the ViSC class project, 12 activities were implemented: Development of commonly shared class rules, Recognizing critical social situations (aggression, bullying), Behavioral options for spectators, Recognizing emotions and empathy training, Managing emotions, Recognizing different viewpoints of the same situation, Behavioral options for victims, Behavioral options, Summary and Rehearsal, Reflection on what has been learned, Class project (3 activities).

All activities were delivered by eight graduate students in clinical psychology, psychological counseling and psychotherapy and four psychology undergraduate students trained in the ViSC and REBE Programs by the program developers.

Design of the Evaluation Study

The first step in school selection was to inform the county school administrative forum. After we had their written consent, as a second step, the program team called each school from Oradea city, met the director of the school and informed her/him about the REBE-ViSC Program and about the benefits for the school. If the director was interested in involving the school in the program, the school was selected for the experimental group. The schools where the director was not interested in the project were allocated to the control group. The experimental group consisted in 8 schools, 23 classes (sixth grade), 500 students and the control group contained 3 schools, 11 classes (sixth grade), 250 students. From the eight experimental schools, five (14 classes) started with REBE activities and three with ViSC (9 classes), this presented our first challenge in implementation – fitting the trainers schedule with the class schedule.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intervention Group 1 (5 schools)</th>
<th>13-14 REBE activities</th>
<th>12 ViSC activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intervention Group 2 (3 schools)</td>
<td>12 ViSC activities</td>
<td>13-14 REBE activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control Group (3 schools)</td>
<td>no intervention</td>
<td>no intervention</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Challenges in Implementation and Evaluation

After obtaining the parents’ written consent, the project team started the pretest evaluation. This was the first challenge – some of the schools did not have the logistics for the online evaluation or we could not fit the info lab and class timetables into a workable plan. Therefore, we had to use both online and paper-pencil evaluation.

Each activity takes one hour per week. In the class timetable, the only possibility for us to implement the activities was the tutorial class, where the teacher tutor meets the class and discusses some class problems and other topics. The second challenge was the class tutor’s attitude toward the program and the working alliance between trainer and students. Some of the tutors complained about taking this time with the class, having a negative attitude towards the program and the trainer, or interfering with the activity. We noticed difficulties in developing the working alliance, some of the trainers were not able to create a genuine relationship with the class, displaying an authoritative style of interaction. This was the reason for the decision to add a measure of the working alliance at the midpoint and the final evaluation. The trainers were supervised after each activity by two supervisors, one for REBE and one for ViSC. There were situations where the supervisor had to join the trainer to the class activity because of the disruptive behaviors of students.

Another challenge for implementation could be the differences between schools regarding the school climate and attitudes towards these types of activities which involve more group work and sharing personal experiences. An important challenge for the trainers was to adapt the methods they used to the class climate. A specific challenge for the REBE activities was to make students conscious about the power of the cognition in their emotional life, this being a totally new approach for them.

When implementing the REBE-ViSC Program teachers and parents were not involved. This might be a shortcoming. Developing training elements for both teachers and parents based on the theoretical background of the combined program could be a new research direction.
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Announcing the XIV EARA Conference in Izmir

Submitted by Figen Cok (Ankara University, Turkey).

WELCOME TO EARA 2014 CONFERENCE

We are pleased to announce the organization of the 14th Biennial Conference of the European Association for Research on Adolescence, which will take place on September 3-6, 2014 near Izmir in Cesme, Turkey. The conference will cover main topics of state of the art adolescent research and will offer perspectives from various areas of psychology, such as developmental, social and clinical and counselling psychology and brain research, as well as from other disciplines such as education, sociology and adolescent psychiatry.

Researchers and practitioners from different disciplines across Europe and all over the world, who study adolescence, will have ample opportunity to exchange ideas, discuss research findings and raise new questions for research. The conference program will include keynote lectures, invited symposia, a round table discussion, preconference workshops, symposia, oral presentations and poster sessions. Leading names in the study of adolescence Christiane Spiel, Laurence Steinberg, Deborah Capaldi, Berna Guroglu, Nebi Sumer, Wim Meeus and Susan Brange will give keynotes. We will have Martyn Barrett, Moin Syed, Isabela Graniec, Melike Sayil, Elena Martha, Lyda Lannegrand-Willems, Luc Gossenss and Ingrid Schoon as invited symposia organizers. Çiğdem Kağtçıbaşı will organize a round table discussion on "Studying adolescent development from cultural perspective" Susan Brange, Wim Beyers, Elizabetta Crocetti and Bill Burk will facilitate preconference workshops on methodological issues of adolescent research. The conference program seems to be very rich with submitted symposia, oral papers and posters.

Conference venue, Çeşme Altinayunus is a large resort with good conference facilities and services situated in a relaxing region of Aegean coast. It could be easily reached by Izmir airport. The conference organization will also organize pre and post conference tours to Ephesus and Izmir and also to Istanbul.

Çeşme is famous with its pleasant climate, wonderful beaches and windsurfing capacity. Conference dates are perfect dates for a summer holiday. We encourage you for considering Çeşme for a holiday opportunity as well.

You are all welcome to Çesme/Izmir, Turkey, in 2014!

www.eara2014.org

From the Student and Early Career Network (SECNet):

Student and Early Career Network Update and Opportunities

Submitted by Hebbah Elgindy, Örebro University, (Sweden)

The Student and Early Career Network (SECNet) are glad to present our new committee for the 2013/2014 term:

Hebbah Elgindy – Lead Representative, PhD Candidate at Örebro University, Sweden.

Shannon Snapp – Representative, Postdoctoral Researcher, University of Arizona, USA.
Elisabetta Crocetti – Representative, Postdoctoral Researcher at Utrecht University, the Netherlands.

Katharina Eckstein – Secretary, Postdoctoral Researcher, University of Jena, Germany.

Constantina Demetriou – Communication Representative, PhD Candidate, University of Roehampton, UK.

Aysenur Ataman – Communication Representative, PhD Candidate, City University New York, USA.

Cyrille Perchec - Membership Manager/Communication Team, European University of Brittany, France.

The new committee has several upcoming projects that we would like to share with our members. We are currently working on developing a new and updated SECNet webpage which we will soon launch. We are also developing a Facebook page that will allow us to better connect with our SECNet members. Through our Facebook page, you will be able to get in touch with us faster, get information quicker, and receive updates about our ongoing work more frequently. In sum, our aim is to find better ways to reach out to our current and new members as well as reinventing the way we work. By developing our communication strategies, we hope to achieve this goal in this coming term.

If you have any questions, or would like some more information, please do not hesitate to contact us. Our e-mail is: eara.secnet@gmail.com

When the new website and Facebook page is set up, we will send out an e-mail to all our members.

Looking forward to connect with you soon.

Best,
The SECNet Committee

---

In memoriam of Margaret

Submitted by Lauree Tilton-Weaver (Örebro University (Sweden))

Margaret Kerr, Professor of Psychology at Örebro University, Sweden, died Monday November 19th after a long struggle with cancer. An adopted Swede, Margaret was originally from Saegertown, Pennsylvania. She attended Edinboro University in Pennsylvania, earning bachelor’s degrees with honors in both psychology and business. She earned her Ph.D. in psychology from Cornell University where she was supervised by Daryl Bem and then completed a post-doctoral fellowship with Richard Tremblay at the University of Montréal, Canada. Margaret had worked at Örebro University for over a decade, establishing and co-directing the Center for Developmental Research with her husband, Håkan Stattin. She was also a co-founder of the research unit, Youth & Society, developed to study political and civic development of adolescents and young adults. During her tenure at Örebro University, she served as an Associate Editor for the Journal of Research on Adolescence and the Swedish editor for the Scandinavian Journal of Psychology.

A consummate researcher, Margaret’s work was fundamental in establishing the Psychology department’s standing as one of the best research units in Europe. Her work, focused on the development of children, adolescents, and young adults, covered a variety of adjustment issues, including delinquency, depression, shyness, anxiety, psychopathic traits, and civic engagement. She was particularly interested in how youths’ development played out across contexts and how they influenced the contexts of their own development. Her interest in research was both vocation and avocation: Asked about her hobbies, she would respond that her work was her hobby.

Recognized nationally and internationally for the quality of her work, Margaret collaborated with researchers across the globe. Her efforts won recognition from the scientific community: she was given an Excellent Researcher Award by the
Swedish Research Council, and with her husband, she won the Roberta Grodberg Simmons Prize from the Society for Research on Adolescence. Her students and colleagues remember her as a remarkably intelligent woman of seemingly boundless energy, who generously mentored others in their research pursuits.

Margaret is survived by her husband, Håkan; her son, Justin Scheckler; her daughter, Tara Lindén, son-in-law, Anders Lindén, and her two-month-old grandson, Ari Kerr Lindén.

We mourn Dr. Margaret Kerr, Professor of Psychology at Orebrö University, Sweden. Margaret Kerr was one of the leading scholars of our Association. Her contributions have been of immense value. We all know her seminal work on parental monitoring, knowledge and adolescent disclosure, and we all have enjoyed her vibrant presentations or co-presentations with Håkan at many many occasions. Margaret was especially strong in conceptual issues and in pointing at the importance of clear and concise operationalizations. Her last published paper, Kerr, Stattin, & Özdemir (2012), Perceived parenting style and adolescent adjustment: Revisiting directions of effects and the role of parental knowledge. Developmental Psychology, 48, 1540-1554, is once again a clear demonstration of this. Margaret has been very important in creating good and friendly relationships with SRA, our sister organization in the US, and her workshops on scientific writing have impacted many of our young scholars.

Margaret’s contributions to EARA will be dearly missed. We salute her as an excellent scholar and a friendly and modest colleague. We offer our condolences to our friend and colleague Håkan, to Margaret’s and Håkan’s children and to her colleagues at Orebrö University.

Wim Meeus, EARA president
Susan Branje, EARA secretary

**EARA Publications**


depressogenic personality and attachment dimensions in adolescence: An examination of associations with changes in depressive symptoms. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*.  
to adolescence: Associations with parenting and adjustment. *Child Development.*


---

**Editor’s note:** Please send citations (following APA style) for recent publications to me for inclusion in this section ([fabrizia.giannotta@oru.se](mailto:fabrizia.giannotta@oru.se)). Citations should be of chapters/books or journal articles on adolescence or of work having relevance to adolescence scholars. Citations of work published in the current year, of unpublished work that has a digital object identifier (doi), and of work that has not been previously announced will be included.
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