

Reducing victimisation and delivering social value: a behavioural evaluation of the stand up for respect program

Journal of Social
Marketing

Sharyn Rundle-Thiele 

*Social Marketing @ Griffith, Griffith University, Queensland, Australia, and
The Behaviour Change Collaborative, West Perth, Australia*

Patrice Huggins

Life Education Queensland, Broadbeach, Australia, and

Julia Carins 

Social Marketing @ Griffith, Griffith University, Queensland, Australia

Received 6 December 2025
Revised 30 April 2026
Accepted 15 May 2026

Abstract

Purpose – This study aims to evaluate the effectiveness and social value of the Stand Up for Respect pilot program. Stand Up for Respect was delivered as a whole-of-school bullying prevention initiative delivered in Queensland, Australia. The program aims to reduce bullying victimisation, foster respectful relationships and contribute to the long-term prevention of domestic and family violence.

Design/methodology/approach – A mixed-methods approach was used, combining pre- and post-surveys with students to assess changes in bullying behaviours and victimisation. A Social Return on Investment (SROI) analysis was conducted to estimate the value of reduced victimisation, focusing on the links between victimisation and domestic violence.

Findings – The pilot program achieved a statistically significant reduction in student-reported victimisation and an increase in student confidence to intervene in bullying. However, no statistically significant change was self-reported for bullying perpetration according to the Olweus (2006) scale. The SROI analysis estimated a social value of \$36,241, demonstrating cost savings for the Queensland community through reduced domestic violence risk.

Research limitations/implications – Limitations include reliance on self-reported data, short program duration and a narrow SROI scope. Future research should incorporate co-design, longer program duration, longitudinal tracking and expanded SROI calculations.

Practical implications – Findings support scaling the program and integrating Stand Up for Respect into broader wellbeing curricula and violence prevention strategies.

Social implications – Reducing bullying victimisation can contribute to safer school environments and long-term reductions in domestic violence.

Originality/value – This study contributes to the literature by linking bullying victimisation to broader societal costs and applying an SROI framework to estimate program value. This study highlights the

© Sharyn Rundle-Thiele, Patrice Huggins and Julia Carins. Published by Emerald Publishing Limited. This article is published under the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY 4.0) licence. Anyone may reproduce, distribute, translate and create derivative works of this article (for both commercial and non-commercial purposes), subject to full attribution to the original publication and authors. The full terms of this licence may be seen at <https://creativecommons.org/licences/by/4.0/>

Funding: This study was funded by Life Education Queensland.



Journal of Social Marketing
Emerald Publishing Limited
2042-6763
DOI 10.1108/JSOCM-12-2025-0384

importance of early intervention and the potential of bullying prevention programs to drive behaviour change in school settings.

Keywords Bullying prevention, Victimization, Behaviour change, Social marketing, School-based intervention, Domestic violence, Whole-of-school approach, Upstander behaviour, Co-design, Social Return on Investment (SROI), Program evaluation, Respectful relationships

Paper type Impact article

Background

Bullying remains a serious issue in Australian schools with the percentage of students who reported being victims of any type of bullying act at least a few times a month amongst the highest four countries in the OECD (OECD, 2019). School-bullying is defined as repeated aggressive behaviours that occur between a bully (or bullies) and victim with the intent to harm (Gaffney *et al.*, 2021). Bullying behaviours can occur in many contexts, for example, in schools, in the workplace, between siblings and online (Gaffney *et al.*, 2019). This study is focussed on bullying in schools.

The *Stand Up for Respect* pilot program was developed in response to this problem (see Appendix for the *Stand Up for Respect* Theory of Change). Delivered by Life Education Queensland (Life Ed. QLD), and Social Marketing @ Griffith, Griffith University, the program piloted a whole-of-school approach to bullying prevention over a 10-week period. *Stand Up for Respect* aims to build the capacity of students, teachers and parents to recognise, respond to and prevent bullying in all its forms, namely physical, verbal, social and online. *Stand Up for Respect* is grounded in evidence, offering age-appropriate lessons for students, playground intervention strategies, professional development for educators and parent education resources.

Beyond directly addressing bullying, *Stand Up for Respect* is part of a broader strategy to prevent domestic and family violence. Australian Bureau of Statistics (2024) data showed that, on average 5,576 people in Queensland are victims of violence and sexual assault each month. This totals 66,912 reports of violence and abuse each year. This is an underestimate, as it does not include acts of violence and sexual assault that are not reported to police. Domestic violence impacts the broader Australian community and is estimated to cost the Australian economy \$21.7bn per annum (Australian Institute of Health and Welfare, 2024). These costs emerge from both the physical and psychological impact of violence on victims, the use of health care and justice services and the generational effects for children who live with violence.

Research shows a clear link between childhood bullying behaviours and the perpetration of violence later in life. Wolke *et al.* (2013) followed 1,237 children into early adulthood, conducting multiple follow-ups between ages 9–23–26. The research found that children who had been targets of bullying were 1.31 times more likely to experience future violent relationships compared to children who had not experienced bullying. The risk was also elevated for children who had engaged in bullying (4.48 times greater), as well as those who had been bully-victims (3.12 times greater). Costa *et al.* (2015) reviewed 25 longitudinal studies examining childhood and adolescent factors that lead to future domestic violence. They found in addition to a child's family and economic circumstances; behavioural problems and poor-quality peer relationships are significant predictors of domestic violence in adulthood. Aggressive behaviour and conduct problems in the middle childhood years were found to be strong predictors of future violence perpetration and victimisation. Routine conflict in peer relationships, poor conflict resolution and a lack of closeness also increased the risk of future violent relationships.

By fostering respectful relationships from an early age, *Stand Up for Respect* seeks to disrupt this trajectory through reducing the incidence of both victimisation and bullying aiming to contribute to long-term cultural change. Over time, early intervention through school-based programs like *Stand Up for Respect* may represent a proactive and cost-effective strategy to reduce these harms and costs incurred by the taxpaying community. By equipping children with the skills to stand up for themselves and others, and by engaging the broader school community, *Stand Up for Respect* aims to lay the groundwork for a safer, more respectful future for all Australians.

Research purpose and aims

Despite decades of research and intervention, bullying remains a persistent and damaging issue in Australian schools (Centre for Education Statistics and Evaluation, 2017). National and international evidence confirms that bullying has serious short- and long-term consequences for students' mental health, academic achievement and social development. Victims of bullying are at significantly increased risk of depression, anxiety, self-harm and suicide, with long-term impacts on their wellbeing and life outcomes. The economic burden is also substantial, with bullying-related mental health issues costing the Australian economy an estimated \$763m annually, representing over 8% of national mental health expenditure (Jadambaa *et al.*, 2021).

While numerous anti-bullying programs have been implemented (Gaffney *et al.*, 2019; Gaffney *et al.*, 2021), many lack systematic evaluation or fail to address the broader social norms that underpin bullying behaviours (Centre for Education Statistics and Evaluation, 2017). There is limited evidence on how school-based interventions can be designed to not only reduce bullying but also prevent future violence, including domestic and family violence. Research shows that bullying behaviours in childhood are linked to the perpetration of violence in adulthood (Wolke *et al.*, 2013), highlighting the need for early, preventative interventions that promote respectful relationships and prosocial behaviour.

The *Stand Up for Respect* pilot was developed to address this gap. *Stand Up for Respect* adopts a whole-of-school approach, grounded in social marketing and behaviour change theory, to empower students, teachers and parents to recognise, prevent and respond to bullying. The program also aims to build a culture of respect and inclusion, thereby contributing to the long-term prevention of domestic and family violence.

This study aims to evaluate the effectiveness of the *Stand Up for Respect* pilot in achieving increased student confidence and a reduction in self-reported victimisation and bullying for students. Specifically, the research seeks to answer the following questions:

- RQ1. To what extent does the *Stand Up for Respect* program reduce student victimisation behaviours in participating schools?
- RQ2. To what extent does the *Stand Up for Respect* program reduce student bullying behaviours in participating schools?
- RQ3. What is the cost savings for Queensland community arising from *Stand Up for Respect*?

Method

Following ethical clearance, the *Stand Up for Respect* pilot program was evaluated using a mixed-methods approach to assess both its effectiveness in reducing bullying and its broader social impact through a Social Return on Investment (SROI) analysis. The evaluation was

designed to be replicable and aligned with best-practice guidelines for pilot program assessment.

Outcome evaluation

A repeated measure design using paper surveys captured information from students before and after participation in the 10-week *Stand Up for Respect* program. Survey items were selected from the Revised Olweus Bully/Victim Questionnaire (OBVQ; [Olweus, 2013](#)) to assess children's experience of victimisation and self-reported perpetration of bullying. The Revised Olweus Bully/Victim Questionnaire (OBVQ; [Olweus, 2013](#)) was selected due to its strong psychometric properties and widespread use in school-based bullying research ([Solberg and Olweus, 2003](#); [Olweus, 2013](#)). The OBVQ operationalises bullying in line with Olweus's established definition, capturing intentional, repetitive behaviour involving a power imbalance, thereby distinguishing bullying from general peer conflict. The measure demonstrates acceptable reliability and validity across diverse educational contexts and has been extensively used in evaluations of whole-school bullying prevention programs, supporting its suitability for assessing intervention-related change ([Volk et al., 2017](#)).

Student's experience of victimisation (nine-items) and bullying (nine-items) were measured on a 0–4 scale where 0 was never and 4 was several times a week. Reliability analysis was performed, and all constructs exceeded the 0.7 threshold. Scales were summed for outcome evaluation and group analysis. Survey data was entered into statistical package for the social sciences (SPSS) for cleaning and data analysis. Independent t-testing and one-way ANOVA was used to examine outcome effectiveness and group differences for student data.

Social return on investment

SROI was assessed following procedures outlined in [Clark and Rosenzweig \(2004\)](#) and [Cabinet Office of the Third Sector \(2012\)](#). The SROI analysis followed a six-stage framework:

- (1) Establishing Scope and Stakeholders: key stakeholders included students, teachers, parents and school administrators. The scope focused on bullying prevention and early indicators of respectful relationship development.
- (2) Mapping Outcomes: outcomes were mapped using the program's theory of change. Outcomes included reductions in victimisation and/or bullying incidents.
- (3) Values assigned to the agreed outcomes: student outcomes for victimisation and self-reported perpetration of bullying were calculated. Then values were assigned for each outcome by estimating financial proxies. These proxies are judgements informed by social indicators, prevalence statistics, monetary values (where available) and assumptions of expected change in these indicators. Although a subjective process, best practice is to justify each in detail and transparently.
- (4) Stage 4 established the impact by identifying how inputs and outputs contribute to impact. This involved identifying causal links between bullying and other behaviours known to deliver significant costs to Australian society. In this SROI, secondary data was available to verify the links between domestic violence, bullying and victimisation for students. Data was not available to verify outcomes for other stakeholder groups (such as teachers).
- (5) Calculate the SROI: gathered data was entered into an SROI ratio. Financial proxies were estimated for observed reductions in bullying victimisation, as a

10.45% reduction was observed from pre-to-post program. No financial proxies were estimated for self-reported bullying perpetration as no changes were observed pre-to-post according to the Olweus (2006) scale for bullying. All estimates including their rationale were transparently reported. The final SROI was determined. This is described as a ratio, where for every dollar invested an immediate impact of social value is provided in monetary terms.

- (6) Report generated: the SROI report was constructed so that all assumptions, calculations and findings are available.

Results

This section presents outcome evaluation and SROI estimate of the *Stand Up for Respect* pilot program. The results are organised around the three research questions:

- RQ1. reduction in victimisation behaviours.
RQ2. reduction in bullying behaviours, and
RQ3. cost savings for the Queensland community.

RQ1. Reduction in victimisation behaviours

Quantitative data collected from a matched pre, during and post program implementation surveys revealed a statistically significant increase in student confidence to intervene to prevent bullying and a reduction in self-reported victimisation among students who participated in the *Stand Up for Respect* program. A repeated measure design using paper surveys captured information for students before and after their participation in the *Stand Up for Respect* program. Nine student survey items were selected from the 40-item Revised Olweus Bully/Victim Questionnaire (OBVQ; Olweus, 2013 to assess students' experiences of bullying victimisation and self-reported perpetration (see selected items in Tables 2 and 3). Students' experience of victimisation and self-reported perpetration were measured on a 0–4 scale where 0 was “never” and 4 was “several times a week”. Confidence to intervene in bullying, including students' ability to recognise bullying behaviours and to respond appropriately, was measured on a 1–5 scale where 1 was “not confident at all” and 5 was “very confident”.

Survey data was entered into SPSS for cleaning and data analysis. Reliability analysis was performed, and all constructs exceeded the 0.7 threshold. Scales were summed for outcome evaluation and group analysis. One-way ANOVA was used to examine outcome effectiveness and to examine group differences for student data. Student outcomes are presented in Table 1.

Table 1. Student outcome data for the *Stand Up for Respect* pilot program

Study construct	Pre Mean (SD) <i>n</i> = 479	During Mean (SD) <i>n</i> = 268	Post Mean (SD) <i>n</i> = 557
Student confidence to intervene in bullying*	3.8 (0.7)	4.0 (0.8)	4.0 (0.9)
Student experience of victimisation*	1.1 (0.7)	1.0 (0.8)	0.9 (0.7)
Student self-reported perpetration	0.4 (0.5)	0.4 (0.5)	0.4 (0.5)

Note(s): *Significant at the $p = 0.05$ or less level

The reduction in victimisation was observed across multiple forms of victimisation (see [Table 2](#)), which included behaviours such as name calling, ignoring other students, making fun of other students, taking or damaging things, spreading rumours, physically hurting other students or making hurtful comments about other students online.

RQ2. Reduction in bullying behaviours

In contrast to the reduction in victimisation, the evaluation did not observe a statistically significant change in self-reported bullying perpetration. Pre- and post-survey data showed variation across different behaviours with students admitting some types of bullying went up while other types of bullying decreased over the pilot program period (see [Table 3](#)).

An important consideration is that bullying behaviours are not evenly distributed across student populations ([Espelage and Swearer, 2003](#)). Research consistently demonstrates that a relatively small minority of students account for a disproportionate share of bullying perpetration, often exhibiting stable and repeated patterns of behaviour over time ([Espelage and Swearer, 2003](#); [Olweus, 2013](#)). From this perspective, even small population-level increases in specific bullying behaviours may be meaningful if they reflect changes among this high-risk subgroup.

Table 2. Comparison of victimisation rates pre and post the *stand up for respect* pilot program

Bullying experience	Every week + Several times a week			
	Pre (%)	Post (%)	Diff. (%)	% Change
I was called mean names by other students	23.88	21.03	-2.85	12
Other students made fun of me in a way that hurt my feelings	20.70	15.46	-5.24	25
Other students ignored me	19.01	14.72	-4.29	23
Other students left me out of things on purpose	17.48	12.41	-5.07	29
I was physically hurt by other students	11.84	5.17	-6.67	56
Other students told lies or spread rumours about me	15.17	8.56	-6.61	44
Other students took my things away from me	10.46	8.22	-2.24	21
Other students damaged my things on purpose	5.88	3.77	-2.11	36
Other students made hurtful comments about me online	7.56	7.24	-0.32	4

Table 3. Self-reported weekly bullying

Bullying behaviour	Every week + several times a week			
	Pre (%)	Post (%)	Diff. (%)	% Change
I called other student(s) mean names	5.84	6.83	0.99	17
I made fun of other student(s) in a hurtful way	2.75	3.06	0.31	12
I ignored other student(s)	6.60	4.06	-2.54	38
I left other student(s) out of things on purpose	2.43	2.39	-0.04	2
I physically hurt other student(s)	1.72	1.72	0.00	0
I told lies or spread rumours about other student(s)	1.72	0.34	-1.38	80
I took things belonging to other student(s) away from them	2.76	2.04	-0.72	26
I damaged things belonging to other student(s) on purpose	2.06	0.68	-1.38	67
I made hurtful comments about other student(s) online	2.43	4.10	1.67	69

RQ3. Cost savings for the Queensland community

The SROI for the *Stand Up for Respect* pilot program includes the community costs of domestic violence, and the role that reductions in victimisation of bullying can have on reducing these costs. Specifically, domestic violence costs the Australian community an estimated \$21.7bn dollars per annum (AIHW, 2024), and people who are targets of bullying are 31% more likely to experience domestic violence (Wolke *et al.*, 2013). Reductions in experiences of bullying can therefore reduce the community costs incurred from domestic violence.

By this measure alone, the cost savings generated for the Queensland community through reduced domestic violence, because of the *Stand Up for Respect* pilot program is estimated to be \$36,241 (see Table 4 for detailed calculations). A positive social value was therefore estimated.

It is important to note that this calculation is not intended to capture the full SROI from the program. This SROI calculation was focused on one known impact of reductions in victimisation. SROI can be calculated for a variety of known impacts. For example, the economic benefits to the community of reducing rates of school drop-out or lower workforce participation, are completely independent of the economic outcomes of domestic violence. Consideration of the benefits arising from lowering rates of school drop-out, which may include reduced reliance on social welfare through increased rates of employment, may lead to a higher SROI, but this was not calculated in this SROI.

Opportunities to consider other community benefits of the *Stand Up for Respect* program to the Queensland community may involve identifying links between reductions in victimisation and increased school attendance, improved student learning and academic achievement, a more conducive learning environment for all students and reductions in teacher burnout which are all important impacts that have economic outcomes for society. The benefits arising from improved school attendance include delivering positive impacts for society in terms of improved earning capacity and socio-economic status and the flow on benefits to the Queensland economy, which are likely to be substantial.

The SROI calculation reported in this paper is therefore not intended to be used as a single measure of the long-term impact of the program. This specific report of SROI aims to demonstrate how the delivery of *Stand Up for Respect* can be communicated in terms of its ability to deliver cost reductions for the Queensland community due to decreases observed in reductions of the incidence of student victimisation.

Discussion

The *Stand Up for Respect* pilot program demonstrated promising results in reducing bullying victimisation and generating quantifiable social value, supporting the underlying theory of change (Appendix) that informed program design. This theory of change assumed that bullying victimisation could be reduced by intervening across multiple, interacting systems within the school environment such as students, educators, parents and the broader classroom and playground context. By embedding practical strategies within the curriculum to help students recognise bullying and respond safely, while simultaneously equipping teachers and parents to reinforce consistent norms and responses, the program addressed both individual capability and environmental influences on behaviour. The observed reduction in victimisation suggests that aligning skills development with supportive social and institutional contexts was effective in disrupting bullying dynamics, consistent with social marketing principles emphasising systems thinking and multi-level value creation.

The 10.45% reduction in victimisation further highlights the effectiveness of a whole-of-school approach as a core mechanism within the theory of change. This finding aligns with

Table 4. Social value estimation

Stakeholder	Intended change	Impact	Social indicator	Calculated value	Assumption	Actual change	Revised assumption	Proxy calculation	Proxy result
Students	Children are not victimised	Less DV	The cost of Domestic Violence in AUS was estimated (in 2015–16) as: \$21,700,000,000 (Source: A) The prevalence rate used in this calculation was 1,033,910 (Source: A)	\$27.1bn divided by (prev. rate of 1,033,910) = \$20,988.29 per person, per year	The odds of a victimised child being involved in a violent relationship is 1.31 higher than someone not bullied/victimised: 1.31 (Source: B) (invert odds ratio)	Actual % drop in victimised children 10.45% (Source: C) your change rate	DV risk reduction factor: 4.15% if victimisation removed completely Reduction proportionate to actual change: 0.43%	All students involved in SuRR: 1,896 (Source: C) by prevalence: 21.0% by calc value: \$20,988.29 by reduction of: 0.43%	\$36,241

Source A: Australian Institute of Health and Welfare. (2024)

Source B: Wolke et al. (2013)

Source C: Stand Up for Respect Outcome Evaluation

existing evidence demonstrating that bullying prevention efforts are more successful when interventions are systemic, inclusive and embedded within everyday school practices rather than delivered as isolated lessons (Gaffney *et al.*, 2019). Strengthening students' confidence to recognise, report and respond to bullying appears to have reduced exposure to victimisation, even in the absence of immediate change in self-reported perpetration.

The absence of observable outcome change in self-reported bullying perpetration suggests that deeper behavioural shifts may require the addition of co-creation (Rundle-Thiele *et al.*, 2021). While the first *Stand Up for Respect* pilot was informed by a rigorous evidence review and embedded best-practice bullying prevention strategies, it did not apply the Co-create–Build–Engage (CBE) process (Rundle-Thiele *et al.*, 2021) or involve stakeholders in co-design (Trischler *et al.*, 2019). Co-creation is essential to ensure that interventions are relevant, valued and effective. Co-design enables students, teachers and parents to act as experts of their own experience, contributing insights that cannot be captured through traditional research methods alone. Involving these groups in the program design process fosters ownership, builds trust and ensures that solutions reflect the lived realities of those they aim to serve.

Evidence from adjacent fields, particularly workplace sexual harassment prevention training, highlights the importance of careful program design to avoid reverse or backlash effects. Research documents that mandatory, compliance-oriented or externally controlling interventions can generate psychological reactance and norm resistance (Legault *et al.*, 2011; Dobbin and Kaley, 2016). While *Stand Up for Respect* adopted a preventative, whole-school orientation, this literature underscores the need for autonomy-supportive implementation and robust evaluation. Analysis in this paper focuses on aggregate pre–post change, future research would benefit from examining heterogeneity in program effects, including subgroup or latent-class analyses to better understand differential impacts among persistent perpetrators. Future research could explicitly test for reverse effects by incorporating comparison or delayed-intervention groups, examining short- versus longer-term trajectories and using mixed-method designs to distinguish between heightened awareness and behavioural change.

From a social marketing practice perspective, the findings provide several actionable insights. Firstly, practitioners should design interventions around a clearly articulated theory of change that prioritises proximal, observable behaviours such as recognising bullying, reporting bullying and upstander action rather than relying solely on distal outcomes like reductions in bullying perpetration. Secondly, results highlight the importance of activating key influence points within the system, particularly educators and parents, through capacity building and shared language to ensure consistent norm reinforcement across contexts. Thirdly, embedding behavioural strategies into routine school practices including classroom activities, supervision and reporting processes appears critical for reducing harm while more entrenched behaviours are addressed over time.

The SROI findings further strengthen the case for investment, demonstrating meaningful social value alongside behavioural outcomes. For practitioners and decision makers, this economic evidence reinforces the importance of impact planning from project inception, including aligning activities, outputs and outcomes within an explicit impact map and measurement framework. Collectively, these findings offer a practical roadmap for social marketers seeking to translate theory into sustained, real-world behaviour change when addressing complex social problems such as bullying.

Conclusion

The *Stand Up for Respect* pilot program offers valuable insights into the potential of whole-of-school approaches to reduce bullying victimisation and deliver measurable social value.

The program achieved a statistically significant reduction in victimisation behaviours and demonstrated a positive SROI, indicating that early intervention can yield both social and economic benefits for the Queensland community. However, the pilot did not observe significant changes in self-reported bullying perpetration, highlighting a key limitation in the pilot program's ability to influence all dimensions of bullying behaviour.

Future research and program development should consider integrating co-design to ensure that interventions reflect the lived experiences and needs of the school community. Longitudinal studies are needed to assess sustained behavioural change and to capture broader societal impacts. Expanding the SROI framework to include additional indicators, such as school absenteeism, educational attainment and teacher burnout, could provide a more comprehensive understanding of the program's value. By addressing these limitations and building on the pilot's strengths, future iterations of *Stand Up for Respect* can contribute meaningfully to the prevention of bullying and domestic violence, while fostering respectful, inclusive school environments.

Ethics statement

The ethical clearance number is Ref: 2022/789.

References

- Australian Bureau of Statistics (2024), "Recorded crime – victims", available at: www.abs.gov.au/statistics/people/crime-and-justice/recorded-crime-victims/latest-release (accessed 30 August, 2025).
- Australian Institute of Health and Welfare (2024), "Economic and financial impacts", available at: www.aihw.gov.au/family-domestic-and-sexual-violence/responses-and-outcomes/economic-financial-impacts (accessed 30 August, 2025).
- Centre for Education Statistics and Evaluation (2017), "Anti-bullying interventions in schools – what works?", available at: https://education.nsw.gov.au/content/dam/main-education/en/home/student-wellbeing/attendance-matters--resources-for-schools/anti_bullying_in_schools_what_works_AA.pdf (accessed 30 August, 2025).
- Cabinet Office of the Third Sector (2012), "A guide to social return on investment", available at: www.socialvaluelab.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2016/09/SROI-a-guide-to-social-return-on-investment.pdf (accessed 30 August, 2025).
- Clark, C. and Rosenzweig, W. (2004), *Double Bottom Line Project Report*, University of California, Berkeley CA.
- Costa, B.M., Kaestle, C.E., Walker, A., Curtis, A., Day, A., Toumbourou, J.W. and Miller, P. (2015), "Longitudinal predictors of domestic violence perpetration and victimization: a systematic review", *Aggression and Violent Behavior*, Vol. 24, pp. 261-272, doi: [10.1016/j.avb.2015.06.001](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.avb.2015.06.001).
- Dobbin, F. and Kaley, A. (2016), "Why diversity programs fail", *Harvard Business Review*, available at: <https://hbr.org/2016/07/why-diversity-programs-fail> (accesses 30 April 2026)
- Espelage, D.L. and Swearer, S.M. (2003), "Research on school bullying and victimization: what have We learned and where do We go from here?", *School Psychology Review*, Vol. 32 No. 3, pp. 365-383, doi: [10.1080/02796015.2003.12086206](https://doi.org/10.1080/02796015.2003.12086206).
- Gaffney, H., Farrington, D.P. and Ttofi, M.M. (2019), "Examining the effectiveness of school-bullying intervention programs globally: a meta-analysis", *International Journal of Bullying Prevention*, Vol. 1 No. 1, pp. 14-31, doi: [10.1007/s42380-019-0007-4](https://doi.org/10.1007/s42380-019-0007-4).
- Gaffney, H., Ttofi, M.M. and Farrington, D.P. (2021), "What works in anti-bullying programs? Analysis of effective intervention components", *Journal of School Psychology*, Vol. 85, pp. 37-56.

- Jadambaa, A., Brain, D., Pacella, R., Thomas, H.J., McCarthy, M., Scott, J.G. and Graves, N. (2021), "The economic cost of child and adolescent bullying in Australia", *Journal of the American Academy of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry*, Vol. 60 No. 3, pp. 367-376.
- Legault, L., Gutsell, J.N. and Inzlicht, M. (2011), "Ironie effects of antiprejudice messages: how motivational interventions can reduce (but also increase) prejudice", *Psychological Science*, Vol. 22 No. 12, pp. 1472-1477, doi: [10.1177/0956797611427918](https://doi.org/10.1177/0956797611427918).
- OECD (2019), "PISA 2018 Results: What School Life Means for Students' Lives, (Volume III)" OECD Publishing, Paris, doi: [10.1787/acd78851-en](https://doi.org/10.1787/acd78851-en) (accessed 30 August, 2025).
- Olweus, D. (2006), "Revised olweus bully/victim questionnaire (OBVQ).", *APA PsycTests*, doi: [10.1037/t09634-000](https://doi.org/10.1037/t09634-000) (accessed 30 August, 2025).
- Olweus, D. (2013), "School bullying: development and some important challenges", *Annual Review of Clinical Psychology*, Vol. 9 No. 1, pp. 751-780, doi: [10.1146/annurev-clinpsy-050212-185516](https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-clinpsy-050212-185516).
- Rundle-Thiele, S., Dietrich, T. and Carins, J. (2021), "CBE: a framework to guide the application of marketing to behavior change", *Social Marketing Quarterly*, Vol. 27 No. 3, pp. 175-194.
- Solberg, M.E. and Olweus, D. (2003), "Prevalence estimation of school bullying with the olweus bully/victim questionnaire", *Aggressive Behavior*, Vol. 29 No. 3, pp. 239-268, doi: [10.1002/ab.10047](https://doi.org/10.1002/ab.10047).
- Trischler, J., Dietrich, T. and Rundle-Thiele, S. (2019), "Co-design: from expert- to user-driven ideas in public service design", *Public Management Review*, Vol. 21 No. 11, pp. 1595-1619.
- Volk, A.A., Veenstra, R. and Espelage, D.L. (2017), "So you want to study bullying? Recommendations to enhance the validity, transparency, and compatibility of bullying research", *Aggression and Violent Behavior*, Vol. 36, pp. 34-43, doi: [10.1016/j.avb.2017.07.003](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.avb.2017.07.003).
- Wolke, D., Copeland, W.E., Angold, A. and Costello, E.J. (2013), "Impact of bullying in childhood on adult, health, wealth, crime and social outcomes", *Psychological Science*, Vol. 24 No. 10, pp. 1958-1970, doi: [10.1177/0956797613481608](https://doi.org/10.1177/0956797613481608).

Further reading

- Daraganova, G. (2016), "Self-harm and suicidal behaviour of young people aged 14–15 years old. Chapter 6 in AIFS" longitudinal study of Australian children 2016 annual statistical report", available at: <https://growingupinaustralia.gov.au/sites/default/files/publication-documents/asr2016f.pdf> (accessed 30 August, 2025).

Corresponding author

Sharyn Rundle-Thiele can be contacted at: s.rundle-thiele@griffith.edu.au

Table A1. Stand up for respect theory of change

Inputs	Activities	Outputs	Outcomes	Impact
Educators Fundraising Marketing PR people Funding Donors Government Technology Life education hub Salesforce Eloqua Systems and processes Infrastructure Booking people Our brand Healthy harold Reputation HWQ CfC • Capricorn Mri sa • Ipswich/Inala • Nith gold Coast • Townsville Database 60,000 parents Schools Knowledge Expertise Prizes Consultant fee	Professional development/ training of team Content development • Videography • Webinars • Seminars On-boarding pack and journey Surveys • Evaluation • Teacher • Parents competition • Reporting Booking process Marketing the program Pre-visit meetings with schools Program development • Modules • Healthy harold modules • Talk about it modules • Podcast Website Social media Community engagement and advocacy External consultation/ subject matter expert (content)	School policy guide including: - “how to co-design the approach with whole of school” - encompassing the 9 areas needed to prevent bullying Support for school giving them access to other programs that can be delivered by partners to support the school to deliver increased rates of before/after, recess and lunch activities Teacher training session Network meetings (can be delivered across all trial schools allowing staff to share what works in a facilitated session). Teacher high visibility vests Teacher plans for school activities that can be added before/after school, at recess or lunch to prevent bullying (e.g. dynamic playground approaches, art and craft sessions, come and make breakfast) LEQ bullying lessons Teacher bullying lesson plans including session 1 agreeing on rules, bullying, how to report bullying, bystander and upstander behaviour and how positively	Schools: Bullying policy (ideally should be co-designed) Additional before/after school, recess and lunch time activities Dynamic playground examples Teachers: Classroom bullying rules. Signed agreements Changes to self-efficacy Changes to preventative bullying behaviours Students: Upstander/bystander behaviour Reduced experiences of people experiencing bullying Reduced incidences of people who bully others Change in bullying reporting behaviour	Reduced domestic violence

(continued)

Table A1. Continued

Inputs	Activities	Outputs	Outcomes	Impact
Professional development people		resolve bullying. Plans to include age-appropriate activities such as literature, audio-visual material and videos, drama and role play, music, debates, workshops, group work and computer-based games where students can act out roles Student and parent agreements. School posters (see bullying, report it, No bullying here, Be an upstander, not a bystander). Newsletter content for program duration		
		Interactive parent session live and recorded. Sessions allow parent teams to talk about scenarios. Parent support program (e.g. weekly/daily prompts text for parents opting into the text message support program following the interactive session). Fun prompts are sent to parents supporting them to encourage positive parent and child interactions		