TEME, Vol. XLVI, N^{o} 2, April – June 2022, pp. 361–375

Review Article https://doi.org/10.22190/TEME210329023K
Received: March 29, 2021 UDC 371.5:37.032
Revised: July 15, 2021
Accepted: October 8, 2021

THE SYSTEMATIC REVIEW OF SCHOOL-BASED PROGRAMS FOCUSED ON EXTERNALISING PROBLEMS IN STUDENTS

Marina Kovačević Lepojević[1], Boro Merdović[2*], Dragan Živaljević[3]

[1]Institute for Educational Research, Belgrade, Serbia
[2]Faculty of Law for Commerce and Judiciary in Novi Sad;
Ministry of Interior of the Republic of Serbia, Belgrade, Serbia
[3]National Security Academy, Belgrade, Serbia

Abstract

School-based programs focused on externalizing problems in students are recognized as an important part of school life and work. The aim of this paper is the systematization of scientific studies in the form of systematic presentations and meta-analysis of school programs, in which externalizing problems in students is among the criteria for assessing the effectiveness of the program. Scientific results published in English in the last seven years are included in the systematization. Bases searched during research are: Google Scholar, PsycINFO, Web of Science (WOS), Education Resources Information Center (ERIC) and Scopus. The results of the research indicate that the most successful school-based interventions resulting in the prevention and reduction of externalizing problems are based on socio-emotional learning, that they are mostly implemented by teachers, that they are incorporated into the curriculum, and that their success depends on the quality of implementation.

Key words: externalizing problems, school-based interventions, systematic review, socio-emotional learning, prevention

ПРЕГЛЕД ШКОЛСКИХ ПРОГРАМА УСМЕРЕНИХ НА ЕКСТЕРНАЛИЗОВАНЕ ПРОБЛЕМЕ У ПОНАШАЊУ УЧЕНИКА

Апстракт

Школски програми којима се унапређује социемоционални статус ученика препознају се као важан део школског живота и рада. Циљ рада представља систематизација научних студија у форми систематских приказа и метаанализа

* Corresponding author: Boro Merdović, Faculty of Law for Commerce and Judiciary in Novi Sad; Geri Karolja br. 1, 21102 Novi Sad, Serbia, boro.merdovic@gmail.com

школских програма, где се међу критеријумима за процену ефективности програма налазе екстернализовани проблеми у понашању ученика. Укључени су научни резултати објављени у последњих седам година на енглеском језику. Претраживане су базе: Google Scholar, PsycINFO, Web of Science (WOS), Education Resources Information Center (ERIC) и Scopus. Резултати истраживања указују на то да су најуспешнији школски програми са исходом превенције и редукције екстернализованих проблема засноване на социоемоционалном учењу, да их најчешће спроводе наставници, да су инкорпориране у наставни план и програм, као и да њихова успешност пре свега зависи од квалитета примене.

Кључне речи: екстернализовани проблеми у понашању ученика, школски превентивни програми, социоемоционално учење, превенција

INTRODUCTION

There has been an increased number of studies in research literature reporting on a general decreasing trend in more severe forms of juvenile delinquency along with a rising trend in behavioral problems in adolescents, which occasioned the need for change in the course of research from studying the delinquent population to studying the general population (Marte, *Adolescent Problem Behaviors: Delinquency, Aggression, and Drug Use*, 2008). Hence, as a consequence of the current politics of ”normalisation”, instead of the traditional politics of “pathologization,” much research attention has been devoted to investigating developmental problems manifested in the adolescent population (Stakić, *A Handbook for Professionals in the Juvenile Justice System*, 2013). These are problems that need not fall under the term of delinquency (juridically) or of behavioral disorders (medically). The concept of externalizing problems arises from the empirical approach to investigating behavioral problems. Externalizing problems in adolescents involve conflicts with the environment - other people or rules of conduct - and include aggressive behavior and behaviors that violate rules. The manifestation of externalizing problems is characterized by open conflicts with the environment, weaker social competence and less receptivity to treatment in mental health services (Achenbach & Edelbrock, 1978). Externalizing problems encompass different dimensions of problems ranging from the most benign symptoms (for example lying) to the most severe ones along that continuum (for example, fights, thefts). Research findings indicate that, after anxiety, externalizing problems are the most frequent problem in the population of adolescents (Merikangas et al., 2010). Externalizing problems presume aggressive behavior and disobedience, i.e. breaking the rules (Gresham, Lane, MacMillan, & Bocian, 1999). Thus, externalizing problems in the general population can be interpreted as part of a normative development crisis on the one hand, and, more specifically, as an introduction to the more serious problems of juvenile delinquency and criminal behavior in adult age on the other.

School-based programs focused on externalizing problems usually aim to reduce the symptomatology or factors that have been found to mediate the onset of externalizing problems (Greenberg, Domitrovich & Bumbarger, 2000). School-based interventions are implemented at three levels: universal, selective and indicative. Research findings indicate that 10% to 25% of pupils exhibit the need for additional interventions in school, out of which 4% to 8% demand the most intensive interventions (Fuchs & Fuchs, 2017). There is a growing tendency in the science of prevention (*prevention science*) to include elements of promotion of child mental health and psychological well-being into preventive program designing (O'Connell, Boat, & Warner, 2009). It is based on a so-called ”paradox of prevention,“ a phenomenon which was first observed by British epidemiologist Geoffrey Rose on the example of cardiovascular diseases (Rose, 1981) and which implies the observation that, epidemiologically, greater welfare is attained if a lower level risk is reduced in a wider population than if a higher risk level is reduced in just one part of the population. Gordon (1983), wanting to emphasize the population in which certain public health interventions are applied, gave a classification of universal, selective and indicated preventive measures. Universal measures, therefore, have the widest application, since they can be applied “anytime”. On the example of the school population, universal preventive measures/programs are applied at the level of the whole class. Selective measures are applied to a subgroup that stands out from the rest of the population by a certain characteristic that makes them particularly risky. High-risk students are recognized as those who need additional support and are usually singled out during the implementation of the universal school program. Indicated preventive measures are applied in individuals who are at high enough risk (for example, if they show any symptoms) (Bašić, Prevention Theories: Prevention of Behavioral Disorders and Risky Behaviors of Children and Youth 2009; Gordon, 1983). Evaluation studies of school-based interventions refer to research evidence of the higher effects of selective and indicative interventions in relation to universal ones (Sanchez et al., 2018). However, in the interpretation of findings, even the authors confine themselves to a phenomenon which indicates that, regardless of the official data on effectiveness, universal interventions can produce changes in the wider population so that eventually the effects can be more significant. The second advantage is that there is no stigmatization, resulting in the greater participation in programs of parents and the community (Sanchez et al., 2018). Thirdly, greater benefit from universal programs can be attributed to easier generalization of adopted skills in peer surroundings. Authors (Florić, Pavlović & Ninković, 2020) emphasize the fact that preventive interventions should rely on an ”effect of peers“ in the process of adopting positive developmental outcomes. The focus of specialists who work on the

prevention of behavioral problems is actually on universal prevention. Prevention deals with averting problems before they have occurred, by postponing an onset of behavioral problem, particularly in risk groups, decreasing the damage, or the effect which behavioral problems can have, encouraging knowledge, viewpoints and behavior by which emotional and psychological well-being is being enhanced and promoting institutional politics of the state and the community in the direction of the physical, emotional and social welfare of an entire community (Romano & Hage, 2000).

Children with externalizing problems more often suffer from a lack of social skills, and cognitive distortions and deficits, which both contribute to the problems and are the consequence of those problems (Greenberg, Domitrovich, & Bumbarger, 2000). Neuropsychological factors contribute the most to behavioral problems (Moffitt, 1993). In this regard, researchers are trying to discover a critical combination of competences/skills whose development is crucial for the prevention of externalizing problems, such as emotional regulation, coping and problem solving (Modecki, Zimmer-Gembeck & Guerra, 2017). The aim of this paper is to consider the content, structure, methods of application and effects of programs that are applied in the school context and are aimed at/result in the prevention of externalized problems. The paper is designed as an analysis of scientific studies in the form of systematic reviews and meta-analysis of school-based interventions in which students' externalizing behavioral problems are among the criteria for the assessment of the effectiveness of the programs.

METHOD

The criteria for scientific results to be included in the analysis were the following: 1) studies published between 2015 and 2021; 2) studies representing a systematic review or meta-analysis of school programs; 3) studies which summarized effects on either the prevention or the reduction of externalizing problems, aggressive behavior and/or rule-breaking behavior; 4) studies published in the English language; 5) studies involving population of children and adolescents and 6) studies including a review of specific programs considered independently of information on effectiveness. The following bases were searched: Google Scholar, PsycINFO, Web of Science (WOS), Education Resources Information Center (ERIC) and Scopus. The following key words were used in the search: systematic review/meta-analysis, school-based intervention/programs, prevention, externalizing problems, aggressive behavior, and rule-breaking behavior. The research process was conducted in the period between 1 February and 15 March 2021, concluding with the papers published by 9 March.

RESEARCH RESULTS WITH DISCUSSION

Of the 69 studies found while searching the aforementioned databases, 35 were analyzed for further screening while 10 meta-analyses and systematic reviews met the initial criteria and were selected for review. A more thorough analysis found that 31 articles included a review of individual interventions in the school context. Since we planned to include only systematic reviews/meta-analytical studies of school programs, studies that considered the effectiveness of individual interventions were consequently rejected. Of the remaining 35 studies in further screening, 25 studies focused on the presentation of programs, although a more detailed analysis determined that they do not actually measure externalizing problems as an outcome, and 10 meta-analyzes and systematic reviews fully met the baseline criteria and were set aside for review. An overview of synthesized meta-analyses and systematic reviews of relevant research studies in reference to authors and results can be seen in Table 1.

Table 1. School-based preventive interventions

Outcome	Reference	Intervention/program
Externalizing problems	Dray et al., 2017	PATHS (Promoting Alternative Thinking Strategies), Cognitive Behavioral Therapy, Tri-Ministry study Class wide Social Skills Program, Penn State Adolescent Study.
Aggressive behavior, bullying, rule-breaking behavior, delinquency	Farrington, Gafney, Losel, Ttofi, 2016	World Health Organization's Health Promoting Schools framework; Antibullying programs (e.g., Olweus Bullying Prevention, Positive Action, Steps to Respect, Kiva, School-Wide Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports).
Externalizing problems	Franklin et al., 2017	Steps to Respect, Promoting Alternative Thinking Strategies, Pennsylvania Resiliency Program for Adolescents, BRIDGE, Early Yes I Can, Creating a Peaceful School Learning Environment (CAPSLE), Second Step: Student Success Through Prevention, Penn Enhancement Program; and Penn Resiliency Program Adolescent, Behavioral Education Program (BEP), The CheckIn/Check-Out (CICO).

Externalizing problems, Bullying	Goldenberg et al., 2019	Kiva, Olweus Bullying Prevention, Positive Action, Steps to Respect, Friendly Schools, WITS, Health Promoting School, Flemish Anti Bullying, Restorative Whole School Approach, Fast Track, ZERO, SEAL, Seattle School Development Program, Steps to Respect, 4R', Raising Healthy Children, Inclusive.
Aggressive behavior	Healy, Valenteb, Caetanoc, Martinsa, & Sanchezb, 2020	Coping Power Program (CPP), PATHS (Promoting Alternative Thinking Strategies), Good Behavior Game (GBG), 4R', Tools for Getting Along (TFGA), Positive Action Program, the Michigan Model for Health (MMH)
Aggressive behavior, bullying, drug and alcohol abuse	Langford et al., 2015	Kiva, Steps to Respect, Gatehouse Project, Fourth R, Friendly Schools, Students for Pease, Dare Plus, Positive Action, Aban Aya.
Externalizing problems	O'Connor & Hayes, 2018	The CheckIn/Check-Out (CICO) program/ Behavior Education Programme (BEP), Rochester Resilience Project, New Beginnings.
Aggressive behavior, bullying, rule-breaking behavior	Paulus, Ohmann, & Popov, 2016	Good Behavior Game, I Can Problem Solve, Promoting Alternative Thinking Strategies, Olweus Bullying Prevention Programme, FAST TRACK. Incredible Years, Anger Coping Program; First Step to Success, Fast Track, PEP-TE, Art Room.
Aggressive behavior	Sanchez et al., 2018	Positive Action Program, Life Skills Training, School-Wide Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports, Zippy's Friend, PATHS, Second Step: A Violence Prevention Curriculum, Fast Track, Tools for Getting Alon, Good Behavior Game, Peace Builders, Second Step: A Violence Prevention Curriculum, IY Teacher Classroom Management, Classroom Centered, Family School Partnership, I Can Problem Solve, Positive Action, Master Mind; Check, Connect, Expect, Tools for Getting Alon, First Step to Success; Prevent Teach Reinforce (PTR), Reducing Repetitions, Behavior Management, First Step to Success, Rochester Resilience Project.

Aggressive behavior rule-breaking externalizing problems	Waschbusch, Breaux, & Babinski, 2019	Good Behavior Game (GBG), I Can Problem Solve, Responding in Peaceful and Positive Way, School-wide PBIS, The peacemaker program, Second Step, PATH, Positive Action; Fast Track, Coping Power Programs, Linking the Interest of Families and Teachers.

By a systematic review of school programs that, along with other problems of mental health, recognize externalizing behavior problems as well, a number of different programs applied in schools at many levels of implementation have been identified (Paulus, Ohmann, & Popov, 2016). At the universal level the following programs were singled out: *Good Behavior Game (GBG), I Can Problem Solve, Promoting Alternative Thinking Strategies (PATHS), Olweus Bullying Prevention Program* and *FAST TRACK*. At the selective level YS, *Incredible Years,* and the *Anger Coping Program* were singled out, while the programs singled out at the indicative level were *First Step to Success, Fast Track, PEP-TE,* and *Art Room*. Factors such as school climate, relationships between pupils and teachers, parents and teachers, teachers and public health service, together with the implementation quality of the program, have the highest impact on its success. It is recommended that school programs follow four steps in implementation: integration into the curriculum, training of school staff for program implementation, establishment and development of institutional support systems for program implementation, and establishment of cooperation with other child and adolescent protection systems (Paulus, Ohmann, & Popov, 2016).

The meta-analytical study which synthesized the effect of 43 primary school mental health programs with a total of 49 941 participating students revealed that best results (of interventions that are not integrated in curriculum) were achieved first by indicative programs (weak to moderate effect), then by selective and, finally, by universal programs. Moreover, interventions integrated into the curriculum, those which were directed towards externalizing problems, contained regulation skills in crisis situations and were applied several times a week, proved to be more successful (strong effects) (Sanchez et al., 2018).

A small but positive effect, which increased with the quality of program implementation, was established on the basis of the insight into 15 systematic reviews and meta-analyses which were aimed at showing the effectiveness of school-based interventions focused on aggressive and rule-breaking behavior. As a key component of almost all successful interventions, a cognitive behavioral orientation of programs was recognized. The programs were focused on students and/or on teach-

ers/environment. Fundamentally, a majority of displayed programs was a combination of social and emotional learning, and behavioral management and positive support (Waschbusch, Breaux, & Babinski, 2018). The results of evaluation studies indicate that socioemotional learning in combination with positive discipline achieves better results than on its own (Gueldner, Feuerborn, & Merrell, 2020).

Goldenberg et al. (Goldenberg et al., 2019) conducted a meta-analytical study which indicated that the most successful school-based socioemotional intervention are those applied at the level of a whole school. Besides behavioral problems, a specific internalizing problems, academic success and social and emotional status were observed as variables. Interventions taken into consideration included a set of activities incorporated into the curriculum, school culture and collaboration with family and community. A total of 45 studies (30 interventions), conducted among 496.299 students, were analyzed. The results demonstrated that programs achieved no statistically significant impact regarding academic success while for other criteria, including externalizing problems, statistically significant differences were observed. Quality of implementation appeared as one of the most significant factors that may affect the strength of the intervention effects. An important finding established by moderator analysis is that interventions focused, among other things, on externalizing behavior problems attain better results compared to those lacking that component (Goldenberg et al., 2019).

Farrington and his colleagues (Farrington et al., 2016) systematized systematic reviews of developmental preventive programs. The selection criteria for systematic reviews were the following: they unite community efforts towards preventing antisocial behavior, and they are oriented towards children and adolescents, i.e. to reducing individual, family and school risk factors. The following criteria were estimated: delinquency, criminal behavior, violence and aggressive behavior. Fifty systematic reviews were detected, half of them being systematic reviews of school-based interventions. All types of school-based preventive interventions proved effective.

The authors advocating a promotion of mental health in schools are promoting a continual implementation of programs. School programs should be based on social and emotional learning driven by the active participation of pupils, parents and the community, and on the assumption of a good implementation quality (inclusion, responsiveness, sensitivity to differences among pupils, training of staff and other) (Weist and Murray, 2007). In an attempt to systematize the results of the evaluation of public health interventions that are carried out in schools and are an integral part of the curriculum and school culture, and to envisage the inclusion of family and the environment in education, 67 studies have been identified (Langford et al., 2015). The observed variables, apart from

quality of nutrition and hygiene, physical activity, prevention of smoking, alcohol abuse, and sexual and reproductive health, included peer violence, aggressive behavior, and the students' psychological and emotional welfare. The interventions that focused on multiple risks were most effective. Anti-bullying interventions had a somewhat greater effect compared to those aimed at preventing violence, smoking, alcohol and drug abuse (Langford et al., 2015).

A group of authors chose a review of psychological and social interventions held by teachers for the purpose of improving mental health (Franklin et al., 2017). Externalizing and internalizing problems were taken as a criterion for assessing the effectiveness of interventions. A total of 25 studies met the search criteria, of which 19 referred to externalizing problems. The average age of the pupils who participated in the programs was 11.35 years. The interventions were mostly multimodal and included cognitive, emotional and behavioral stimulation. Unlike previous studies (for example, Ghiroldi, Scafuto, Montecucco, Presaghi, & Iani, 2020), this study revealed that interventions were more successful in regards to internalizing problems than the externalizing ones.

In order to analyze the effects of universal school-based programs focused on child and adolescent resilience, a meta-analysis was conducted with the following defined criteria: it included programs focused on a minimum of three protective factors, and it measured mental health criteria in children and adolescents ages 5 through 18 such as anxiety, depression symptoms, hyperactivity, behavior disorders, internalizing problems, externalizing problems, and apprehension (Dray et al., 2017). A total of 57 studies have been identified. Interventions proved effective on 4 out of the 7 previously mentioned mental health criteria measured: depressive behavior, externalizing problems, internalizing problems and anxiety. Four studies proved effective on externalizing problems. Two of those studies were conducted among children and two were conducted among adolescents. All were based on the cognitive and behavioral approaches. The competencies promoted in the programs that positively affected externalizing problems were: empathy, emotional regulation, self-control, social and emotional competencies, problem-solving skills, cooperation, communication and other (Dray et al., 2017).

The analysis also included a systematic review of studies published between 2010 and 2019, all of which estimated the effectiveness of psychological and social interventions in the school context and were focused on aggressive behavior in children ages 6 through 11 (Healy et al., 2020). Fifteen studies met the initial criteria, with a positive effect on aggressive behavior, through promoting the social and emotional status of students, being detected in 14 of those studies. The results of the analyses of moderation and mediation demonstrate that preventive programs are successful both with pupils who exhibit behavioral problems and with

pupils without such problems. Preventive programs proved particularly successful among pupils with poor self-management and/or high level of behavioral problems in general. Programs such as *Coping Power Program* (CPP), *Promoting Alternative Thinking Strategies* (PATHS) and *Good Behavior Game* (GBG) were reviewed in a number of the studies analyzed, while programs such as *Tools for Getting Along* (TFGA), *Positive Action Program*, *Michigan Model for Health* (MMH) and *4Rs Program* (Reading, Writing, Respect, and Resolution) were each examined in a separate study. By a systematic review of 17 indicative primary school-based interventions with children who exhibit indicative externalizing problems, it was determined that the programs proved successful both in individual application and in small groups.

The analysis of the research material revealed:

1) Terminological inconsistency: by inspecting the studies in Table 1 the choice of school-based programs was done in relation to mental health criterion (Paulus, Ohmann, & Popov, 2016), an approach focused on a whole school approach (Goldenberg et al., 2019), regarding whether the interventions are applied by the teachers (Franklin et al., 2017), whether they are focused on students` resilience (Dray et al., 2017) or whether it is the question of developmental preventive programs implemented in school (Farrington et al., 2016). By the insight into the contents of studies it can be perceived that according to their effectiveness the same or similar programs are recommended.
2) Effective programs are based on enhancing students' social and emotional status, and on behavioral management (empathy, self-management, problem-solving skills, collaboration and other) (Dray et al., 2017; Healy et al., 2020; Sanchez et al., 2018; Waschbusch, Breaux, & Babinski, 2019);
3) Successful programs basically have cognitive, emotional, and behavioral interventions

(Dray et al., 2017; Franklin et al., 2017; Waschbusch, Breaux, & Babinski, 2019). Moreover, the findings suggest that, on externalizing problems, school interventions based on a combined approach (e.g., cognitive behavioral interventions and peer mediation) are more successful than those based on a single approach (Park et al., 2019; Langford et al., 2015);

4) Most interventions are incorporated into the curriculum. The majority of the successful interventions are delivered by teachers during their regular teaching activities. The programs are more successful with populations that exhibit more social and emotional problems (Healy et al., 2020; Sanchez et al., 2018; Carroll, Houghton, Forrest, McCarthy Sanders, & O'Connor, 2020);

5) A success of interventions depends on quality of implementation and resource support (Goldenberg et al., 2019; Paulus, Ohmann, & Popov, 2016);
6) For assessing the externalizing problems while monitoring the program's effects the

Following instruments were used: Achenbach System of Empirically Based Assessment (ASEBA), Behavior Assessment System for Children (BASC), Strengths and Difficulties Questionnaire (SDQ), the Teacher Observation of Classroom Adaptation-Revised (TOCA-R) and others. We consider that it was necessary to emphasize the instruments by which externalizing problems were assessed in order to avoid confusion regarding the definition of criteria for monitoring the outcomes of interventions. In this regard, the assessment process provides a precise answer to the question of whether externalizing problems are actually measured as an outcome. The authors recognize the problems in defining terms in the field of special pedagogy (Fortness, Kavale, & Lopez, 1993).

CONCLUSION

On the basis of the analysis presented, it can be concluded that schools should, within the framework of their teaching units, encourage the development of social and emotional skills (for example, recognizing and managing emotions, respecting the perspective of others, setting positive goals, making responsible decisions, and nurturing supportive relationships), as well as implement a precise protocol for additional support for students who need it. It seems that schools in Serbia are not yet ready enough for that. Due attention is paid to social and emotional competencies neither during schooling nor throughout the teachers' professional development (Tošić Radev, Pešikan, 2017). Despite the availability of a number of resources, research has revealed that only about 61% of US schools have implemented interventions within the framework of their curricula (Waschbusch, Breaux, & Babinski, 2018).

A clear distinction should be made between the effective and ineffective interventions when externalizing problems are in question, so that practitioners should not waste their resources and time. As illustration, we provide a brief overview stated in previous systematic reviews of frequently cited Good Behavior Game Programme (GBG, Good Behavior Game) recommending its complementary implementation with promoting alternative thinking strategies (PATS, *Promoting Alternative Thinking Strategies*) (Hart et al., 2020; Ialongo et al., 2019).

Good Behavior Game (GBG, *Good Behavior Game)* (Barrish, Saunders, & Wolf, 1969) is a program of social and emotional learning that showed its effectiveness both on the regular student population and on the population with specific learning disabilities. It has proved particu-

larly effective on pupils with externalizing problems. Teachers talk with the students about the behaviors that contribute to a stimulating learning environment and about behaviors that lead to undesirable consequences. In such a way, together they make rules for their class which are displayed in a visible place in the classroom. After this, the class is divided into several groups (most often two groups) based on the students' behavior. The teacher encourages the students' interactions in order to improve both individual and group-level behavior. The students' behavior is monitored and assessed at predetermined intervals. Negative actions can be noted beside a student's name, or the name of the group. Alternatively, each group can be assigned a certain number of cards which are to be confiscated in case of rule breaking. At the end of the game, the winning team receives public praise from the teacher and rewards in the form of items of non-material value (stickers, seals) or activities. There can be more than one winning team if a minimum number of offences that can be tolerated is agreed upon in advance. Every week and month, winners are announced and suitable prizes are awarded. The implementation of this program requires appropriate training.

In order to achieve both academic and psychosocial goals within education, it is necessary to encourage the efforts of teachers and educators to incorporate socio-emotional learning into teaching content.

REFERENCES

Achenbach, T. M. & Edelbrock, C. S. (1978). The classification of child psychopathology: a review and analysis of empirical efforts. *Psychological Bulletin*, *85*(6), 1275-1301.

Barrish, H. H., Saunders, M., & Wolf, M. M. (1969). Good behavior game: Effects of individual contingencies for group consequences on disruptive behavior in a classroom. *Journal of Applied Behavior Analysis*, 2, 119-124.

Bašić, J. (2009). Teorije prevencije: prevencija poremećaja u ponašanju i rizičnih ponašanja djece i mladih [Prevention theories: prevention of behavioral disorders and risky behaviors of children and youth]. Zagreb: Skolska knjiga.

Carroll, A., Houghton, S., Forrest, K., McCarthy, M., & Sanders-O'Connor, E. (2020). Who benefits most? Predicting the effectiveness of a social and emotional learning intervention according to children's emotional and behavioral difficulties. *School Psychology International*, *41*(3), 197-217.

Dray, J., Bowman, J., Campbell, E., Freund, M., Wolfenden, L., Hodder, R. K., ... & Wiggers, J. (2017). Systematic review of universal resilience-focused interventions targeting child and adolescent mental health in the school setting. *Journal of the American Academy of Child & Adolescent Psychiatry*, *56*(10), 813-824.

Farrington, D. P., Gaffney, H., Lösel, F., & Ttofi, M. M. (2017). Systematic reviews of the effectiveness of developmental prevention programs in reducing delinquency, aggression, and bullying. *Aggression and Violent Behavior*, *33*, 91-106.

Florić, O. K., Pavlović, A., & Ninković, S. (2021). Peer pressure and academic achievement as predictors of adolescent risk behaviors. *Teme*, 45(4), 1123-1135.

Forness, S. R., Kavale, K. A., & Lopez, M. (1993). Conduct Disorders in School. *Journal of Emotional and Behavioral Disorders, 1*(2), 101–108.

Franklin, C., Kim, J. S., Beretvas, T. S., Zhang, A., Guz, S., Park, S., ... & Maynard, B. R. (2017). The effectiveness of psychosocial interventions delivered by teachers in schools: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Clinical Child and Family Psychology Review*, *20*(3), 333-350.

Fuchs, D., & Fuchs, L. S. (2017). Critique of the National Evaluation of Response to Intervention: A case for simpler frameworks. *Exceptional Children*, *83*(3), 255–268.

Ghiroldi, S., Scafuto, F., Montecucco, N.F., Presaghi, F. & Iani, L. (2020). Effectiveness of a School-Based Mindfulness Intervention on Children's Internalizing and Externalizing Problems: the Gaia Project. *Mindfulness*, 11, 2589–2603.

Goldenberg, J. M., Sklad, M., Elfrink, T. R., Schreurs, K. M., Bohlmeijer, E. T., & Clarke, A. M. (2019). Effectiveness of interventions adopting a whole school approach to enhancing social and emotional development: a meta-analysis. *European Journal of Psychology of Education*, *34*(4), 755-782.

Gordon Jr, R. S. (1983). An operational classification of disease prevention. *Public health reports*, *98*(2), 107-109.

Greenberg, M. T., Domitrovich, C., & Bumbarger, B. (2000). *Preventing mental disorders in school-age children: A review of the effectiveness of prevention programs*. Prevention Research Center for the Promotion of Human Development, College of Health and Human Development, Pennsylvania State University.

Gresham, F. M., Lane, K. L., Macmillan, D. L., & Bocian, K. M. (1999). Social and academic profiles of externalizing and internalizing groups: Risk factors for emotional and behavioral disorders. *Behavioral Disorders*, 24, 130- 146.

Gueldner, B. A., Feuerborn, L. L., & Merrell, K. W. (2020). *Social and emotional learning in the classroom: Promoting Mental Health and Academic Success*. NewYork, London: Guilford Publications.

Hart, S. R., Domitrovich, C., Embry, D. D., Becker, K., Lawson, A., & Ialongo, N. (2020). The Effects of Two Elementary School-Based Universal Preventive Interventions on Special Education Students' Socioemotional Outcomes. *Remedial and Special Education*, *42*(1), 32-43

Healy, S. R., Valente, Y. J., Caetano, S. C., Martins, S. S., & Sanchez, Z. M. (2020). Worldwide school-based psychosocial interventions and their effect on aggression among elementary school children: a systematic review 2010-2019. *Aggression and Violent behavior*, 55, 101486.

Ialongo, N. S., Domitrovich, C., Embry, D., Greenberg, M., Lawson, A., Becker, K. D., & Bradshaw, C. (2019). A randomized controlled trial of the combination of two school- based universal preventive interventions. *Developmental Psychology*, *55*(6), 1313.

Langford, R., Bonell, C., Jones, H., Pouliou, T., Murphy, S., Waters, E., ... & Campbell, R. (2015). The World Health Organization's Health Promoting Schools framework: a Cochrane systematic review and meta-analysis. *BMC Public Health*, *15*(1), 1-15.

Marte, R. M. (2008). *Adolescent Problem Behaviors: Delinquency, Aggression, and Drug Use*. El Paso: LFB Scholarly Pub.

Merdović, B. (2019). *Faktori prevencije kriminaliteta (Crime prevention factors)*, Monografija, Pravni fakultet Univerziteta Privredna akademija, Mala knjiga, Novi Sad.

Merikangas, K. R., He, J. P., Burstein, M., Swanson, S. A., Avenevoli, S., Cui, L., ... & Swendsen, J. (2010). Lifetime prevalence of mental disorders in US adolescents: results from the National Comorbidity Survey Replication–Adolescent Supplement (NCS-A). *Journal of the American Academy of Child & Adolescent Psychiatry*, *49*(10), 980-989.

Modecki, K. L., Zimmer- Gembeck, M. J., & Guerra, N. (2017). Emotion regulation, coping, and decision making: Three linked skills for preventing externalizing problems in adolescence. *Child Development*, *88*(2), 417-426.

Moffitt, T. E. (1993). Adolescence-limited and life-course-persistent antisocial behavior: a developmental taxonomy. *Psychological Review*, *100*(4), 674-701.

O'Connell, M. E., Boat, T., & Warner, K. E. (2009). *Preventing mental, emotional, and behavioral disorders among young people: Progress and possibilities* (Vol. 7). Washington, DC: National Academies Press.

O'Connor, K. M., & Hayes, B. (2020). How effective are targeted interventions for externalizing behavior when delivered in primary schools? *International Journal of School & Educational Psychology*, *8*(3), 161-173.

Park, S., Guz, S., Zhang, A., Beretvas, S. N., Franklin, C., & Kim, J. S. (2020). Characteristics of Effective School-Based, Teacher-Delivered Mental Health Services for Children. *Research on Social Work Practice*, *30*(4), 422-432.

Paulus, F. W., Ohmann, S., & Popow, C. (2016). Practitioner Review: School- based interventions in child mental health. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry*, *57*(12), 1337-1359.

Romano, J. L., & Hage, S. M. (2000). Prevention and counseling psychology: Revitalizing commitments for the 21st century. *The Counseling Psychologist*, *28*(6), 733–763.

Rose, G. (1981). Strategy of prevention: lessons from cardiovascular disease. *British Medical Journal (Clinical research ed.)*, *282*(6279), 1847-1851.

Sanchez, A. L., Cornacchio, D., Poznanski, B., Golik, A. M., Chou, T., & Comer, J. S. (2018). The effectiveness of school-based mental health services for elementary-aged children: A meta-analysis. *Journal of the American Academy of Child & Adolescent Psychiatry*, *57*(3), 153-165.

Stakić, Đ. (2013). Priručnik za stručnjake u sistemu maloletničkog pravosuđa [A handbook for professionals in the juvenile justice system]. Beograd: International Management Group.

Tošić-Radev, M., & Pešikan, A. (2017). Komadić koji nedostaje'u procesu obrazovanja-socioemocionalno učenje [The missing piece in the education process - socio-emotional learning]. *Nastava i vaspitanje*, *66*(1), 37-54.

Waschbusch, D. A., Breaux, R. P., & Babinski, D. E. (2019). School-based interventions for aggression and defiance in youth: A framework for evidence-based practice. *School mental health*, *11*(1), 92-105.

Weist, M.D. & Murray, M. (2007) Advancing school mental health promotion globally. *J Adv Sch Ment Health Promotion*, 2-12.

ПРЕГЛЕД ШКОЛСКИХ ПРОГРАМА УСМЕРЕНИХ НА ЕКСТЕРНАЛИЗОВАНЕ ПРОБЛЕМЕ У ПОНАШАЊУ УЧЕНИКА

Марина Ковачевић Лепојевић[1], Боро Мердовић[2], Драган Живаљевић[3]
[1]Институт за педагошка истраживања, Београд, Србија
[2]Правни факултет за привреду и правосуђе, Нови Сад;
Министарство унутрашњих послова Републике Србије, Београд, Србија
[3]Академија за националну безбедност, Београд, Србија

Резиме

Савремене тенденције у превенцији подразумевају да су промоција менталног здравља и психичко благостање младих све више саставни део програма превенције. Универзални превентивни програми епидемиолошки имају већу корист због смањења нижег нивоа ризика у широј популацији. Универзалне школске интервенције доносе позитивне промене у широј популацији, а у крајњој линији ефекти су значајнији него код селективних или индикативних. Избегава се стигматизација ученика, а учешће родитеља и заједнице је веће. Такође, већа корист универзалних програма може се приписати лакшој генерализацији стечених вештина у вршњачком окружењу. Циљ овог рада представља систематизација научних студија у форми систематских приказа и метаанализа школских програма, где се међу критеријумима за процену ефективности програма налазе екстернализовани проблеми у понашању ученика. Укључени су научни резултати објављени у последњих седам година на енглеском језику. Претраживане су базе: Google Scholar, PsycINFO, Web of Science (WOS), Education Resources Information Center (ERIC) и Scopus. Аутори су уочили велику терминолошку недоследност у погледу критеријума по којима се систематизују школске интервенције (од менталног здравља, отпорности до индивидуалних социоемоционалних вештина). Увид у садржај наведених студија показује да се исти или слични програми препоручују због њихове ефикасности. Ефикасни програми се заснивају на подизању социо-емоционалног статуса ученика и управљању понашањем (емпатија, саморегулација, вештине решавања проблема, сарадња итд.). Успешни програми у основи имају рационалну емоционалну оријентацију понашања. Већина интервенција је уграђена у наставни план и програм који примењују наставници. Програми су се показали успешнијим код квалитетне имплементације и ресурсне подршке и код популације са више социо-емоционалних проблема. Коришћени су следећи инструменти екстерне процене проблема у праћењу ефеката програма: Achenbach System of Empirically Based Assessment (ASEBA), Behavior Assessment System for Children (BASC), Strengths and Difficulties Questionnaire (SDQ) Meanwhile the Teacher Observation of Classroom Adaptation-Revised (TOCA-R) и др. На основу приказане анализе, препоручује се да школе у оквиру својих наставних јединица усвоје неговање социо-емоционалних вештина код ученика, као и прецизан протокол за додатну подршку ученицима којима је то потребно.