



Received: 11 August 2016  
Accepted: 11 September 2016  
Published: 28 September 2016

\*Corresponding author: Caroline Claussen, Department of Sociology, University of Calgary, Calgary, Canada  
E-mails: [c3inc@shaw.ca](mailto:c3inc@shaw.ca), [ccclauss@ucalgary.ca](mailto:ccclauss@ucalgary.ca)

Reviewing editor:  
Sandro Serpa, University of the Azores, Portugal

Additional information is available at the end of the article

## SOCIOLOGY | RESEARCH ARTICLE

# The role of community-based organizations in school-based violence prevention programming: An action research project

Caroline Claussen<sup>1\*</sup>, Lana Wells<sup>2</sup>, Deinera Exner-Cortens<sup>2</sup>, Rida Abboud<sup>2</sup> and Alina Turner<sup>3</sup>

**Abstract:** Research suggests limited attention has been paid to the role played by non-profit community-based organizations in offering violence prevention programming within school settings. This action research project emerged from the desire of researchers, community-based organizations, school systems and funders to explore the specific challenges and opportunities faced by local non-profit community-based organizations when offering school-based violence prevention programming for children and youth. Data revealed challenges in the delivery of violence prevention programming, including lack of consistency and coordination with schools and lack of programming for diverse children and youth. Opportunities for improvement and steps toward action are discussed.

**Subjects:** Community Health; Community Social Work; Population Health; School Social Work; Violence and Abuse; Youth Work

**Keywords:** community-based organizations; non-profits; prevention programming; violence prevention; school-based programming; community-based research

### ABOUT THE AUTHORS

Ms Caroline Claussen is with the Department of Sociology, University of Calgary. Dr Deinera Exner-Cortens and Dr Rida Abboud are with the Faculty of Social Work, University of Calgary. Dr. Alina Turner is with the School of Public Policy, University of Calgary.

Prof. Lana Wells leads Shift: The Project to End Domestic Violence, Faculty of Social Work, University of Calgary. Shift works to enhance the capacity of policy makers, systems leaders, clinicians, service providers and the community at large by making research accessible and working collaboratively with a diverse range of stakeholders to inform and influence domestic violence primary prevention efforts.

### PUBLIC INTEREST STATEMENT

While schools are a key setting for violence prevention efforts, school-based efforts alone may be fragmented and uncoordinated with broader community violence prevention initiatives. Our research findings show that community-based organizations (CBO) experience multiple barriers when trying to support children and youth in school settings (i.e. school gatekeepers, importance of academic outcomes over social and emotional learning, etc.). Findings specifically highlighted that the needs of diverse children and youth are not yet met through available school violence prevention programming, due to the intersecting issues these children face (e.g. racism, homophobia, loss and grief associated with migration, etc.). Enhanced coordination between local funders, schools and CBOs would allow for a more systemic approach that better leverages community and school resources. These findings are of particular interest to CBOs providing violence prevention programming in schools, schools focused on developing school climate policies, and funders of violence prevention programming for children and youth.

## 1. Introduction

Schools are an important setting for violence prevention efforts (Crooks, Wolfe, Hughes, Jaffe, & Chiodo, 2008; Russell, 2008; Wolfe & Jaffe, 2003); however, a growing body of work demonstrates that achieving positive change for children and youth requires coordination of programming and strategies across a range of community stakeholders and sectors that reach well beyond the boundaries of the school building (Fagan, Brooke-Weiss, Cady, & Hawkins, 2009; Feinberg, Greenberg, & Osgood, 2004; Hanish et al., 2013; Holt, Raczynski, Frey, & Hymel, 2013; Nickerson, Cornell, Smith, & Furlong, 2013; Pepler & Craig, 2011; Tite, 2006). For example, in her study of women's organizations delivering violence prevention programming (VPP) in Canadian schools, Tite (2006) found that violence prevention efforts could be strengthened by understanding the role schools and community stakeholders play in this work, and by overcoming barriers to school and community collaboration. Indeed, work in this area specifically calls for coordinated school-based violence prevention approaches to leverage the role of a broader range of community stakeholders, particularly non-profit community-based organizations (Feinberg et al., 2004; Nation et al., 2010; Tutty et al., 2005; Walker & Shinn, 2002).

The call for the meaningful integration of community stakeholders into school-based violence prevention work aligns with whole school approaches to violence prevention—these approaches are generally directed at the entire school community (e.g. training for students, staff, administration, and parents), are integrated into the curriculum context, have well-developed violence prevention policies and procedures, and are reinforced through extracurricular activities in partnership with community-based organizations and clubs (Nickerson et al., 2013; Smith, Schneider, Smith, & Ananiadou, 2004). The whole school, whole community and whole child approach is also promoted by the Centers for Disease Control as a key practice for child and youth well-being (Lewallen, Hunt, Potts-Datema, Zaza, & Giles, 2015). However, within this approach, there is limited information on the perspectives of community-based organizations (CBOs) regarding successes and challenges when partnering with schools to offer violence prevention programming, which precludes an understanding of conditions that inhibit or promote productive partnerships (Fagan et al., 2009; Gajda, 2006; Nation et al., 2010).

Given the importance of the involvement of CBOs in the prevention of violence with school-aged children and youth, this article examines the specific opportunities and challenges faced by non-profit CBOs who offer VPP in the school setting, in order to support understanding of the role community stakeholders play in violence prevention work, as well as identify barriers to school and community coordination and collaboration (Nation et al., 2010; Tite, 2006; Tutty et al., 2005). The paper draws on findings from 25 in-depth interviews with community-based staff engaged in child- and youth-focused VPP in Calgary, Alberta, Canada. This action research project emerged from the desire of local funders, two school boards and CBOs (many of which had staff participating in the research) wanting to better understand the local landscape of school-based violence prevention programs offered by CBOs so that they could identify gaps and assess the potential for a collective agenda moving forward.

### 1.1. The partnership

In May 2012, the first and second author, in partnership with two local funders (United Way of Calgary [UW] and the City of Calgary Family & Community Support Services [FCSS]), invited a group of key stakeholders (consisting of local service providers and representatives from two local, large urban school districts) to engage in learning and discussion around emerging trends in healthy relationships and violence prevention research and the potential implications of this research for VPP in the city.<sup>1</sup> Through this conversation, stakeholders discussed the need for a better understanding of the programming offered by local CBOs who implement VPP in schools. Stakeholders felt that information on what programs were offered by whom, to whom and in what schools would help them to better understand how the research information on emerging trends in healthy relationships and violence prevention might impact their own programs and other programs offered in the city. The conversation also revealed a curiosity in how best to approach areas for collective efforts in violence prevention, not only between schools and CBOs, but also between CBOs themselves.

To support the group in meeting this informational need, the authors were asked by the stakeholders (which included the two funders mentioned above) to develop a research project to help them better understand the local context of VPP in the city. Action research methodologies guided the development of the research project. The impetus for action research begins from practical questions arising from concerns and observations experienced in everyday work (Somekh, 1995). As Reason and Bradbury (2008) discusses “Action Research seeks to bring together action and reflection, theory and practice, in participation with others, in the pursuit of practical solutions to issues of pressing concern to people, and more generally the flourishing of individual persons and their communities” (p. 4).

Stakeholders were involved in the study design, and were specifically engaged in decision-making as to the breadth and depth of the project. Through two separate meetings occurring between May 2012 and July 2012, 28 stakeholders from a variety of CBOs, educational organizations and local funders engaged in discussion to identify what research questions they were interested in addressing and to scope the research project. Through facilitated conversation, the group landed on three questions, specifically: (1) How do CBOs make decisions around the provision of VPP for children and youth in schools? (2) What, if any, are the current challenges faced by CBOs in providing VPP for children and youth? and (3) What opportunities exist to support CBOs to more effectively deliver school-based VPP for children and youth? Stakeholders agreed that violence prevention programs included in this study would be those dealing with relational violence (i.e. bullying, dating violence, sexual violence, and promotion of healthy relationship skills) as part of K-12 education. The group also decided that the first phase of study would focus exclusively on CBOs and their programs (as opposed to including school-board personnel and educators). The rationale for this focus was that stakeholders felt they lacked an in-depth understanding of the network of Calgary-based organizations offering violence prevention programs, and wanted to use the research findings to support areas for collective work. School board representatives at the meetings agreed with the focus on CBOs for the first phase, and committed to work with the group to identify organizations providing programming in schools for participation in the study.

## 2. Methods

Non-probability sampling was used to recruit interview participants, and included both convenience and snowball sampling, as this presented the best way of reaching the largest number of representatives from CBOs that offered violence prevention programs meeting the study criteria. The participants were identified through: (1) the two main local funders of VPP (UW and FCSS); (2) lists provided by the two school boards; (3) open source internet searches; and (4) snowball sampling with interviewees.

A total of 25 individuals were interviewed from 14 CBOs, representing 24 violence prevention programs (see Appendix A for the interview guide). Included programs were those that (1) dealt with relational violence; (2) were offered to school-aged youth (K-12); and, (3) used school locations to deliver programs or had a connection to a particular school through which they recruited program participants. Interviews were conducted during September and October 2012. Research participants included 11 executive directors, nine direct program managers (i.e. those with direct program oversight), three program directors (i.e. those with oversight for multiple programs within an agency), one community development worker (i.e. engaged in outreach and youth empowerment initiatives), and one evaluation manager (i.e. responsible for monitoring program evaluation within her agency). Eleven of the research participants were attendees at the stakeholder meetings initiating and advising the project.

The interview guide was developed by a research team consisting of the first, second and fourth authors who had extensive experience working with CBOs in Calgary. Research assistants then conducted in-person interviews with all participants, where hand-written notes were taken. During the in-depth, semi-structured interviews, participants were asked to describe their school-based violence prevention programs (e.g. program approach), and discuss their perspectives on and experiences of

**Table 1. Participating targeted programs, target population, and delivering organizations**

Program name	Organization	Target population
Children exposed to DV	YWCA	Age 4–13 who have been exposed to domestic violence
Culture camps	Awo Taan	Age 7–18 who have been exposed to domestic violence
Families and schools together	Catholic Family Services	Elementary and early elementary children Early intervention program to children and their families designed to enhance family functioning and reduce family stress.
Healthy relationships program	Calgary Women's Emergency Shelter	Teens, male and female, age 13–18. For kids who identify as being in any sort of abusive relationship or using [Grade 7–9, and same aged youth in mandated systems]
HERA	Boys and Girls Club of Calgary	Females, aged 13–17, at risk of, or involved in, sexual exploitation.
Kickstart/Restart	McMan Services	Kick-start: age 7–11 Re-start: high school aged At-risk kids identified as dealing with violence and abuse
Life skills development program	Calgary Chinese Community Association	Grade 7–9 and targeted to newcomer youth dealing with acculturation and migration trauma and stress
Louise Dean	Catholic Family Services	Pregnant teens
Responsible choices	Calgary Counseling Centre	Program for children who are abusive or aggressive, both victims and perpetrators. 3–18 year olds, 10 week sessions

providing school-based VPP in relation to the study questions above. To analyze interviews, thematic analysis was used, whereby researchers interpret raw text data to apply codes and subsequently develop themes (Namey, Guest, Thairu, & Johnson, 2008). Research assistants did the initial analysis, identifying and applying structural codes (based on the questions in the interview guide) to each interview, followed by the creation of key themes (Guest, MacQueen, & Namey, 2012). The codes and themes were then brought to the research team for discussion and further interpretation. This study was approved by the University of Calgary Conjoint Faculties Research Ethics Board.

### 3. Results

#### 3.1. The scope of local non-profit violence prevention programming

The study identified a total of 14 agencies and 24 unique violence prevention programs targeting children and youth in kindergarten to grade 12. Based on the information provided by stakeholders, programs tended to be delivered to two kinds of audiences (See Table 1). Targeted programs were delivered to children and youth identified as potentially benefiting from more tailored violence prevention messaging, for example, because they were identified as “at-risk”, because of their gender (i.e. single-gender programs) or because they were diverse (e.g. culturally diverse). In total, nine targeted programs were included in the study. Universal programs were delivered to any and all children and youth (e.g. all grade seven students) and included universal messaging and approaches (Centers for Disease Control & Prevention, 2004). These programs tended to use general messaging around violence prevention intended for the general student body. In total, there were 15 universal programs included in the study (see Table 2).

**Table 2. Participating universal programs, target population, and delivering organizations**

Program name	Organization	Target population
Anti-racism/anti-bullying workshop residency	Antyx Community Arts Society	Youth age 13–18
Comprehensive sex education program	Calgary Sexual Health Centre	Any schools that call for programming
New roads	Hull Services	7–11 year olds
Paths program	Hull Services	5 schools in the forest lawn area, also in pre-school and after-school programming (content is slightly different in these schools).
Peace program	Awo Taan	Grade K-7
RAISE	Boys and Girls Clubs of Calgary	Aboriginal youth 15–19
RespectEd: Healthy youth relationships	Red Cross	Age 12+
RespectEd: It's not your fault	Red Cross	Youth grade 8; age 12+
RespectEd: Beyond the hurt	Red Cross	Youth grade 6; age 12+
RespectEd: Be safe	Red Cross	(K-3)
Roots of empathy	Hull Services	Children and youth, kindergarten to grade 8 (English and French)
SASS	Boys and Girls Clubs of Calgary	Any youth 15–19
Maestro	Boys and Girls Clubs of Calgary	Any youth 15–19
Wise guyz	Calgary Sexual Health Centre	Young men identified by teachers
Who do you tell?	Calgary Communities Against Sexual Abuse	Grade K-6

Many CBOs had long-standing relationships with certain schools, and tended to deliver programs on an ongoing basis within those schools. In some instances, CBOs commented that schools considered a particular organization to be better content and delivery experts than teachers, as the organization had specific training in specialized areas (e.g. sexual health education). Several other interviewees reported that they were approached in situations where teachers were either uncomfortable or unfamiliar with the content (e.g. sexual abuse prevention). Such organizations reported that they tended to field more requests than resources allowed, resulting in waitlists for services. In addition to providing the scope of local non-profit VPP, interview data revealed three themes centered on two key challenges and one opportunity.

### 3.2. Theme 1: Lack of continuity and consistency with schools

Achieving continuity and greater reach with VPP was identified as a significant challenge by almost all of the interviewees. As decisions around program delivery often depended on school administrators or teachers who acted as gatekeepers, CBOs reported that their efforts were piecemeal, inconsistent, and lacking strategic focus across grade levels or target groups. Although, as one interviewee who was an executive director remarked, “these programs have to be available to all kids throughout schools and grade levels,” in reality, they were being delivered in a haphazard manner by as many as 24 unique programs.

Despite the strong relationships developed with schools, none of the programs reviewed as part of the interview process used a whole-school approach; specifically, while several of the programs described during the interviews were using components of a whole-school approach (e.g. training for students, staff, administration, and parents, integrated into the curriculum context), no program used all elements. The importance of the need for a whole-school approach was noted by another executive director, when he said “there has to be a whole-school and whole-community approach.

All of this has to go beyond curriculum,” and another participant suggested, “It has to be for youth AND with youth. It has to go beyond just individual learning and address a culture that supports violence and unhealthy relationships.”

According to many participants, one of the reasons for this lack of integration was schools’ need to align programming with academic curricular outcomes set by the provincial ministry of education and the local school districts. Research in this area suggests that curriculum barriers are particularly difficult for schools to overcome, as many administrators are reluctant to spend classroom time on violence prevention activities if they cannot see a direct link to improved academic outcomes (Fagan et al., 2009; Nation et al., 2010). As the time teachers have to deliver mandated curricular instruction is limited, respondents indicated that their violence prevention program had to fit within a scheduled time-slot in relation to the mandated curriculum. At times, the choice given to the CBO by the school was to either deliver a portion of their program that would fit in the scheduled-time slot, or not offer it in the school at all. Some CBOs chose to adapt their program in this manner, which often resulted in students not receiving the program’s intended intensity, likely impacting program effectiveness (Durlak & DuPre, 2008).

Many interviewees also acknowledged the need to be sensitive to unique school environments, policies, and culture. However, these often presented incongruence with the goals of the VPP they aimed to deliver. In particular, interviewees explained that their respective CBOs had particular philosophies and approaches that guided program delivery, and that these were not always aligned with the values and philosophies of teachers, administrators, and school boards. For example, individual school privacy policies may be in conflict with violence prevention program procedures around disclosures of sexual violence and abuse. As summed up by one interviewee: “There has to be a shared philosophy between the school administrators and the (CBO) programs. If the administrator is on board, the programming works wonderfully.”

### **3.3. Theme 2: Challenges working with diverse children and youth**

Approximately one-third of participants reported that diverse children and youth<sup>2</sup> had unique needs that were often missed in the available VPP. In particular, these interviewees believed programming was generally designed for mainstream youth who consistently attended school; as one program director pointed out, “youth experiencing multiple barriers (such as those in the juvenile justice system) may not be served by mainstream programming,” as it does not address their particular needs, concerns, or experiences. Instead, these interviewees suggested that diverse children and youth may need targeted approaches to specifically address the intersecting issues they face including racism, homophobia, xenophobia, loss and grief related to migration, etc. These findings echo some well-founded criticism to the blanket application of generic violence prevention programs, policies, and practices (Furlong, Pavelski, & Saxton, 2002; Jiwani, Berman, & Cameron, 2010). As stated by a respondent in the position of community developer who worked with immigrant children and youth, there is often not enough consideration given to the complex issues faced by immigrant youth that may put them at risk for engaging in unhealthy behaviours: “Kids are very interested in the program, but immigrant kids usually have competing demands, such as working part-time, family care-giving, and dealing with acculturation issues like loneliness and isolation.” Participants also noted a number of difficulties in tailoring programs to diverse youth, including lack of research and evidence to support design and adaptation of programming, as well as limited available resources for these adaptations.

### **3.4. Theme 3: Opportunity for a coordinated and collective approach**

Several interviewees indicated that enhanced coordination between funders, schools and CBOs would allow for a more systematic approach that better leveraged community resources and communicated prevention messages. As expressed by one executive director, “Are we overwhelming children and youth with all the different messages? What is the common messaging between programs and schools?” These participants suggested that a more coordinated approach to violence prevention could better support the achievement of positive outcomes for children and youth,

including healthier relationships. This idea is supported by other work in the field, which suggests there is an overall benefit to students when schools use both internal and external resources in tandem with a comprehensive violence prevention strategy (Brand, Felner, Shim, Seitsinger, & Dumas, 2003; Nation et al., 2010). Past scholarship on this topic also suggests that without some unifying framework or approach to providing services, prevention efforts are often isolated, fragmented and disjointed (Furlong et al., 2002; Nation et al., 2010). For example, violence prevention, teen pregnancy prevention and dropout prevention activities, in large part, focus on many of the same risk and protective factors (Nation et al., 2010); ensuring that program and school staff understand the interconnectivity of these issues can support greater collective impact through integration and coordination of prevention activities and resources.

Finally, while interviewees overwhelmingly identified increased coordination as a tremendous opportunity, some tempered their comments by identifying the role that funders play in determining the type of programs available in a community. Indeed, funders were perceived as often unintentionally contributing to fragmentation; as discussed by one interviewee, “how do you collaborate when you are competing for funding?” This comment suggests that a coordinated approach needs to include not just schools and CBOs, but funders of VPP as well.

#### **4. Discussion**

Findings from this action research project highlight that Calgary CBOs are important partners in delivering VPP for children and youth from K-12. Many organizations have long-standing relationships with schools, and others are frequently turned to by schools as “experts” in a given content area. However, a number of important issues raised by study participants merit consideration in order to improve the efficacy of current efforts, inform future research, and support other jurisdictions interested in examining the potential for coordination.

##### **4.1. Effective prevention approaches for working with diverse youth**

Interviewees pointed to the challenges CBOs currently face in providing appropriate and meaningful VPP in schools for diverse children and youth. This finding, while aligning with a growing body of literature calling for enhanced school-based prevention approaches for these groups (Freedner, Freed, Yang, & Austin, 2002; Hanish et al., 2013; O’Keefe, 2005; Silverman, Decker, & Raj, 2007), goes further by suggesting that the development of enhanced prevention approaches must consider the role played by CBOs, given that they are often called upon by schools to deliver critical VPP services. An important future research consideration is how to engage CBOs when designing and implementing new prevention approaches for diverse children and youth, in order to facilitate meaningful knowledge transfer and mobilization of evidence-based programs and practices as part of community-based delivery.

Further, violence prevention approaches that effectively engage marginalized or ‘difficult to reach’ youth need to be explored, and more research in this area is needed. This learning is also consistent with literature on school-based violence prevention efforts. For example, as argued by Adair (2006), while it is important to offer prevention programming in the school, there needs to be increased outreach efforts in community settings. Even though not the focus of this paper, our CBOs did attempt to recruit these youth through the schools. This might be a point of synergy between school- and community-based prevention efforts as offered by CBOs, as in the latter setting, CBOs likely have a better vantage point than schools to reach such groups using informal networks or linkages with other public systems (i.e. corrections, child intervention, etc.). A concerted effort that brings both school- and community-based efforts together in a strategic fashion can leverage the impact for these vulnerable populations. This is also an important consideration for other jurisdictions interested in pursuing coordination.

##### **4.2. Strategic and coordinated approaches to violence prevention**

Participants in this study suggested that VPP is being delivered in a fragmented, uncoordinated manner, where programs are allocated to schools on a first-come, first-served basis or on the basis

of long-standing relationships between schools and CBOs. This finding supports recent recommendations around the need to enhance the coordination of violence prevention programs during both planning and delivery (Nation et al., 2010; Seltzer, Cline, & Ortega, 2009; Tutty et al., 2005). As decisions are often driven by relationships and programming requests (Nation et al., 2010; Tutty & Nixon, 2000), the needs of the community and student population are not systematically and strategically considered in resource allocation decisions. This lack of a strategic approach to violence prevention funding and program delivery risks resources being spread across the population in an inconsistent manner, thereby reducing efficacy. To build a strategic and coordinated approach, consistency and congruence between the policies, cultures and values of the education system and non-profit sectors must be addressed and negotiated; the first step toward this goal involves concentrated investment in collaborations where trust and understanding between the groups can be built.

The need for consistency and congruence between the various funders who support VPP has often been overlooked by researchers when recommending enhanced coordination. Funding bodies often have divergent policies, requirements and expectations, contributing to the fragmented nature of community-based programs and services by encouraging competition between organizations as opposed to collaboration. Engaging funders in conversations around coordination would reduce the challenges faced by CBOs in delivering violence prevention services in a more cohesive manner. Given that two prominent local funders funded and participated in this action research study, the preliminary conditions are favorable for supporting enhanced coordination in this area. However, this is an important implication for other jurisdictions interested in coordination, as local funders appear to play a significant role in determining the direction of programming in a community, and often unknowingly contribute to the difficulty of coordination and collaboration between community organizations.

#### **4.3. Implications of the project**

In January 2013, results of this study were shared with all stakeholders involved in the planning and implementation of the project (Calgary's two main school boards, participating CBOs and project funders for a total of 24 participants). The research findings were presented to the whole group, and subsequent small-group discussions were held at tables to process the research findings, specifically asking: (1) what surprised them most about the findings?; (2) what was not a surprise from the findings, and; (3) what do you think of the recommendations drafted by the researchers? Based on the small group discussions, the large group explored a number of directions for subsequent phases of work (e.g. research with school personnel and educators to collect, test and document approaches to promising community-based violence prevention practices in Calgary; development of a framework to guide VPP for children and youth in Calgary). The group agreed that working towards creating a strategic and coordinated framework for CBOs, schools and funders to support their efforts in VPP should be the immediate priority for a subsequent phase of work. In June 2013, a working group was formed to support framework development, with representation from three CBOs, the two local school boards, funders from both City of Calgary FCSS and UW, and researchers from the Faculty of Social Work at the University of Calgary. This working group has just finished a three-year project, where a framework was drafted, tools to support local stakeholders in advancing coordination were created, and an online resource for school personnel in choosing VPP was developed.<sup>4</sup> A comprehensive three-year evaluation of the initiative was also conducted to glean lessons learned and implications for other jurisdictions doing this work; we are now in the process of analyzing these findings.

#### **4.4. Limitations**

Several limitations of the study should be noted, particularly its narrow focus on relational violence prevention programs delivered by CBOs as part of K-12 education. Specifically, we did not interview representatives from programs with an intervention focus (e.g. working with children and youth already engaged in violence) or staff within the local school boards. However, the design choice to collect information from prevention-focused CBOs only at this stage of the project (and not schools or youth) was made by our school and community partners in line with action research methodology, and the information we have gathered is an important first step in understanding the perspective of

CBOs involved in school-based violence prevention, a perspective that is limited within the literature. Furthermore, our sampling method was limited, as we could only gather information from those representatives known to us and/or the study participants. There may be additional violence prevention programs operating in the city of Calgary of which we remain unaware. Accurately mapping and accessing organizations offering programming was challenging, as there was no master list from which to reference. An important lesson emerging from an action research project like this is that scanning and mapping of programs cannot be considered “finished” at the end of the project. We continued to receive information on available workshops and programs, which were included in subsequent phases of this project.

## 5. Conclusion

Given the need identified in the literature to strengthen the understanding of the roles played by schools and CBOs in violence prevention efforts and overcome barriers in working together, our research contributes to this body of knowledge by highlighting the role played by CBOs, as well as the challenges they face in working to deliver VPP for children and youth. Further examination of how schools and community-based delivery agents can work together to achieve violence prevention outcomes is needed as part of a comprehensive violence prevention research agenda that includes a wide range of stakeholders. As noted by our participants, this approach requires the incorporation of community-based efforts into comprehensive violence-reduction strategies that involve the full range of stakeholders concerned with preventing violence for children and youth.

### Funding

This work was supported by the United Way of Calgary and Area; City of Calgary Family and Community Support Services.

### Acknowledgements

We would like to thank all of the participants who made this research possible: Antyx, Awo Taan Healing Lodge Society, Boys and Girls Clubs of Calgary, Calgary Board of Education, Calgary Bridge Foundation for Youth, Calgary Catholic School District, Calgary Communities Against Sexual Abuse, Calgary Counselling Centre, The Calgary Chinese Community Service Association, Calgary Family Services Society, The Calgary Sexual Health Centre, Calgary Women’s Emergency Shelter, The Canadian Red Cross Society - Southern Alberta Region, Catholic Family Service, Ethno-Cultural Council of Calgary, Hull Homes, McMan Youth Family and Community Services, Woods Homes and YWCA of Calgary.

### Author details

Caroline Claussen<sup>1</sup>  
E-mail: [c3inc@shaw.ca](mailto:c3inc@shaw.ca)  
Lana Wells<sup>2</sup>  
E-mail: [lmwells@ucalgary.ca](mailto:lmwells@ucalgary.ca)  
Deinera Exner-Cortens<sup>2</sup>  
E-mail: [deinera.exner2@ucalgary.ca](mailto:deinera.exner2@ucalgary.ca)  
Rida Abboud<sup>2</sup>  
E-mail: [rida.abboud@gmail.com](mailto:rida.abboud@gmail.com)  
Alina Turner<sup>3</sup>  
E-mail: [turneralina@gmail.com](mailto:turneralina@gmail.com)

<sup>1</sup> Department of Sociology, University of Calgary, Calgary, Canada.

<sup>2</sup> Faculty of Social Work, University of Calgary, Calgary, Canada.

<sup>3</sup> School of Public Policy, University of Calgary, Calgary, Canada.

### Citation information

Cite this article as: The role of community-based organizations in school-based violence prevention programming: An action research project, Caroline Claussen, Lana Wells, Deinera Exner-Cortens, Rida Abboud & Alina Turner, *Cogent Social Sciences* (2016), 2: 1238609.

### Notes

1. A list of meeting dates and topics is available from the first author.
2. For these participants, diverse children and youth included newcomer, immigrant, racialized, Aboriginal, sexually and gender diverse, as well as “hard to reach” children and youth (e.g. those disengaged from the education system).
4. This resource is available at <http://preventdomesticviolence.ca/content/research-library>.

### References

- Adair, J. (2006). The efficacy of sexual violence prevention programs. *Journal of School Violence*, 5, 87–97. doi:10.1300/j202v05n02\_07
- Brand, S., Felner, R., Shim, M., Seitsinger, A., & Dumas, T. (2003). Middle school improvement and reform: Development and validation of a school-level assessment of climate, cultural pluralism and school safety. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 95, 570–588. doi:10.1037/0022-0663.95.3.570
- Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. (2004). *Sexual violence prevention: Beginning the dialogue*. Atlanta, GA: National Center for Injury Prevention and Control.
- Crooks, C. V., Wolfe, D. A., Hughes, R., Jaffe, P. G., & Chiodo, D. (2008). Development, evaluation and national implementation of a school-based program to reduce violence and related risk behaviors: Lessons from the Fourth R. *Institute for the Prevention of Crime Review*, 2, 109–135.
- Durlak, J. A., & DuPre, E. P. (2008). Implementation matters: A review of research on the influence of implementation on program outcomes and the factors affecting implementation. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 41, 327–350. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10464-008-9165-0>
- Fagan, A. A., Brooke-Weiss, B., Cady, R., & Hawkins, J. D. (2009). If at first you don't succeed ... keep trying: Strategies to enhance coalition/school partnerships to implement school-based prevention programming. *Australian & New Zealand Journal of Criminology*, 42, 387–405. doi:10.1375/acri.42.3.387

- Feinberg, M. E., Greenberg, M. T., & Osgood, D. W. (2004). Readiness, functioning, and perceived effectiveness in community prevention coalitions: A study of communities that care. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 33, 163–176. doi:10.1023/B:AJCP.0000027003.75394.2b
- Freedner, N., Freed, L. H., Yang, Y. W., & Austin, S. B. (2002). Dating violence among gay, lesbian, and bisexual adolescents: Results from a community survey. *Journal of Adolescent Health*, 31, 469–474. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S1054-139X\(02\)00407-X](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S1054-139X(02)00407-X)
- Furlong, M. J., Pavelski, R., & Saxton, J. (2002). The prevention of school violence. In S. Brock, P. Lazarus, & S. Jimerson (Eds.), *Best practices in crisis intervention* (pp. 131–149). Bethesda, MD: National Association of School Psychologists.
- Gajda, R. (2006). Safe schools through strategic alliances. *Journal of School Violence*, 5, 63–80. doi:10.1300/J202v05n01\_05
- Guest, G. S., MacQueen, K. M., & Namey, E. E. (2012). *Applied thematic analysis*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage. <http://dx.doi.org/10.4135/9781483384436>
- Hanish, L. D., Bradshaw, C. P., Espelage, D. L., Rodkin, P. C., Swearer, S. M., & Horne, A. (2013). Looking toward the future of bullying research: Recommendations for research and funding priorities. *Journal of School Violence*, 12, 283–295. doi:10.1080/15388220.2013.788449
- Holt, M. K., Raczynski, K., Frey, K. S., & Hymel, S. L. (2013). School and community-based approaches for preventing bullying. *Journal of School Violence*, 12, 238–252. doi:10.1080/15388220.2013.792271
- Jiwani, Y., Berman, H., & Cameron, C. A. (2010). Violence prevention and the Canadian girl child. *International Journal of Child, Youth and Family Studies*, 1, 134–156.
- Lewallen, T. C., Hunt, H., Potts-Datema, W., Zaza, S., & Giles, W. (2015). The whole school, whole community, whole child model: A new approach for improving educational attainment and healthy development for students. *Journal of School Health*, 85, 729–739. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/josh.12310>
- Namey, E., Guest, G., Thairu, L., & Johnson, L. (2008). Data reduction techniques for large qualitative data sets. In G. Guest & K. M. MacQueen (Eds.), *Handbook for team-based qualitative research* (pp. 137–162). New York, NY: Altamira Press.
- Nation, M., Collins, L., Nixon, C., Bess, K., Rogers, S., Williams, N., & Juarez, P. (2010). A community-based participatory approach to youth development and school climate change: The alignment enhanced services project. *Progress in Community Health Partnerships: Research, Education and Action*, 4, 197–205. doi:10.1353/cpr.2010.0003
- Nickerson, A. B., Cornell, D. G., Smith, J. D., & Furlong, M. J. (2013). School antibullying efforts: Advice for education policymakers. *Journal of School Violence*, 12, 268–282. doi:10.1080/15388220.2013.787366
- O'Keefe, M. (2005, April). *Teen dating violence: A review of risk factors and prevention efforts*. Harrisburg, PA: VAWnet. Retrieved from <https://www.ncjrs.gov/pdffiles1/nij/grants/235368.pdf>
- Pepler, D., & Craig, W. (2011). Promoting relationships and eliminating violence in Canada. *International Journal of Behavioral Development*, 35, 389–397. doi:10.1177/0165025411407455
- Reason, P., & Bradbury, H. (Eds.). (2008). *Handbook of action research: Participatory inquiry and practice* (2nd ed.). London: Sage.
- Russell, N. (2008). *What works in sexual violence prevention and education: A literature review*. Retrieved from <http://www.justice.govt.nz/policy/supporting-victims/taskforce-for-action-on-sexual-violence/documents/What%20Works%20in%20Prevention.pdf>
- Seltzer, D., Cline, R., & Ortega, S. (2009). *Pathways in prevention, a roadmap for change: Ohio's plan for sexual and intimate partner violence prevention*. Retrieved from [http://www.nsvrc.org/sites/default/files/file/Projects\\_RPE\\_ODH%252BODVN\\_State\\_SVIPV\\_Plan\\_April-2009-FINAL\\_9\\_8\\_2009.pdf](http://www.nsvrc.org/sites/default/files/file/Projects_RPE_ODH%252BODVN_State_SVIPV_Plan_April-2009-FINAL_9_8_2009.pdf)
- Silverman, J. G., Decker, M. R., & Raj, A. (2007). Immigration-based disparities in adolescent girls' vulnerability to dating violence. *Maternal and Child Health Journal*, 11, 37–43. doi:10.1007/s10995-006-0130-y
- Smith, J. D., Schneider, B. H., Smith, P. K., & Ananiadou, K. (2004). The effectiveness of whole school anti-bullying programs: A synthesis of evaluation and research. *School Psychology Review*, 33, 547–560.
- Somekh, B. (1995). The contribution of action research to development in social endeavours: A position paper on action research methodology. *British Educational Research Journal*, 21, 339–355. doi:10.1080/0141192950210307
- Tite, R. (2006). School violence prevention: The role of the women's community. *Journal of School Violence*, 4, 85–104. doi:10.1300/J202v04n04\_06
- Tutty, L., Bradshaw, C., Thurston, W. E., Barlow, A., Marshall, P., Tunstall, L., ... Nixon, K. (2005). *School based violence prevention programs: Preventing violence against children and youth* (Rev ed.). Calgary, AB: RESOLVE Alberta.
- Tutty, L., & Nixon, K. (2000). *ACAV youth violence prevention coordinator evaluation: Phase I final report*. Calgary, AB: RESOLVE Alberta.
- Walker, H. M., & Shinn, M. R. (2002). Structuring school-based interventions to achieve integrated primary, secondary, and tertiary prevention goals for safe and effective schools. In M. R. Shinn, G. Stoner, & H. M. Walker (Eds.), *Interventions for academic and problem behavior problems II: Preventive and remedial approaches* (pp. 1–25). Bethesda, MD: National Association of School Psychologists.
- Wolfe, D. A., & Jaffe, P. G. (2003). *Prevention of domestic violence and sexual assault*. Harrisburg, PA: VAWnet.

## Appendix A

Interview questions: Violence prevention programming for children and youth

1. Who funds your program?
2. How long has your program been running?
3. How do you make changes to your program?
4. What partners do you work with (if any)?
5. Do you have a strategy for which communities and schools you work with? If no, how are these decisions made?
6. What challenges do you face in conducting this kind of programming?
7. What benefits do you foresee of a collective approach to violence prevention programming for children and youth? What challenges do you foresee?
8. What other child and youth-focused violence prevention programs are you aware of in Calgary?



© 2016 The Author(s). This open access article is distributed under a Creative Commons Attribution (CC-BY) 4.0 license.

You are free to:

Share — copy and redistribute the material in any medium or format

Adapt — remix, transform, and build upon the material for any purpose, even commercially.

The licensor cannot revoke these freedoms as long as you follow the license terms.

Under the following terms:

Attribution — You must give appropriate credit, provide a link to the license, and indicate if changes were made.

You may do so in any reasonable manner, but not in any way that suggests the licensor endorses you or your use.

No additional restrictions

You may not apply legal terms or technological measures that legally restrict others from doing anything the license permits.



**Cogent Social Sciences (ISSN: 2331-1886) is published by Cogent OA, part of Taylor & Francis Group.**

**Publishing with Cogent OA ensures:**

- Immediate, universal access to your article on publication
- High visibility and discoverability via the Cogent OA website as well as Taylor & Francis Online
- Download and citation statistics for your article
- Rapid online publication
- Input from, and dialog with, expert editors and editorial boards
- Retention of full copyright of your article
- Guaranteed legacy preservation of your article
- Discounts and waivers for authors in developing regions

**Submit your manuscript to a Cogent OA journal at [www.CogentOA.com](http://www.CogentOA.com)**

