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Over the last seven years I have been involved in community activities and one these is as patron of Violence Free Communities (formerly Violence Free Waitakere). Although I don’t play an active role in the organisation, partly due to being resident in Wellington, I keep in touch and support it.

Violence Free Communities’, and especially Elaine Dyer’s, drive to improve the lives and future of New Zealand children has led to the making of a school programme that includes the animated short film ‘Jade Speaks Up’. I have been a supporter of the idea since I first saw the trailer and heard of the plan to build resources around it, some years ago now.

As a country we strive to find things that help children cope with their circumstances and to mature successfully into well-adjusted adulthood. This needs the concerted involvement of family and community as well as teachers, health workers and social and justice services. Each one of us and each culture plays a part.

Family violence is a serious matter for children and it is difficult to stop. Bullying can also be life changing for a victim. Many children have few opportunities to talk about such issues. Empowering them to look after themselves and each other is a bold and hopeful way to achieve this.

The programme, ‘Jade Speaks Up’ emerged from a collaborative community in West Auckland which has done many things to address child safety. The programme is New Zealand made and devised, easy to follow and to see why children can be drawn to it. The people are authentic and local. It is worth pausing to look closely at the results.

There has been detailed evaluation and analysis of ‘Jade Speaks Up’. The first year of the pilot study, funded by ACC, shows the success of the strategy as reflected in the 1300 children’s voices as well as the perspectives of their teachers and school management.

The research is robust and thorough. It shows that there are ways that children aged 8 – 12 can be supported to make wise choices about how they can respond to the challenges of their lives in an atmosphere of trust and openness within classrooms. The results also show an increase in wellbeing, expanded use of safety strategies and considerable enthusiasm for the programme from both children and their teachers.

As the government has stated, the wellbeing of children is as important in education as their academic success. ‘Jade Speaks Up’ is well designed to add to the pathway for resourcing our valuable and vulnerable tamariki.

I commend the report on ‘Jade Speaks Up’ to you.

Susan Satyanand
A focus on wellbeing is a vital aspect of civilised government.
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Summary Interim Report of Research 2017
The goal of our evaluation of the Jade Speaks Up programme was to demonstrate that a relatively small and short-term intervention giving year 5-8 school children the tools to develop trusting relationships and the strategies to keep themselves safe from violence, could result in children feeling safer and more resilient and in teachers finding the programme most effective in the areas of relationship learning. This project is funded by the Accident Compensation Corporation in the search for ways to reduce the cost of injuries due to violence in our communities.

With 1300 children from 47 classrooms in eight schools (seven in Auckland and one in the Bay of Plenty) involved in this research, at the outset, using two measures of childhood wellbeing and depression (Child Outcomes Rating Scale - Duncan, Miller & Sparks, 2003; and the Center for Epidemiologic Studies of Depression Scale for Children - Weissman, Orvaschel & Padian, 1980), we were able to show that 46% of children were in the category of “at risk” of psychological distress. From 2007 to 2017 the percent of children (aged 0-14) with a diagnosed mental illness trebled to 7% (Ministry of Health, 2017). Underlying this change is the increasing uncertainty in children’s lives driven by poverty, poor housing, homelessness and school pressure (Woulfe, 2018). These issues, added to children’s stories of parental emotional instability, unsafe family arrangements, addictions and harsh punishment, impact on classrooms, which potentially make them unsafe environments for some children. The Jade Speaks Up programme uses the classroom as the base for creating in children a sense of safety that can extend into their wider environments.

The first year of this enquiry has shown overall that the programme has been successful in achieving its stated goals. However, a more detailed analysis has shown many areas for improvement, such as allowing more time for the programme to run, a greater focus on teacher support, meeting the specific needs of each classroom and keeping the learnings from the programme alive after it has finished. How best to engage parents is also a key question in this second phase of the pilot study. What follows is an interim snapshot of our key findings.

Brief introduction to Jade Speaks Up (JSU):
JSU is a programme that provides safe classroom exploration of being violence-free. It helps children and young teens to learn about:

- feelings and safe ways to express them
- trust and the importance of having trusting relationships in our lives
- the fundamentals of respectful relationships
- how to keep ourselves safe from violence

The JSU programme is a detailed exploration of the skills connected with “feelings”, “trust”, “respect” and “keeping safe”. These skills are the foundation of the essential “4th R” of the school curriculum, competencies required for Relating.
The evaluation showed significant shifts in children’s behaviour around key messages that were part of the programme such as “going to a safe place”, “just breathing and keeping calm”, “asking for help from a friend to help sort things out” “talking to the person you are scared of”, “making a safety plan” and “keeping calm in a time when you could have been angry”.

1.2 Positive changes in children’s attitudes and behaviours around safety

- A Year 7 girl student went to the neighbours and phoned the police during a domestic violence incident. The student had recently shifted to the town and did not have a strong support network. She also self-referred to the school counsellor after the incident and talked the counsellor through the steps she had taken in implementing her JSU safety plan to keep herself and others safe. She said that the jingle ‘Breathe, Think & Do’ taught in the programme was what kept playing over in her mind in this scary situation.

1.3 Improvement in children’s access to people and environments they can trust

- Children in the programme were more likely to learn the phone numbers of non-family members they could trust and to identify a wider range of environments (friends, relatives, libraries, sports venues, meeting places in shopping centres and malls) where they can be safe, beyond the expected ones of family, school or the police. This may have encouraged children to speak more freely about family spaces that did not feel safe.

- One male student noted the phone number for CYFS in the lesson on safety planning. On his own initiative, he later called the 0508 number and told them that things were not okay at home. CYFS took prompt action and placed him in a safe home with extended family. The school had been aware that the family had issues but had been unable to initiate change for the parents.

- A school counsellor noted a significant increase in disclosures from Year 7 students compared to previous years when the new Year 7’s usually didn’t approach her for such help. JSU was run with only the Year 7 cohort in this school.

1.4 Children’s positive assessments of the value of the programme

- Eighty-two percent of the children who rated the programme said it was helpful and 43% said that it was “a lot” helpful. As well, 79% thought the programme was interesting and 75%, fun. Only 3.4% rated the programme as being of no help. Especially liked were the safety planning, the trust and problem-solving tasks, the Jade video, and the stories and conversations they had.

- Compared with children who were neutral or negative about the value of the programme showed poorer wellbeing, fewer trusted support people, more aggressive beliefs, lower responsiveness to upsetting situations and fewer protective strategies.

- In two schools there was initial concern amongst students who were talking of home situations that this would ‘contaminate’ their safe/happy place within the school environment. However, in discussions, once appropriate support was given, there was a new understanding of what happens when a child talks with a trusted adult (teacher, SWiS, Counsellor).
1.5 Significant improvement both in children’s wellbeing and in risk of depression

Overall there was a significant improvement in the combined measure of well-being and depression between pre-test and post-test which was sustained into the follow-up test, six months later. The percent of children meeting the “at risk” criteria fell by 11% between pre- and the post-tests, with the greatest improvement shown by the 78% of children who were positive about the programme and who had significantly better uptake of JSU practices than children who were negative (6%) or neutral (16%). However, these two latter groups improved most in the follow-up assessment.

- One child from a home where domestic violence used to occur had parents who separated. When she was with Dad she ‘took the weight’ of Dad’s behaviour towards her younger sisters. She used to talk only with her teacher about problems. Since participating in the JSU programme, she became able to share with a wider circle of classmates and reported feeling less isolated from her peers.

1.6 Improvement in the teachers’ perceptions of children’s vulnerability

Teachers were asked to rate the vulnerability of their class in the pre-tests. The four areas of most concern were that children: were unable to talk about their feelings; didn’t know how to keep themselves safe; were unsupportive of children who were struggling to keep up; and were unable to ask for help (figure 1.1). In the post-tests, these were the four areas where the teachers judged the children as having made the most progress. 70% to 90% of teachers said their children had improved in these areas. Also, more than half the classrooms noted reductions in bullying and fewer non-school issues of concern.

- One of our pilot teachers agonised over the evident distress displayed by one of her students who was from a very unstable and troubled family already under attention of CYFS. The teacher’s query, taken to her colleagues and contacts was “Are we doing these children any favours by opening up these painful feelings?”. In the teacher’s supervision session, we discussed this perplexing question. We acknowledged the importance of staying with the process, listening compassionately and providing the student with the pastoral support needed. In their post-programme interview, the teacher reported significant change in the girl. She was lighter, more confident, more outspoken and engaged more with people. Not only had there been a release of blocked emotion, but having safe adults attend to her was reassuring.
A beginning teacher in a rural school reported:

“One student … has had some incidents at school but recently was able to come to his teacher with tears in his eyes, able to process what had happened and articulate what was happening for him. He understood why he may have reacted in that way and why the situation was what it was. Jade Speaks Up undoubtedly contributed to that”.

Overall the teachers rated the programme helpful and practical. The key features, such as the Jade Speaks Up video, the training sessions and the modules on Keeping myself safe and Choices to keep myself and others safe, were rated as being more than helpful (figure 1.2). The programme met clear needs within the schools. It had components that worked well and were successful in making positive changes in children’s lives.

Teacher enthusiasm for the programme was mirrored by student appreciation of it. Figure 1.3 shows the correlation between teachers valuing of the JSU programme and positive student comments. The feature that most strongly correlates with student support of the programme is that of having available external support and supervision ($r=0.60$, $p=0.000$). Only for this feature is there a significant correlation with two other student ratings, those asking - how interesting ($r=0.341$, $p=0.025$) and how much fun ($0.377$, $p=0.013$) was the programme. This tells us that teachers who valued the ongoing supervision and support of programme leaders were more able to make the programme interesting and fun for the students.

In both training and supervision, it became evident that teachers’ skills for responding to disclosures were either lacking or inadequate. We noted that in several schools there was a policy on disclosures in place, but the actual procedures were not familiar to some of the teachers. There was also a significant gap in the information loop between Oranga Tamariki and teachers following a referral. The supervision offered to the teachers was a unique part of the JSU programme and appreciated both by teachers and school management. Teachers noted that while the kaupapa of care of others was consistent throughout the JSU training and supervision sessions, they were unused to having supervision, so going through disclosure processes could be difficult for them.
Predictably, not all teachers and students liked the programme. From figure 1.3 there were 5 teachers whose enthusiasm was marginal (below 3.5), and 7 classes where the percent of children commenting positively about JSU was below 60%. However, while there was an overall improvement in child wellbeing, it improved more for some schools (full primaries did less well) and some cultures (Asian/African and Pacific Island cultures made the most progress, while Pākehā/European made the least progress). Older children showed greater improvement in wellbeing scores than younger, and boys made more progress than girls. Such school and cultural patterns were repeated in the answers to many questions and in the ratings that children gave for the usefulness of the programme. There were no outcome differences for age. Girls were more enthusiastic about the programme and more likely than boys to put its teachings into practice, while boys showed greater improvement in wellbeing scores.

Informally, it was our observation that for Māori and Pacific students, having teachers of the same culture helped, particularly where aspects of the programme promoted a different approach to the student’s home-discipline practices and survival skills’ regimes in under-resourced social and economic environments. We heard teacher comments such as “this programme aligns to my Māori and Pacific values, so I feel at home with this work”.

After providing an extra supervision session with a Samoan social work lecturer at the request of two schools, some teachers commented that they were now better prepared to engage in conversations with their students on the issue of caregivers using physical punishment. The teachers had been concerned to hear that some students were being physically punished at home. Students were struggling with the difference between home and school methods of discipline, and they now had opportunities in the classroom to safely talk about this difference. The additional supervision supported teachers in developing some conversational strategies that supported positive approaches to discipline and narratives within different cultures that affirmed these approaches.

At follow-up, six months after post-test, children continued to identify JSU strategies as ones they would use and were significantly more positive about the outcomes of using these strategies. However, we were concerned about the progress of the most vulnerable children, the group that only gave negative or neutral comments about JSU in the post-test. Figure 1.4 shows that at follow-up six months later, this group was catching up on the positive group in their expectation of use of JSU strategies in response to a scary person. Strategies like walking away, going to a safe place and talking to an adult about what happened. Not only are the negative/neutral group 5% more likely to use JSU strategies, their positive comments about using JSU strategies increased from 35% to 52%.
In their comments, many students referred to practical outcomes such as “deciding to learn all my friends phone numbers and my family’s just in case of an emergency”, doing a “safety plan ... because ... I’d be prepared and safe” or learning “the ‘I have the right to be safe’ sayings [which] helped me know what to do in tough situations”. Doing “the ‘111, write it on your thumb’ ... was very useful” because you know “there is someone out there to talk too.”

At the follow-up, 6-months later, teachers repeated the assessment of change they had made when the JSU programme was complete (see figure 1.2). Figure 1.5 shows these two assessments together. Improvement is still occurring on all factors apart from being able to talk about your feelings. The biggest relative improvements are in literacy and anger reduction. The right-hand column shows the percent of classes for which teachers think that children’s behaviours have improved because of JSU. The teachers believe that every child has improved in knowing how to keep themselves safe, and nearly three quarters have improved in areas of key JSU teaching (being able to talk about their feelings, being able to ask for help and being supportive of children who are struggling to keep up). In 63% of 275 comparisons between follow-up and post-test, children had improved, in 35% there was no change and only in 2% had things got a bit worse (a bit more sickness and a bit more anger outbursts)
We enter round two of our research with a mix of confidence and curiosity. We are assured that we have found parts of the answer towards supporting resilience and wellbeing in our children, but we know that the ultimate solution is beyond the reach of any single programme or organisation. Our data can contribute to these conversations. This year ahead is about us entering deeper collaborative conversations with others sharing our aim of keeping our children safe from the challenges of violence in our communities and homes.

There were some gaps and significant questions that arose from the 2017 research which we aim to pursue in the 2018 pilot. Based on the 2017 teachers’ feedback the manual has been updated, and the need to tailor the delivery of the programme to different cultural groups and school and community environments has been addressed. More input from teachers and students in other regions of the North Island as well as one city in the South Island will be valuable.

Can the results of the 2017 pilot be replicated in the regions outside of Auckland? Can children in other settings easily use the strategies taught to keep themselves safe and to get help? What will it take to ensure classrooms become even more of a safe haven for the children of New Zealand? Are we resourcing and supporting our teachers sufficiently as the ‘chalk-face’ agents of keeping children safe? Who can we partner with in rural and Māori communities further away from centralised resources? There is opportunity now for tangatawhenua in the regions to provide their local perspective through pre-pilot consultation and engagement with the researcher and developers of JSU to ensure that Māori participation in the research project aligns with their tūmanako (aspirations) and that tangible benefits are obtained.

Teacher’s comment
This programme just worked in so well with my own personal beliefs around anxiety, yoga and mindfulness. It can be so terrifying to talk about deep topics (in case we stuff it up) that we avoid it entirely to the detriment of our students their whānau and ultimately our society.

Deputy principal’s comment
This programme trumps other programmes, so present it to schools as: - here’s the ‘everything’ but if you can’t teach it in its entirety there are the one or two parts to really focus on and reference alongside other programmes/units of work.

I like Jade Speaks Up. Our kids are walking differently, more upright. They are confident and able to talk about what is going on for them. Jade Speaks Up should definitely be supported to continue. Deputy School Principal

‘Kei a tatou katoa te taonga hua wairua hei tainga mo te katoa’. Everyone has potential access to the treasures of the spirit for the highest good of all. (Whakatauki gifted to this work by Awa Hudson, Kuia to Violence Free Communities)
2. Introduction and literature review

2.1 Introduction
The goal of the Jade Speaks Up programme (JSU) is to deliver a relatively small and short-term intervention which would give Year 5-8 school children tools to develop trusting relationships and strategies to keep themselves safe from violence. The planned result is that children will feel safer and more resilient and that teachers will find the programme a most effective resource around interpersonal relationship learning.

The JSU programme has had a long gestation starting in the West Auckland community. The knowledge behind the programme has been collected together by local leaders and community workers from justice, police, health, mental health, education, social workers, Māori, Pacific, Asian/African and others. There have been several initiatives in West Auckland all working towards a violence free society supporting the 2005 Waitakere City for Peace declaration. These initiatives included supporting children, parents, young mothers, grandparents raising grandchildren, men and fathers. They provided training in alternative forms of discipline and skills in raising families, programmes to address family harm, alcohol and drug addictions, and the development of a family court and a restorative justice programme. Members of the community would meet regularly to share their experiences and work together on community events.

Violence Free Waitakere was founded as Zero Tolerance to Violence in 1998 by the agencies of West Auckland advocating for zero tolerance and violence prevention programmes. The first CE of Violence Free Waitakere was Elaine Dyer, who had wide experience of working in community, and having had New Zealand and international experience of working in prisons. She had heard stories of homes that were dysfunctional, broken, violent, poor, with missing fathers, unemployment and drug and alcohol problems. The children from these homes often ended up violent, distrustful, addicted, lacking in empathy. They were out of touch with their emotions and some had undiagnosed attachment disorders which eventually led into lives of crime. In 2004, committed to changing this pathway from childhood to prison, she started on the development of the Violence Free Begins With Me (VFBWM) violence prevention programme addressing bullying in primary and intermediate schools (Woodley, 2009).

VFBWM was run in several West Auckland Schools between 2004 and 2012. Evaluations of the VFBWM programme were overall very positive. However, the length of the programme and the commitment required by teachers meant that it was difficult to enlist schools who, in 2013, were also being encouraged to engage with the Ministry of Education’s introduction of Positive Behaviour for Learning (PB4L) programme. In 2014 VFBWM was transformed into Jade Speaks Up, a shorter, teacher driven and better resourced programme. Key elements of the new programme were: a powerful animated video relating to the experience of violence and danger of 8 to 12-year-old children; a teacher manual, and counsellor and parent education facilitator guides. Andrea O’Hagan, an experienced educator, collaborated with Elaine in developing and delivering both VFBWM and JSU, along with other talented teachers, resource creators and researchers.

In 2015 Elaine stepped down from the CE role in Violence Free Waitakere to work full-time on JSU with the support of Andrea and Dr Geoff Bridgman, an experienced researcher. From late 2016 ACC have funded Violence Free Communities (VFC) for the delivery and evaluation of JSU as pilot programme for violence prevention. ACC has made a commitment to providing an integrated educational pathway for

---

1 Violence Free Waitakere changed its name to Violence Free Communities in November 2015
children to be kept safe from violence, and to ultimately become agentic in decreasing the distressingly high numbers of domestic violence incidents. ACC saw the potential of JSU to address the gap in school-based programmes that existed for Years 5-8.

While the JSU programme is a New Zealand-developed initiative, it is also highly aligned with the best exemplars of the category of Universal School-based Youth Violence Prevention in the US Centre for Disease Control’s 2014 review of best practice (David-Ferdon & Simon, 2014). Such programmes “provide students and school staff with information about violence, change how youth think and feel about violence, and teach nonviolent skills to resolve disputes” (p22). Within this category, the model that JSU follows is the one of Promoting Alternative Thinking Strategies (PATH - Kam, Greenberg & Walls, 2003). This, in turn, is based on social and emotional learning in the affective, behavioural and cognitive domains covering “self-awareness, regulation of emotions, social awareness, good relationship skills and responsible decision-making” (EPIScenter, 2012, p4). In addition to the Centre for Disease Control, several other major agencies have named PATH as a model violence-prevention programme (SAMHSA, 2007; CASEL, 2013; Blueprint, 2016). Within the field of education in New Zealand, Boyd’s (2012) development of the Wellbeing@Schools Survey for the assessment of social and emotional learning draws upon the work of Payton, Weissberg, Durlak, Dymnicki, Taylor, R. Schellinger et al. (2008). This work argues that building students’ social and emotional skills and competencies in relating to one another and in social problem-solving connects to improvements across a range of outcomes, including increases in social competencies and academic achievement, as well as a decrease in conduct problems such as bullying.

2.2 Wellbeing, safety and the quality of education in New Zealand Schools

International comparisons suggest the New Zealand primary and secondary education outcomes are in decline. The OECD 2015 PISA international surveys show New Zealand educational achievement in science, maths and reading declining against past OECD surveys and in the rank order of more than 50 nations (OECD 2016a). The same survey shows that at 18.5%, New Zealand has the second highest percentage of school children who are frequently bullied, double the OECD average (OECD, 2016b). Our age-standardised rates of admissions to mental health services for 10-14 year olds have risen 63% from 2010 to 2016 and from 8th of 18 five-year age brackets to third, and are rising faster than any other age group (Ministry of Health, 2013, 2014a,b, 2016a,b,c, 2018). Since 2011 when the government asked the Chief Science Advisor, Sir Peter Gluckman, to report on the looming crisis in adolescent mental health, the situation for children has clearly worsened. In the search for solutions that build resilience into our vulnerable children, Bagshaw (in Gluckman, 2011) quotes Luthar’s (2006) maxim that “resilience rests, fundamentally, on relationships” and claims that “schools that have high expectations, moderate classroom sizes and in which teachers treat students with warmth, positive regard and support also have good outcomes academically” (p. 81).

2.3 The Structure of Jade Speaks Up

The JSU programme is woven together by 4 main strands, based on child development principles:

- expert training
- support and supervision of teachers
- well recognised research and evaluation processes
- specialist resources covering a blend of art, drama, songs, storytelling and the development of an animated DVD.

These resources have been developed by a multicultural group of artists, musicians, teachers, animators and filmmakers collaborating with the Violence Free Communities organisation.
The unique structure of the JSU programme was developed from a strengths-based coaching model. An underlying value of the programme is that people of all ages and stages of life have the resources available to make positive change happen. Additionally, the programme is based on the value of adults being able to provide children with positive influential modelling of appropriate relational behaviours. Given that the adults in question are teachers, the expectation of the JSU programme is that teachers use best-practice coaching approaches with their classes once they are provided with quality professional learning development unpacking the four main meta-level questions behind any learning - why, how, what and what-if. The teacher’s manual has been carefully developed on the premise that the students will be more willing to engage in the activities when those same four meta-level questions are addressed.

All modules are strongly aligned with the 2007 New Zealand Health Curriculum Levels 2 and 3 for children aged 8-12 years (Ministry of Education, 2014a). In particular, the programme is focused on the strands of Relationships with Other People and Healthy Communities and Environments. The developers also drew on the 1999 New Zealand Health Education Curriculum document which included the underlying concepts of wellbeing and hauora as well as a socio-ecological perspective of health.

One of the key modules of the programme is Module One which introduces the children to emotional literacy, a core aspect of developing interpersonal skills of expressing their own needs and feelings effectively. Students go on in Module Two to explore what ‘trust’ is, as well as ways of developing trust through activities based on best practice. JSU is grounded in the transformative power of teaching emotional literacy and providing children with safe places to tell a trusted adult what is happening in their often-stressful lives. This experience of talking with an adult who is willing to listen can be a point of change in a child’s life (DuBois, Portillo, Rhodes, Silverthorn & Valentine, 2013).

The PB4L Restorative Practice (Ministry of Education, 2014b) approach, where the staff, whānau and school community model consistent best-practice for relational/restorative behaviour using Restorative Conversations, Circles and Conferencing, is also used with JSU. The JSU programme provides teachers with tools and activities to develop children’s awareness of some essential components of relationships, such as having an empathetic response towards another person, experienced when behaviours ranging from joyful and enthusiastic to scary or violent are exhibited. The JSU manual includes comprehensive teacher’s notes to enhance teacher understanding of what is involved in developing positive relational behaviours. From the outset the lessons encourage reflection on what it takes to keep classmates safe.

The programme focuses on ensuring that key messages vital to the children’s safety are clear and easily understood, being delivered through a series of catchy phrases and songs. Visual resources, such as film clips, and interactive experiential activities are provided to prompt discussion and cooperative learning. Examples of illustrated emotional vocabulary charts are provided in the teacher’s manual in Te Reo Māori as well as English, and participating classes are helped to develop their own charts using the languages of the students’ cultures.

2.4 Jade Speaks Up’s approach to Professional Learning Development and supportive supervision of teachers

The teacher’s role within the JSU programme is to create the conditions whereby their students feel safe enough to discuss aspects of life that may have been previously omitted, overlooked or even purposely brushed aside within the setting of a classroom. This is no small ask of the teachers. Therefore, the programme features a one-day professional learning development (PLD) workshop for all teachers and management staff to attend before the course is taught by the classroom teachers. Delivery of the
programme by class teachers is essential as the foundation of the programme is trust. Children who don’t trust their teacher are vulnerable and so the creation or reinforcement of that relationship of trust is vital to the success of the programme. With trust comes disclosure, and part of the PLD day is about familiarising teachers with guidelines for handling disclosures, as well as with their school’s policy and internal procedures. Teachers also have the opportunity to connect with personnel from Oranga Tamariki, to ask questions and to have the ‘human face’ of this organisation revealed.

During the programme two feedback/feedforward supportive supervision sessions are held (usually via skype) with the teachers. This supervision-support offered to the teachers is a unique part of the JSU programme and recognises the stress that teachers and managers experience when presented with the tough and unfair experiences of many of the children in their classes. While some of this work around disclosures is restorative, the aim is to be preventative through catching the hints of trouble before the damage is done.

**2.5 The importance of evaluation alongside the Jade Speaks Up programme**

Integral to the robustness of the programme is a thorough evaluation process for both teachers and students. Staff and student questionnaires, including standardised tests of wellbeing and depression, are conducted before and after teaching the programme and in a follow-up 6-months after the programme has finished. Data on child wellbeing is collected during the programme and fed back to teachers during the supervision sessions, allowing teachers to initiate pastoral care conversations with their students. The supervision sessions for teachers encourage the development of best practice teaching processes and strategies for developing trusting and respectful relationships. The evaluations feed into new iterations of the programme, with changes to manuals, activities, training and future evaluations.

The method for the JSU evaluation process, is detailed and will be described in Chapter 2. It follows a gold-standard methodology of using pre, post and follow-up conditions, control and experimental groups, standardised tests of well-being and triangulation between student and teacher data and qualitative and quantitative data. Going forward, there may be an opportunity for the Wellbeing@School Survey data to be used as part of the JSU process to build a more comprehensive picture of how life is for our children, and how/whether their resilience is developing. The Keeping Ourselves Safe programme is trying to develop such a strategy to demonstrate that programme’s value (New Zealand Police, 2017).

From the beginning, the developers of the programme consciously strove to honour the three P’s of Te Tiriti o Waitangi - partnership, participation and protection of Māori knowledge and values - throughout the decision making, planning and development phases of the programme. The key resource of the programme, the Jade Speaks Up video, with its emphasis on manākitanga, music, and the nurturing pedagogy of the Māori male teacher, exemplifies this awareness. This commitment continues to ensure the learnings are appropriate for Māori. It is a feature of the pilot to ensure that the material is trialled in schools that are pre-dominantly Māori, in classes that are bilingual and in Kura Kaupapa schools, as well as in multicultural settings. The JSU pilot programme in its first iteration has no engagement with parents or caregivers, but this is planned for future iterations.

While the JSU Programme is in its pilot stage, it is providing teachers with training, resources and external supervision as they build a safe place, five days a week for children to talk with a trusted adult about their fears and concerns. This is helpful for children’s wellbeing as well as academic development (Wood, 2006). Through sharing experiences and talking about problems the children are becoming aware that other kids, and even their teachers, have tough days too. This is the hidden curriculum - where children
learn through stories and activities how to be empathetic. These are life skills that society greatly needs us to have as we become even more of a multicultural society espousing many different values.

Robust evaluation is critical because over recent years there have been a range of programmes and packages to address the decline in academic competence and in the general wellbeing of children competing for space in school curriculums. These include programmes developed in New Zealand and ones that are imported and adapted to New Zealand conditions. However, it has become clear that some form of framework and accreditation is necessary to help schools determine what is likely to work best in individual schools.

2.6 The Positive Behaviour for Learning approach to child wellbeing

The Ministry of Education’s Positive Behaviour for Learning (PB4L) framework, established in 2010 (Ministry of Education, 2011), is such a framework and is currently in just over a third of schools, and “supports New Zealand schools, early childhood education (ECE) settings, and whānau to promote positive behaviour and create inclusive learning environments that foster wellbeing and achievement for every child and student” (Ministry of Education, 2015, p3). PB4L School-Wide is one component of the PB4L approach and “is a framework of key features...shared values and behaviour expectations...[that] aims to engage the whole school community in adapting school structures, practices and philosophies related to behaviour, and in developing [social interaction] systems that everyone can use in a consistent way” (Boyd and Felgate, 2015, p1).

PB4L School-Wide is based on the Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports (PBIS) programme developed in the 1980s at the University of Oregon and later through the national Center on Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports based at that university (Sugai and Simonson, 2012). By 2012 over 16,000 school teams had been trained in PBIS, resulting in “improvements in problem disciplinary behavior, school climate, organizational health, student bullying behavior and peer victimization, and academic achievement” (p3). Fergusson, Boden and Hayne (in Gluckman, 2011) felt that PB4L was a “a step in the right direction” (p.67) and that the PB4L School-Wide programme is effective. However, given lack of progress since 2011, “much more needs to be done” (p67)

A more recent New Zealand Council of Educational Research (NZCER) review of three years of implementation of PB4L School-Wide involving, in its final year, 48 primary, intermediate and secondary schools and over 9000 students (Boyd and Felgate, 2015) showed that the programme was well liked by the schools involved and resulted in perceived increases in student engagement and class attendance and decreases in disruptive behaviours. In the last two years year of the evaluation of PB4L School-Wide, the Wellbeing@School survey instrument developed by NZCER (Boyd, 2011) was used to do pre and post student assessments one-year apart. This 50-question assessment explores the extent to which schools are caring, collaborative, prosocial and safe environments that respectfully engage cultures and parents. Over 10,000 assessments were done, both pre and post, with children at Years 5 and 6 (primary), 7 and 8 (intermediate) and 9 and10 (secondary), in an attempt to measure some of the impacts of PB4L School-Wide. While changes (defined here as a 5% shift in the level of agreement to an individual question) were found in 20% of the questions for the primary schools, a third of these were negative. Secondary schools recorded a positive change in 46% of the questions and no negative changes, but intermediate level children showed no changes at all. Boyd and Felgate (2015) conclude that while most of the shifts are encouraging, it is too early to say whether the Wellbeing@School survey can show that PB4L School-Wide can produce changes in wellbeing. A major area of weakness identified in the research was no clear improvement in initiatives to enhance Māori and Pacific Island student wellbeing.
While NZCER review of *PB4L School-Wide* tells us something of the successes generally and gaps in the programme relating to intermediate level education, *PB4L School-Wide*, on its own, was never expected to provide all the answers to the mental health and behavioural challenges in schools. It is one of a suite of programmes have been clipped onto the *PB4L* framework, often focused on a particular age group or level within pre-school, primary and secondary education (Ministry of Education, 2015). Programmes include those based on international models, such as *My FRIENDS Youth Resilience Programme* designed for students aged between 12 and 15 years and aimed at anxiety reduction (Barret, 2012a and b); the *Incredible Years Parent, Teacher and Autism* packages for children between two and eight years (Ministry of Education, 2015), and *Check & Connect*, a long-term mentoring programme for at-risk students aged between 12 and 15 years. The *My FRIENDS Youth Resilience Programme* by 2017 had reached some 8 million children worldwide and had completed randomised control trials that showed small but sustained reductions in anxiety (Murphy, Abel, Hoove, Jellinek, Faze et. al., 2017). In New Zealand there has been a trial of *My FRIENDS Youth Resilience Programme* (MacDonald, Bourke, Berg and Burgon, 2015) which was well received by teachers and students, particularly Māori and Pacific Island students. However, there were concerns about the length of the programme, the need to adapt teaching materials to New Zealand conditions and overall resourcing of the programme. At present, the Ministry of Education is not continuing with this programme as part of the *PB4L* suite.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 2.1: <em>PB4L School-Wide</em>’s relationship to restorative practice (Ministry of Education, 2014)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Essential Components of <em>PB4L School-Wide</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Support, participation, and leadership by principal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. A common purpose and approach to discipline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. A clear set of positive expectations for all students and staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Procedures for teaching expected behaviour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. A continuum of procedures for encouraging expected behaviour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. A continuum of procedures for discouraging inappropriate behaviour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Procedures for the ongoing monitoring and evaluation of the effectiveness of the <em>PB4L School-Wide</em> system</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other programmes that are part of the *PB4L* framework are rebranded services, such as the *Intensive Wraparound Service: Te Kahu Toi*, designed for a small cohort of students with complex and challenging behaviour and social and/or learning needs; while others draw on New Zealand and Māori models of practice (e.g. *Te Mana Tikitiki* is a kaupapa Māori positive behaviour programme for 8 to 12 year old...
Māori students), and Restorative Practice, which is a programme aimed at secondary schools that “helps schools to build and maintain positive, respectful relationships across the school community” (Ministry of Education, 2015, p16). Missing from all of these programmes is a focus on intermediate level education.

To become part of PB4L, programmes must be aligned with the essential principles. Table 2.1 sets out how Restorative Practice aligns with the PB4L School-Wide framework. The Ministry of Education is currently supporting the implementation of PB4L Restorative Practices through to 30th June 2020 by funding Restorative Practice coordinators, regular professional learning and development for up to 200 primary, intermediate and secondary schools nationwide, together with open access online and hard copy resources and materials.

Outside the PB4L framework, there is a raft of other programmes in schools that have a violence prevention focus and designed to improve wellbeing. Programmes like the ACC funded Mates & Dates (Duncan and Kingi, 2016), the Ministry of Health funded BodySafe (Dickinson, Carroll, Kaiwi Gregory, 2011) and the New Zealand Police’s Loves Me Not (New Zealand Police, 2018) are sexual violence prevention programmes directed at secondary school.

Most relevant to the intermediate school years are The NZ Police funded and delivered Keeping Ourselves Safe programme which brings “a comprehensive range of child protection resources to help students [of all ages] learn and apply a range of safety skills that they can use when interacting with others” (New Zealand Police, 2017); and the Peace Foundation’s Peer Mediation school programmes across all schools aimed at conflict resolution and relationship building (The Peace Foundation, 2015). These programmes are delivered across New Zealand to collectively, hundreds of schools and have been doing so for more than two decades. These programmes have had limited evaluations mainly focused on surveys of teachers, principals and programme coordinators, with small sample sizes and some in-depth interviews with participants (Sanders, 2006; National Centre for Peace and Conflict Studies, University of Otago, and The Foundation for Peace Studies Aotearoa/New Zealand, 2016). Absent from the evaluations of these two programmes (and from most of the programmes covered in this section) are key components of gold standard programme evaluation: the use of standardised wellbeing assessments; pre and post assessment; the use of control groups; and follow-up assessments. The point we are making here is that in context of the decline in school performance noted in S2.2 above, there is no clear evidence that these programmes are having any lasting impact. Many of these programmes are delivered by outside providers and are thus not incorporated into the usual learning programmes and evaluation cycles of schools. This is problematic because they do not build the capacity of teachers, nor partner with teachers, to continue to address this learning and provide ongoing learning and support for students.

### 2.7 How *Jade Speaks Up* be aligned with PB4L as one of the PB4L clip on programmes

Across both the PB4L suite of programmes and the independent programmes there appears to be a gap at intermediate school level that is not being fully addressed. While the version of the internationally successful My FRIENDS Youth Resilience Programme (designed for younger children (Friends for Life - Friends Resilience, 2017) could be promising for relationship building, it is not a violence prevention programme and it has yet to be trialled in New Zealand. There are other PB4L projects and initiatives currently available which could be adapted for Year 7 and 8 students to cover the intermediate years. Check and Connect from the University of Minnesota (2018) is a drop-out prevention and mentoring programme aimed at secondary school students with behaviours that make school graduation unlikely (Ministry of Education, 2014). A positive report (“I enjoy school now”) has been written on a trial in schools (Wylie & Felgate, 2016), – secondary and one intermediate – focusing on small numbers of high risk children from gangs and other at-risk environments. A US meta-analysis states that while Check and
Connect showed very positive effects for staying at school, school completion rates did not improve (Institute of Educational Sciences, 2015). Wylie & Felgate (2016) suggest that the Check and Connect programme is suitable for Year 7 and 8 students and possibly for Year 5 and 6, which may indicate the value dovetailing with the JSU programme, as there are no programmes outside the PB4L framework addressing this gap in safety and relationship learning at Years 7 and 8.

The PB4L framework has been introduced to schools based on the understanding “that environments can be changed to improve behaviour and support effective teaching and learning. It also reflects the belief that schools play a major role in creating safe, healthy societies” (Ministry of Education, 2014b, p4). What sets JSU apart is the focus on building trust and on the use of powerful tools and tasks to achieve this within a very economic training and delivery structure. This structure is also supported by a commitment to ongoing supervision and to ongoing evaluation feeding back into improving the delivery of the programme. PB4L School-Wide and JSU both seek to improve the wellbeing of the students through the development of positive interpersonal relationships. Both programmes also aim to develop a culture of care within schools with mutual trust and respect as key components. When the seven essential components of PB4L School-Wide (see table 2.2) are examined alongside JSU programme expectations, it seems that JSU would be very compatible with PB4L school-wide framework.

| Table 2.2: Example of a possible relationship of the PB4L School-Wide programme (Ministry of Education, 2014b) with Jade Speaks Up. |
|---|---|
| Essential Components of PB4L School-Wide | JSU programme expectations |
| 1. Support, participation, and leadership by principal | The principal and senior leadership team attend the training day. Senior management staff are often the school coordinators of the programme. |
| 2. A common purpose and approach to discipline | A best-practice approach to developing student trust and understanding of choices and possible consequences of behaviours. |
| 3. A clear set of positive expectations for all students and staff | School values and expectations of behaviour and learning are supported through the JSU best-practice approach. |
| 4. Procedures for teaching expected behaviour | JSU focus is on building the students’ emotional literacy and developing their concept of trust to underpin positive, respectful relationships that encourage student engagement. |
| 5. A continuum of procedures for encouraging expected behaviour | Participating teachers model a consistent best-practice approach to relational behaviour and positive communication, and the tasks in the JSU are progressive more complex. |
| 6. A continuum of procedures for discouraging inappropriate behaviour | Provides teachers with tools and activities to develop awareness of essential components of relationships, such as empathy with what another person may experience, so that inappropriate or violent behaviours can be self-modified. |
| 7. Procedures for the ongoing monitoring and evaluation of the effectiveness of the PB4L School-Wide system | Staff and student questionnaires are given before and after teaching the JSU programme and at a 6-month follow-up. Supervision support sessions are provided for the teachers by the external programme trainers, and teachers give ongoing feedback on the effectiveness of the programme. Data is collected from students’ evaluations and fed through to the teachers for pastoral care conversations. |
This review has outlined the core elements of the development and implementation of the *Jade Speaks Up* programme. It has placed *JSU* within the current picture of school wide programmes currently being trialled in New Zealand schools. The data that follows in this report will offer a significant contribution to what is possible in the arena of long-term social change in intermediate-level education.

### 3. Method

#### 3.1 Participants

The project aimed to recruit a minimum of 800 students from 40 classes at Years 5-8, and 40 teachers in four or more intermediate and full primary schools, one being rural, and with a mix of cultural composition and deciles. Ultimately, 1300 students and 48 teachers were involved. To get 800 completions after the consent process, student non-completion of the pre-and post-assessments, and loss from dropouts, we expected a 25% loss from the beginning sample which would mean selecting 1066 students to begin with (Esbensen, Osgood, et al, 2013). We approached schools which had already been involved in the *PB4L* framework on the assumption that they would already have policies and practices in place that would deal with issues such as disclosures, and a staff group which would be proactive around supporting their students to deal with challenging behaviours.

#### 3.2 Pre-, post- and follow-up programme student questionnaires

The project used pre- and post- programme and follow-up (6-months later) student and teacher questionnaires and qualitative data drawn from training and support conversations with teachers. The questionnaires (tick box, open ended and comment questions) are designed to assess the change in students exposed to the *JSU* programme. The student questionnaires (pre-, post- and follow-up) were conducted as online, and have the components shown in table 3.1. The post-test and the follow-up have some extra evaluative questions, but follow-up is restricted to key questions about current wellbeing, depression and safety. Questions on emotional literacy, trust and safety attitudes and skills were more focussed on processes that underpin safe behaviour and were not essential in the follow-up, and the programme was now too distant for children to make useful value judgements about.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 3.1: Student questionnaire components</th>
<th><em>JSU</em> programme</th>
<th>Class as usual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>pre-test</td>
<td>post-test</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demographic questions: school, decile, class, age, gender, culture.</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measures of child wellbeing: the 20-item Center for Epidemiologic Studies’ Depression Scale for Children (CES-DC; Weissman, Orvaschel, &amp; Padian, 1980) and the Child Outcomes Rating Scale (Duncan, Sparks Miller, Bohanske &amp; Clau, 2006).</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional literacy questions: four tick box question banks - two picture-based recognition tasks, one describing emotions and one on responsiveness to emotional situations</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safe people and environments: seven very short open-ended questions</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature of trust and safety attitudes and skills: Five tick box question banks - two on trust, and two on safety attitudes and use of safety skills.</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responses to a scary person: One tick box question bank and a comment question</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Rating and comment questions on the overall value of JSU

All the questions are able to be scored (see appendix 1 for the full questionnaires) and over the time period of the research it was possible to see predicted improvements in emotional literacy, knowledge of safe, trustworthy people and environments, knowledge and use of safety skills, and, child wellbeing, all objectives of the JSU project. The images used in the first of the emotional literacy questions are from the Body Language Quiz / Test Your Emotional Intelligence produced by the Greater Good Science Centre (2016) of the University of California Berkley. Apart from the tests of global distress, all other questions were created by the study authors.

The emotional literacy, trust and safety questions align with the core learning goals of the course, e.g. understanding feelings, the concept of trust and evidence of thinking about ways to create a safety plan, some self-care strategies, and, understanding different forms of violence. For emotional literacy questions, we used photographs of adults displaying different emotions to test how accurately children aged between 10-12 can read/recognise adult emotions.

3.2.1 Center for Epidemiologic Studies’ Depression Scale for Children

One of the expectations we have from a successful programme is that children will feel safer at home and school. That in turn will mean children will experience less anxiety, less depression, more positivity and better relationships. Both the standardized scales in this evaluation are capable of measuring reliable small changes in these areas.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 3.2: The four subscales of the CES-DC.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(The numbers are the order of the questions)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. I was bothered by things that usually don’t bother me</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I did not feel like eating, I wasn’t very hungry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. I felt like I couldn’t pay attention to what I was doing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. I felt like I was too tired to do things</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. I didn’t sleep as well as I usually sleep</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. I was more quiet than usual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. It was hard to get started doing things</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I wasn’t able to feel happy, even when my family or friends tried to help me feel better</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. I felt down and unhappy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. I felt like things I did before didn’t work out right</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. I felt scared</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. I felt lonely, like I didn’t have any friends</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. I felt like crying</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. I felt sad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. I felt like I was just as good as other kids</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. I felt like something good was going to happen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. I was happy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. I had a good time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. I felt like kids I know were not friendly or that they didn’t want to be with me</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
19. I felt people didn’t like me                          Interpersonal problem

CES-DC is a 20-item scale (table 3.2) designed as a screening test for childhood depression and has a scoring range of 0 -60, and 15 has been set as the cut-off indicating risk of depression (Wiessman et al, 1980), at which point it has a sensitivity of 71% and a specificity of 57% (Fendrich et al, 1990). The test has good record of internal consistency (a= 0.88, Brage, Meredith, & Woodward, 1993; 0.87–0.92, Hudson, Elek & Campbell-Grossman, 2000; 0.84-0.89; Froh, Fan et al, 2011; 0.91, Brown, Harris, Woods & Cox, 2012), and convergent validity. For example, it is correlated with: the Children’s Depression inventory, r=-0.61 (Kovacs, 1992, Faulstich, Carey et al, 1986); the Social Adjustment Scale Self-Report, r=-0.75 (Weissman & Bothwell, 1976; Weissman, Orvaschel & Padian, 1980), and the self-report of loneliness from the Revised UCLA Loneliness Scale (Roberts, Andrews, Lewinsohn & Hops, 1990). More recently, the translation into German of CES-DC (Barkmann, Erhart & Schulte-Markwort, 2008) has been shown to have convergent validity for self-report with a number of protective factors for children, such as family cohesion, parental support, social support, peer competence, self-efficacy, self-esteem and optimism (r=0.23 to 0.43), and for a range of quality of life measures (r=-0.26 to -0.51 Bettge, Wille et al, 2008).

The CES-DC has been used in topics ranging from: the connection between internet use and depression (Banjanina, Banjaninb, Dimitrijevicc, & Pantic, 2015); validation of an instrument for OCD assessment (Jones, De Nadai et al, 2012); the relationship between gratitude, materialism and well-being (Froh, Emmons et al, 2010), to the effectiveness of therapeutic play for children with cancer (Li, Chung & Ho, 2011).

The German translation of the CES-DC has also been factor analysed into four distinct subscales - somatic symptoms and retarded activity, depressive affect, positive affect, and interpersonal problems (Barkman et al, 2008 – see table 3.2). This factor analysis was confirmed in a Chinese version of CES-DC (Li, Chung & Ho, 2010), which also reported strong convergent validity with standardised tests of anxiety and self-esteem. Other translations have been into Swedish (Olsson & von Knorring , 1997), Farsi in Iran (Essau, Olaya et al (2013) and Kinyarwanda in Rwanda (Betancourt, Scorza et al, 2012); again all showing good internal consistency and convergent validity.

**3.2.2 The Child Outcome Rating Scale**

The Child Outcome Rating Scale (CORS) is an adaptation of the Outcome Rating Scale (ORS) developed by Miller and Duncan (2000) as part of a project to get therapists (counsellors, psychotherapists, psychologists) to pay greater attention to the outcome of each therapeutic session thus improving treatment outcome. CORS is a four-item measure recorded as marks on 10cm lines anchored at each end by the positive and negative limits of each item and takes less than 5 minutes to complete. Duncan, Miller & Sparks (2003) created the CORS (see figure 3.1 below) and in later (Duncan, Sparks et al, 2006) demonstrated CORS: test-retest reliability (r=0.60) across clinical and non-clinical self-report populations; internal consistency (a=0.84); consistency between caregiver and self-report administrations (r=0.63); and convergent validity (r= -0.43) between caregiver administrations of CORS and the 64-item Youth Outcome Scale (Lambert & Burlingame, 1996). Cooper, Stewart, Sparks & Bunting (2013) found that CORS caregiver and teacher administrations correlate with the Strengths and Difficulties Questionnaire (Goodman, 1999) for caregivers (r=0.49 at baseline and r=0.60 at endpoint) and teachers respectively (r=0.58 at baseline and r=0.69 at endpoint).

The scoring for each scale is from 0 to 10 (measuring the distance of the mark from the left hand anchor point), with the maximum total score being 40. Based on the difference between the clinical and non-
clinical samples, a cut-off point of 32 was suggested for an indication of “global distress” for children aged between 7 and 12 (Duncan, Sparks et al. 2006). In later British clinical school-based samples, 73% were below 32 on first assessment and 9% at completion of the counselling in one study (Cooper, Stewart et al, 2013); and 53% and 15% respectively in a second study (Fernandes, 2015). Generally, there is a recent strong uptake of the use of CORS in counselling services in British schools and generally in child mental health services (Timimi, Tetley, Burgoine & Walker, 2012; Barth, Lee, Lindsey, Collins et al 2012; Law & Wolpert, 2014).

3.2.3 CORS use as a feedback system for focussing teacher attention
In the pre- and post-test children rather than marking a paper form, identified their wellbeing by digitally ticking a circle on a 10-circle continuum (see below) rather than making a mark on a line, which may affect the scoring.

![Family - how are things in my family?](image)

However, CORS was also used within the JSU programme in pencil and paper form as part of a feedback process to help teachers identify children who might need more attention and support. In counselling
situations, the use of CORS has been shown to improve counselling outcomes since it provides session by session feedback to the therapist (Cooper, Stewart et al, 2013; Fernandes, 2015). Asking the children to do the pencil and paper version on weeks 3 and 5 of the project and feeding those results back to the teacher not only confirmed or otherwise the reliability of our digital version of CORS but gave the teacher information about where she might best focus her attention.

The value in the pencil and paper version of the CORS (as opposed to the digital version), was that it was easier for the whole classroom to do this at the same time, early in the day near the beginning of the week while the course is being conducted. This took no more than 5 minutes of class time. Children whose scores were below the cut-off point for risk of distress were brought to the attention of the teacher. The disadvantage with this process is that the data had to be collected, measured and entered into a Google form by a research assistant for the results to be available to the research team and through them to the teacher.

3.3 Pre-, post- and follow-up programme teacher questionnaires
Forty-eight teachers were involved with the JSU programme group. Using a mix of tick box and comment questions, the pre-programme teacher questionnaire assessed the following:

- Pre-existing conditions that might affect the value and uptake of the programme, such as previous keeping-ourselves-safe programmes, and the atmosphere of the class.
- Perceived value of the training
- Knowledge of protective resources
- Using the CORS, the wellbeing of two selected students, one “vulnerable” and one “safe” in each of 46 classrooms, drawn from the pre-test ratings of children doing the JSU programme group. The teachers were not told about pre-test scores or labels as we wanted to get their independent assessment of the children. Teachers were told that the children had been randomly selected. Thus, we had:
  o 46 “vulnerable” children scoring 4-points below the cut-off points for the CORS (28 and below) and 10 points above the cut-off point for CES-DC (25 and above); and,
  o 46 “safe” children scoring above the CORS cut-off point (33 and above), and below the CES-DC cut-off point (15 and below).

The post-programme teacher questionnaire, also using a mix of tick box and comment questions, assesses the following:

- Classroom conditions (repeat of the pre-test) that may have changed as a function of JSU
- Perceived value of the training and implementation of the programme.
- Global assessment of programme effectiveness.
- Knowledge of protective resources.
- Using the CORS, a repeat of the teacher wellbeing assessment of the selected students above - , 46 “vulnerable” and 46 “safe” – a repeat of pre-test, plus descriptions of change that may have occurred.

The follow-up questionnaire to teachers was a reduced form of the post-test covering:

- Classroom conditions (repeat of the pre-test) that may have changed as a function of JSU
- Global assessment of programme effectiveness.
3.4 Qualitative feedback from teachers and school managers
Alongside the collection of online questionnaire data, we established several interactive forums to build relationship with the teachers, support their delivery of the programme, and provide a vehicle through which we could dialogue about the emergent issues and discoveries. These took the form of:

- A one-day professional learning and development session to explore different aspects of family violence, update teachers on best practice around responding to student disclosures and familiarise them with material and key processes in the manual. It also provided an opportunity for teachers to meet away from the school and strengthen collegial relationships with other participating teachers.
- Two skype supervision sessions where, in small groups of five teachers or less, a conversation was held with the two trainers to update progress, consider responses, and reflect on the scores generated by the class completing the two CORS surveys. Some observations of their two allocated students were also shared by the teachers.
- When needed, separate sessions were arranged where schools were grappling with cultural issues, particularly the question of punishment in many of the students’ homes. We enlisted an experienced social worker from the appropriate cultural community to help guide the teachers’ discussion and respond to their concerns.
- A post programme interview with participating teachers was held, via skype, to reflect on the delivery of the programme and to receive teachers’ immediate feedback on its value, the number and type of disclosures resulting from the programme and any changes that the programme had facilitated in the classroom.
- Six months follow up interviews were held in-person with the management and with participating teachers to consider the longer-term effects and implications of the programme.

The whole sequence of training, supervision and interviews was conducted twice, since all schools had a Class as Usual (control group) which began teaching the programme in Term 2 once the JSU programme group completed the programme in Term 1. At the end of the training day teachers were asked to give written feedback on the content and quality of the training day. For each supervision/mentoring or review session by the JSU team, audio recordings and written notes were taken and summaries of themes arising created for each school. It is important to note that the supervision sessions with teachers were not structured as narrative interviews, but as supervision sessions, as the primary purpose was to give advice and support to teachers.

3.5. Analysis
The intention of the project was to draw from schools across the decile range and thus create a sample that would be generalisable to the New Zealand school cohort of 10-12-year olds, with a margin of error of 4% at the 95% confidence level. Data from government Education Counts (2016) website permits an a-priori analysis of the degree to which the population of 10-12-year olds in a sample of schools is a statistical match for the Auckland cohort. This means that all the pre-test measures could give a general indication of where Auckland schools are functioning in terms of vulnerability and preparedness with regard to addressing violence prevention in the lives of 10-12-year-old children.

Because we are using children as their own controls for pre-, post- and follow-up tests, one-way ANOVAs are sufficient to assess the changes that occur from one stage of the programme to the next. We used Zaiontz’s (2018) Realstats package, mainly the analysis of variance (ANOVA) and Tukey’s post-hoc analysis to explore how children of different ages, genders and cultures, and from different schools, respond to the measures of change in the project. Using Soper’s (2016a) a-priori Sample Size Calculator for Multiple
Regression on a sample of 400, with five predictor variables and a statistical power level of 0.8, small differences (Cohen’s $f^2= 0.0324$) at $p<0.05$, were able to be detected. Medium sized differences (Cohen’s $f^2= 0.015$) would be detected with a sub-sample size of 91, and for medium to small differences (Cohen’s $f^2= 0.085$) as many as 50 predictor variables would be addressed with a sample size of 400. Again, using Soper’s (2016b) calculators, looking at the statistical power for pre-, post- and follow-up comparisons of the individual and consolidated measures, for a strong effect size (Cohen’s $d=0.8$), a statistical power level of 0.8 and a two-tailed hypothesis, 53 is the minimum sized group to enable the detection of small significant differences ($p<0.05$). This means that we were able to detect significant changes in relatively small sub-samples (e.g. specific cultural groups) of the sample.

With respect to changes in the CES-DC and CORS, the large CES-DC Swedish sample (2270) had a SD=10.80 (Olsson & von Knorring, 1997), which means for a sample of 400, a pre-/post- or an experimental/control difference of ±1.4 was significant at $p<0.01$, and ±1.05 at $p<0.05$, and for a sub-sample of 50, the difference would be ±4.1, and ±3.1 respectively (Soper 2016c). With CORS, the non-clinical group (n=119) SD in Duncan, Sparks et al’s (2006) validation study was 7.8, which means for a sample of 400, a pre-/post- or an experimental/control difference of ±1.4 would be significant at $p<0.01$, and ±1.00 at $p<0.05$, and for a sub-sample of 50, the difference would have to be ±3.0, and ±2.2 respectively. In summary small, significant changes with large effect sizes were able to be detected even, in most cases, at the sub-sample level.

With 92 possible comparisons between student pre- and post-test CORS and teacher pre- and post-test CORS, correlations of $r=0.205$ would be significant ($p<0.05$, 2-tails). Correlations between student pre- and post-test CORS, and two student pencil and paper CORS involving 400 students would be significant at $r=0.098$ ($p<0.056$, 2 tails).

To add depth to the statistical analysis, thematic analysis was used with the comment data from questionnaires and teacher observations of the children selected as case studies, as were the notes from supervision/mentoring and review sessions with teachers and school management.

### 3.6 Ethical issues

There are five key ethical issues that were addressed, apart from the standard one of preserving the anonymity of the students, teachers and the schools involved (Loveridge, 2010).

- **Perceived risk to vulnerable children** if their issues are exposed and not properly addressed. Schools are required under the Education Act to properly address issues of violence that are outside the school as well as inside. In using JSU strategies, schools are trying to improve their capacity to prevent violence, creating a social milieu where children can disclose minor incidents that can be addressed before long-lasting damage occurs. Thus, teachers were trained to respond to disclosures of violence in ways that improve the safety and wellbeing of the child.

- **Disclosure of sensitive information** about children’s negative experience/vulnerability gained in the research, thus breaking rules of confidentiality. The project followed procedures under the Vulnerable Children’s Act on reporting of acts and threats of violence towards children. The process of responding to student disclosures was a key part of the training for teachers. We avoided questions that would ask for personal details in relation to issues of violence in the questionnaires to make the chances of acts of concern being disclosed in the assessments used to be very low.
In the programme teachers were given access to the results from two CORS assessments completed in class to help them identify and support vulnerable children. CES-DC and CORS both have cut-off points for risk of distress which, although reasonably sensitive in clinical populations, have high false alarm rates with non-clinical groups. Care had to be taken in their interpretation with individual students, and the approach we took was practical. Is there an issue that needs to be addressed? If so, what can be done? If this is a very temporary state (e.g. a brief falling out with another child) or a false alarm (the child “experimenting” with the assessment) then we can ignore it. All the data from child and adult pre-, post- and follow-up assessments is presented in aggregate form so as to preserve the anonymity of the participants.

- **Teacher deception.** Telling the teacher that their two case-study students have been randomly selected rather than selected as representatives of “vulnerable” or “safe” students was to prevent our perceptions of the students influencing how the teacher might respond to them. Test results can have a strong effect on teacher behaviour and we considered this small deception to be essential.

- **Consent.** We received school, parental, student and teacher consent for the research project. We expected that about 20% of parents would either refuse consent or not respond to requests for consent and that a small percentage of students would not complete the assessments (Esbensen, Osgood et al. 2013). To minimise loss of participants through the failure of parents to respond to consent requests, we stated on the consent form that non-return of the form was taken as an indication of consent. Students for whom consent to engage with the research was not given were still full participants in the programme, but no data were collected from them.

Teachers were informed that their check-up conversations were being recorded (notes or audio) and asked for permission to do this each time. Refusal would not mean that advice and support would be withdrawn.

- **A research approach that is sensitive to the needs of Māori and Pacific Island students** and those of other non-European/Pākehā cultural background. As can be seen from table 4.1 (next chapter), all of our preliminary work involved a wide range of cultural groups, with Pākehā/European origin only 21% of our cohort. The JSU film addresses the multi-ethnic character of New Zealand and is designed so that a wide variety of children can recognise aspects of themselves in the characters, many of whom are voiced by Māori and Pacific Island actors. Similarly, the content of the modules is drawn from and reflects our multi-ethnic background.

The *Jade Speaks Up* project was approved by the ACC Ethics committee on the 2nd of November 2016.
4. Analysis of the Children’s data

4.1 Introduction to the data analysis

In the evaluation of the JSU programme evaluation there were experimental classes initially doing the programme (JSU), and the control groups (Class as Usual (CAU) groups) just doing the pre- and post-programme tests. Almost all CAU groups later went on to become experimental JSU groups, with the result that 1272 children in 50 classrooms and eight schools (seven in the Auckland region and one from outside) had access to the JSU programme. The programme was presented as part of the 2007 New Zealand health and physical education curriculum (Ministry of Education, 2014a) so all children in JSU classes participated fully. However, children had the choice of not being involved in the evaluation of the programme and similarly, parents or guardians could also withdraw their children at any time from the evaluation.

Table 4.1 gives the demographic and programme features of the eight schools involved with the JSU programme. The definitions for each feature are given in table 4.1. Of the total involved, 1106 children (87%) took part in the JSU and CAU pre-test evaluation, almost evenly split between girls (48.3%) and boys (51.7%), and with substantial cohorts of Asian/African, Māori, Pacific Island and Pākehā European students. After completing the JSU programme, 813 children (64% of the total) took part in the post-tests. One school (AREA) had to withdraw before the CAU group could start on the JSU programme, and a second school (FPA) was too small to have a control group.

A wide range of schools was included in the research. Five different types of education Years 6, 7 and 8 were involved – three large intermediate schools, two full primary schools, one Integrated school, and one Area school covering primary and secondary spectra, and one tiny alternative full primary. The largest contributor had 293 children (INT1) involved and the smallest had only 7 (FPA). While five are low decile (high support needs), two are mid-range (FPA and INT3) and one is high decile (FP2). The cultural mix of the schools varies widely, with one (AREA) being 82% Māori descent, another (FP2) being 71% Pākehā, and two other schools (INT2 and INTG) having Pacific Island majorities. Asian/African children are a quarter or more of the children in three schools (INT1, INT3, INTG). The gender balance is also quite varied with two schools (FP1, INTG) having boys exceed girls by 24%.

Most children were happy to do the evaluations which took between 10 and 20 minutes. Some children (particularly children where English is a second language) needed help to do the evaluation. Parent refusal accounted for only a small percent of the dropout. Participation was lower in classes where the delivery of the programme had been less sure-footed or had been disrupted by teacher illness or clashes with other school priorities. Some in CAU groups got bored by the third iteration of evaluations, and in one class the teacher failed to organise a post-test. On many occasions children were not in class (not at school or in another teaching/pastoral space) at times when evaluations were being done.

Various parts of the analysis were limited by missing data. For example, 11% of the evaluations had incomplete wellbeing assessments (the Child Outcome Rating Scale – CORS, and the Centre for Epidemiological Studies Depression Scale – CES-DC) which had to be discarded in parts of the analysis that relied on that data. A key part of the analysis relied on having matched participants across pre- and post-tests. Table 4.2 shows the attrition that occurred as we look for matched and complete data sets from pre- to follow-up tests. While the preference is for data sets where there is matched data across up to
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Decile</th>
<th>Average Pre-test</th>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>Classrooms</th>
<th>Roll</th>
<th>Pre-test</th>
<th>Post-test</th>
<th>Follow-up</th>
<th>% Completed Post-test</th>
<th>Asian/African</th>
<th>Māori</th>
<th>Pacific</th>
<th>Pākehā</th>
<th>European</th>
<th>Not Known</th>
<th>Girls</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>INT1</td>
<td>7&amp;8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>JSU</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>265</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CAU</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INT2</td>
<td>7&amp;8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>JSU</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>247</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CAU</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FP1</td>
<td>7&amp;8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>JSU</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CAU</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTG</td>
<td>7&amp;8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>JSU</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CAU</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AREA</td>
<td>7&amp;8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>JSU</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>113</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CAU</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FPA</td>
<td>7&amp;8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>JSU</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

School: AREA = area school (full primary and secondary); FP = full primary; FPA = full primary alternative school; INT = Years 7 and 8 intermediate school; INTG = integrated school (primary, intermediate and secondary).

Year: The Year levels of the classes involved in the project

Decile: a measure of socio-economic disadvantage used by the Education Ministry (2015) as a basis for school funding.

Average age: the age of the children in each school and overall. Taken at the first evaluation

Group: E experimental (JSU = class does Jade Speaks Up programme) and Control (CAU = class as usual)

Classrooms: each school allocates a number of classrooms to be either a JSU or a CAU group

Rolls: the number of children on the rolls in the classes that are taking part in the project

Pre-tests and post-tests: The JSU group has a pre-test before the JSU programme starts and, 7 weeks later, a post-test when the programme is finished. The CAU group does similar pre- and post-tests at the same time as the JSU group. When the CAU group completes the CAU post-test (not shown), they start the JSU programme. The CAU post-test doubles as a pre-test for the JSU programme and the post-test shown for the CAU groups is the one at the end of their JSU training

Follow-up: All those children who did a shorter follow-up evaluation 5-6 months after the post-tests

Percentage completed: the percentage of children on the roll evaluating the JSU programme after completion of the programme

Asian/African: children with either full or partial Asian or African descent who participated in the JSU and CAU pre-tests

Māori: children of Māori descent, full or partial, but excluding children with Asian/African descent who participated in the JSU and CAU pre-tests

Pacific: children of Pacific Island descent, full or partial, but excluding children with Māori or Asian/African descent who participated in the JSU and CAU pre-tests

Pākehā: Children with Pākehā or European descent, fully or partial, but excluding children with Pacific Island, Māori or Asian/African descent who participated in the JSU and CAU pre-tests

Girls: the number and percentage of girls in the project who participated in the JSU and CAU pre-tests

Total: the number of children and the percent of the total roll that participated in the JSU and CAU pre-tests
Table 4.2: Attrition of sample size due to matching across the stages of the project

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage and level of completion of the wellbeing tests</th>
<th>JSU</th>
<th>% of enrolled children (597)</th>
<th>CAU</th>
<th>% of enrolled children (675)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre-test</td>
<td>530</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>576</td>
<td>85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-test wellbeing tests completed</td>
<td>482</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>492</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-test</td>
<td>387</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>426</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-test wellbeing tests completed and matched with pre-test sample</td>
<td>294</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAU to JSU post-tests</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>426</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAU to JSU post-test wellbeing tests completed and matched with pre-test and/or post-test samples</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-month follow-up tests</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-month follow-up wellbeing tests completed and matched with post-test samples</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

four successive evaluations from pre- to follow-up tests, comparisons are also able to be made between evaluations where intervening evaluations are absent or incomplete.

We had planned on an attrition rate on successful completion of the post and follow-up-tests that would leave an overall sample size of matched data of 400 children. The follow-up sample is less than 400, but using a repeated measures ANOVA design, a sample size of 199 and significance level of p<0.05, has a power of 0.80, and will be able to identify small differences across repeated measures (Cohens f = 0.10 - Faul et al., 2013) and between JSU and CAU groups. Consequently, although the follow-up sample may be only one third of the children enrolled, it is still large enough for a fine-grain analysis of the main effects and of differences based on culture, gender, age and school level. With 517 matched children completing the pre- and post-wellbeing tests, small to medium differences between and within schools (excluding FPA with only 7 children) can also be detected. As well, some 813 children (64% of enrolled) did part or all of the JSU and CAU to JSU post-tests, which included their evaluation of the JSU programme.

The sample chosen is representative of the cultural and gender of the segment of Auckland schools (without AREA – see table 4.3) with the same decile weighting and school type (Education Counts, 2018). The sample represents 5.1% of the Auckland schools in the same bands which means we can have a high degree of confidence that the outcomes are representative of this group of schools. All teachers of JSU classes were expected to do pre, post and follow-up (6 months later) tests. Of 50 classes involved, 47 did the JSU programme (three CAU classes did not proceed to JSU) and 44 teachers completed pre-and post-programme tests.

Table 4.3: Comparison of the gender and culture mix of the Auckland schools in the sample with that of the Auckland schools in the same decile categories and the same weighting according to decile (Education Counts, 2018)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Samples</th>
<th>n of schools</th>
<th>n of children years 6-8</th>
<th>female</th>
<th>male</th>
<th>Māori</th>
<th>Pacific Is.</th>
<th>Asian/ African</th>
<th>Pākehā</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Auckland Schools</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>19506</td>
<td>48.7%</td>
<td>51.3%</td>
<td>22.8%</td>
<td>39.9%</td>
<td>19.1%</td>
<td>18.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auckland matched sample</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>993</td>
<td>47.4%</td>
<td>52.6%</td>
<td>19.4%</td>
<td>37.1%</td>
<td>20.8%</td>
<td>21.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.2 The core data
The core children’s data is divided into four categories. 1) the demographic data (age, gender, culture, school level, school and classroom); 2) two psychometric tests (the Child Outcome Rating Scale (CORS) and the Centre for Epidemiological Studies Depression Scale for Children (CES-DC)); 3) measures of access to support people and keeping yourself safe attitudes and behaviours; and 4) measure of satisfaction with the JSU programme. The core data is divided into four categories for
teachers also - 1) the CORS test; 2) measures of class vulnerability, 3) measures of change due to the JSU programme and 4) measure of satisfaction with the JSU programme.

4.2.1 Validity and reliability of CORS and CES-DC
Both the CORS and the CES-DC have high split-half correlations (CORS r=0.70; CES-DC r=0.49, n=933), high Cronbach’s alpha (CORS=0.62; CES-DC=0.81) and an intercorrelation of r=-0.58, (p<0.00001, n=933). CES-DC scoring runs from 0 (nil depression) to 60 (maximum depression), while CORS runs from 40 (maximum wellbeing) to 0 (nil wellbeing). Negative intercorrelations between CES-DC and CORS signifies alignment of the two scales. Teachers completed several CORS assessments, and the intercorrelations between teacher assessment and child self-assessment on both psychometric tests are also high (teacher CORS/child CORS r=0.47; teacher CORS/CES-DC r=-0.48; p<0.0001, n=65).

Teacher reports suggest that a pencil and paper version of the CORS test is useful in helping them identify issues of concern that the children had. We conclude both the CORS and the CES-DC appear to be very reliable and the teacher/child intercorrelations and teacher reports also suggest these standardised tests are valid in the context of this evaluation.

4.2.2 CORS and CES-DC combined as a measure of wellbeing change
Both these two assessments have criteria for indicating children at risk of depression/mental illness. These are >15 for CES-DC and <32 for CORS. If we reverse the scoring for CES-DC so that high scores reflect positive wellbeing, the cut-off point is <45. Combining the two tests we have a score ranging from 0 to 100 and an at-risk cut-off point of 77.

4.3 Comparison of the combined pre-test data (JSU and CAU) and combined post-test data (JSU and CAU to JSU)
One of the major problems in the analysis of JSU was the considerable variability in the timing of post-tests, as shown in Table 4.4, with less than half the JSU post-tests being performed within the expected range of 5-7 weeks (35-49 days) after the pre-test and only 14% of the CAU pre-test being performed in the same range. In fact, half the CAU post-tests were done between 9 and 17 weeks after the pre-test and, in many cases, well after the CAU children had started on the JSU programme. There appeared to be an advantage to the JSU programme when the post-test was given within the expected timeframe, but while there is a positive correlation between change in the CORS/CES-DC wellbeing measure and the time between the pre- and post-test, it was not significant (p=0.1, 1-tailed). In addition, and as expected, teachers adapted the JSU programme to fit within their class and the school’s programme, with the consequence that the time period over which the programme ran might be compressed because the teacher felt that they were running out of time to do it, or expanded because the teacher felt that it needed to be taken more slowly or that more time was needed to fit all the activities in. Consequently, the comparisons between JSU and CAU post-tests may not show the difference between the experience or not of the JSU programme. What will be less contaminated are the pre-tests for JSU and CAU and the post-tests for both groups on completion of the programme.

Table 4.4: Impact of time period between pre- and post- tests for CAU and JSU groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Average pre-post time period (days)</th>
<th>Range in days</th>
<th>% of post-tests in range (35-49 days)</th>
<th>change in CORS/CES-DC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>JSU all</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>56.8</td>
<td>28-169</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAU all</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>61.8</td>
<td>21-12</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JSU in range</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>40.2</td>
<td>35-49</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAU in range</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>39.0</td>
<td>35-49</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2 In the post programme interviews the teachers from the one school commented 16 children from the CAU classes had made appointments to talk to the school SWiS worker.
One place where the CAU data could be useful is for post-test questions where there are no pre-test comparisons (assessments of use of JSU skills at the completion of the programme).

Figure 4.1 shows that overall, students have made a small (4%) but significant gain in wellbeing. Using the >77 cut off point, this gain is accompanied by an 11% gain in the number of children who are not “at risk” of mental unwellness. Table 4.5 shows that this shift is strongest on the CES-DC (5%) and two CES-DC subscales (depression and somatic) which, along with ME being the only significant subscale on the CORS, indicating that there is less depression or physical illness and higher self-esteem at post-test. These improvements are not uniform across school, gender, age and culture.

Table 4.5: Pre- and post-test scores for 495 students with complete scores for both pre- and post-tests on the Centre for Environmental Studies – Depression Scales, Child Outcome Rating Scales and subscales of the two tests. N.B. high scores on the CES-DC indicate higher values of depression while the reverse is true of the CORS. In the combined score, CES-DC is reverse scored. ns = not significant

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CES-DC subscales</th>
<th>CORS subscales</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CES-DC Somatic</td>
<td>CORS ME</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal</td>
<td>Home</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>problem</td>
<td>School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>depression</td>
<td>Everything</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>positivity</td>
<td>Total CES-DC+CORS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pre-test</th>
<th>Post-test</th>
<th>p value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CES-DC Somatic</td>
<td>36.2</td>
<td>34.3</td>
<td>0.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal</td>
<td>1.94</td>
<td>1.79</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>problem</td>
<td>1.58</td>
<td>1.51</td>
<td>0.013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>depression</td>
<td>1.61</td>
<td>1.52</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>positivity</td>
<td>2.04</td>
<td>2.04</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CORS Somatic</td>
<td>32.0</td>
<td>32.8</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal</td>
<td>7.83</td>
<td>8.13</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>problem</td>
<td>8.17</td>
<td>8.33</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>depression</td>
<td>7.88</td>
<td>8.08</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>positivity</td>
<td>8.09</td>
<td>8.25</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CORS Somatic</td>
<td>75.8</td>
<td>78.5</td>
<td>0.006</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.6 shows the results for schools. There is a significant difference (p=0.000) between schools, with two schools showing, respectively, 9% and 11% gain in student wellbeing (INT2 and INTG, p=0.04 and 0.002), two schools making small but not significant gains (3% - INT1 and INT3), one school losing ground (FPA – not significantly) by about 4%, and three staying much the same (AREA, FPA. FP2).

Table 6: Combined CES-DC/CORS scores for pre- and post-tests across schools. N=495. ns = not significant

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>INT1</th>
<th>INT1*</th>
<th>FP1</th>
<th>INTG*</th>
<th>AREA</th>
<th>FPA</th>
<th>INT3</th>
<th>FP2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRE</td>
<td>78.4</td>
<td>71.9</td>
<td>69.8</td>
<td>71.2</td>
<td>76.5</td>
<td>81.0</td>
<td>76.8</td>
<td>77.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POST</td>
<td>80.5</td>
<td>78.0</td>
<td>67.1</td>
<td>79.0</td>
<td>76.5</td>
<td>80.2</td>
<td>78.9</td>
<td>78.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p value</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.7 shows the results of the wellbeing assessments for the four cultural aggregates, two of which show significant improvement. A 5-point difference on the CORS or CES-DC would constitute a successful clinical outcome for (say) a 10-week period of therapy, so a 4.3 gain for the Asian/African group represents real progress, from 2 points below the 77 score cut-off for being “at risk” to two points above the cut-off. Similar progress is made by Pacific Island children, and Māori children are not far behind.

Twelve-year olds and boys also made solid and significant gains, whereas younger children and girls did not (Table 4.7). In summary this section demonstrates that the JSU programme appears to have
produced an overall improvement in child well being as judged by student self-assessment using the CES-DC and CORS. This improvement is not universal as it occurs only on some sub-scales of the scales used, for some schools, some cultures, the oldest age group and for boys. There are no comparisons that show wellbeing falling significantly for any group across pre- and post-tests.

Table 4.7: Combined CES-DC/CORS scores for pre- and post-tests for four cultural groupings (n=491), three-age categories and gender (n=495)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Asian/African</th>
<th>Māori</th>
<th>Pacific</th>
<th>Pākehā NZ European</th>
<th>&lt;11 years</th>
<th>11 years</th>
<th>&gt;11 years</th>
<th>Boys</th>
<th>Girls</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRE</td>
<td>75.22</td>
<td>75.28</td>
<td>76.29</td>
<td>76.12</td>
<td>77.53</td>
<td>75.06</td>
<td>75.95</td>
<td>76.08</td>
<td>75.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POST</td>
<td>79.54</td>
<td>77.89</td>
<td>79.86</td>
<td>76.33</td>
<td>79.41</td>
<td>77.62</td>
<td>79.16</td>
<td>80.27</td>
<td>76.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p</td>
<td>0.023</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>0.021</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>0.007</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.4 Analysis of CES-DC/CORS follow Up data
The follow-up test was designed to explore whether the learnings from JSU survived or whether things had returned generally to much the same state as we had encountered in the pre-tests. This section will show that, at follow-up, students’ wellbeing scores showed no significant difference from post-test scores.

Table 4.8: Post- and Follow-up test scores for 277 students with complete scores on both tests on the Centre for Environmental Studies – Depression Scales, Child Outcome Rating Scales and subscales of the two tests. NB - high scores on the CES-DC indicate higher values of depression while the reverse is true of the CORS. In the combined score CES-DC is reverse scored. ns = not significant

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>CES-DC</th>
<th>CES-DC subscales</th>
<th>CORS subscales</th>
<th>Total CES-DC+CORS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Somatic</td>
<td>Interpersonal</td>
<td>Depression</td>
<td>Positivity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-test n=277</td>
<td>33.4</td>
<td>1.73</td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td>1.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Follow-up n=277</td>
<td>34.9</td>
<td>1.82</td>
<td>1.55</td>
<td>1.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p value</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A follow-up test (FU) was completed by 482 students, of whom 381 had completed the JSU and CAU pre-tests and 317 had done the post-tests, and 225 had done pre-, post- and follow-up tests. The follow-up had a reduced number of questions, some of which were part of both pre- and post-tests and some that were part of the post-test only. We have already looked at the relationship between the pre- and post-test in a larger matched sample of 495 students, so we will confine this section of the analysis to the post-test/follow-up comparison. Of the 315 who did the post-test and the follow-up, 277 fully completed the two wellbeing tests.

Table 4.9: Combined CES-DC/CORS scores for pre- and post-tests across schools. ns = not significant

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>INT1</th>
<th>INT2</th>
<th>FP1</th>
<th>INTG</th>
<th>AREA</th>
<th>INT3</th>
<th>FP2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POST</td>
<td>82.9</td>
<td>74.7</td>
<td>69.0</td>
<td>80.0</td>
<td>79.9</td>
<td>79.1</td>
<td>80.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FU</td>
<td>78.6</td>
<td>71.9</td>
<td>67.6</td>
<td>79.8</td>
<td>73.3</td>
<td>78.0</td>
<td>78.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p value</td>
<td>0.020</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>80.8</td>
<td>73.2</td>
<td>68.3</td>
<td>79.9</td>
<td>76.6</td>
<td>78.5</td>
<td>79.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
While Table 4.8 shows there was a small, but not significant, decline in the combined wellbeing score and only the School subscale showed a significant decline, all schools showed a decline in wellbeing scores (Table 4.9), but this reached significance only for INT1. There was a significant difference across schools (p=0.004) but using Tukey’s post-test the only significant differences were between FP1 and INT1, INTG and FP2 (p<0.05).

Table 4.10: Combined CES-DC/CORS scores for post- and follow-up tests for four cultural groupings. There were four nil responses for culture, n=277. ns = not significant

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Māori</th>
<th>Pacific Island</th>
<th>Asian/African</th>
<th>Pākehā NZ European</th>
<th>p-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>73</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post test</td>
<td>79.1</td>
<td>80.5</td>
<td>79.2</td>
<td>79.9</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Follow-up</td>
<td>74.5</td>
<td>77.7</td>
<td>77.0</td>
<td>78.9</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p-value</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.10 shows there were no significant differences in CES-DC/CORS scores between the four cultural categories overall or individually between post-tests or follow-up tests, but there is a progressively smaller drop in wellbeing as we move from Māori through Pacific Island and Asian/African to Pākehā (interaction p=0.000).

Table 4.11: Combined CES-DC/CORS scores for post- and follow-up tests for three age categories and gender. ns = not significant

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>8-10 years</th>
<th>11 years</th>
<th>12-13 years</th>
<th>Boys</th>
<th>Girls</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-test</td>
<td>78.0</td>
<td>79.3</td>
<td>81.7</td>
<td>81.5</td>
<td>78.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Follow-up</td>
<td>74.0</td>
<td>77.4</td>
<td>79.0</td>
<td>79.8</td>
<td>75.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p-value</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Older children (table 4.11) again have higher wellbeing scores than younger children (p=0.003), but the interaction term (p=0.000) shows that the 11-year-olds have significantly less drop off than the younger and older cohorts. Boys have significantly higher wellbeing scores than girls (p=0.003) and smaller drop off from post-test to follow-up (interaction p =0.000).

The follow-up data shows that essentially the students return to the same wellbeing scores as in the pre-test. A comparison of the 207 children who provided data for all three stages shows no significant difference between each stage with pre-test = 77.7, post-test=80.3 and follow-up = 77.9. The comparison between pre- and post-test does reach significance in the larger sample of 495 students (See table 4.5), but the comparison between post-test and follow-up does not (277 students), with exception of the significant drop for the School measure, which suggests that when you stop doing the programme, the atmosphere within the classroom shifts back to a less engaged position similar to that of the pre-test. However, this was only significant for AREA, with a drop on CORS School from 8.64 out of 10 to 6.77 (p=0.016).

4.5 Changes from pre- to post-test and follow-up

4.5.1 Emotional literacy.

The evaluation had four tasks that were designed to show improvements in emotional literacy as a part of the JSU programme.
a) Recognition of the emotion conveyed in seven pictures of faces
Table 4.12 shows that, on post-test, children do slightly but significantly better overall, and specifically with the Surprised and Frightened faces. Sub-tests show that there are no significant cultural or age differences, but girls at 92% average do 6% significantly better than boys and across all seven emotional categories. Schools, as well, show significant differences (p=0.016) with AREA scoring significantly lower - 7.7% less than the mean and 8-12% lower for Sad, Disgust and Frightened.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Surprised</th>
<th>Sad</th>
<th>Frightened</th>
<th>Happy</th>
<th>Angry</th>
<th>Loving</th>
<th>Disgusted</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PRE</td>
<td>89%#</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>82%#</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POST</td>
<td>94%#</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>88%#</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boys</td>
<td>90%#</td>
<td>93%#</td>
<td>82%^</td>
<td>88%^</td>
<td>87%^</td>
<td>79%^</td>
<td>84%#</td>
<td>86%#</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girls</td>
<td>94%#</td>
<td>97%#</td>
<td>89%^</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>93%^</td>
<td>88%^</td>
<td>90%#</td>
<td>92%#</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

b) Describing emotional states
Children were asked How can you tell if someone is angry? with an identical intro for Sad, Frightened and Happy. Their responses were scored as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Culture</th>
<th>Pre or post</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>emotions described (using children’s spelling and punctuation)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AREA</td>
<td>Māori</td>
<td>pre</td>
<td>11 girl</td>
<td></td>
<td>they scrunched there fists flaring nostrils you see tears, eyes watery, they shake they talk to much and they always smile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NT2</td>
<td>Māori</td>
<td>post</td>
<td>12 boy</td>
<td></td>
<td>they ignore you, they yell at you and get frustrated over all the little thins you do. they forget to contact you and they are always down. they hide or try to ask if someone could help them or go with them they always jump around, scream and also want to play.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NT3</td>
<td>Pacific</td>
<td>pre</td>
<td>10 girl</td>
<td></td>
<td>they give me a evil look or if they start talking behind my back there always alone and they also cry and dont wanna be included in anything they stutter and like avoid eye contact also when there like far away from you they smile and want to include people and just enjoy life</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NT1</td>
<td>Pacific</td>
<td>post</td>
<td>11 boy</td>
<td></td>
<td>their nose are going up and their eyebrow is going down. their lips shaping like a half moon. their mouths open wide out and their eyes. Talk too much, and they will be smiling.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FP1</td>
<td>Asian/African</td>
<td>pre</td>
<td>12 boy</td>
<td></td>
<td>If their face is Red and fists are curled up Sniffing, crying and usually doesn’t want to talk Like if they saw a ghost (scared) Fulled of Joy and excited</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NTG</td>
<td>Asian/African</td>
<td>pre</td>
<td>11 girl</td>
<td></td>
<td>their face is red and they breathe heavily. they cry and you can see it in their eyes. they gasp really loudly and their [eyes] enlarge they smile really big.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FPA</td>
<td>Pākehā NZ Euro</td>
<td>post</td>
<td>10 girl</td>
<td></td>
<td>they go all puffy and red or make a sulking face they cry, shrink back and try not to exist they look away, curl-up and look as though they saw a ghost they smile, their colourful and bright</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FP2</td>
<td>Pākehā NZ Euro</td>
<td>post</td>
<td>11 boy</td>
<td></td>
<td>they have a scrunched up face and threatening someone they have tears down their face and if they are look down they are maybe shaking and they look scared and sad they are smiling or laughing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
0 = no answer, a Don’t Know response, or an answer that doesn’t address the question, such as, You just know, Make them sad, Are u okay, Take [them] to the teacher, djhgbvs… I’m bad at reading people

1 = an answer that consist of a repeat of the emotional label or offers one that is very similar (they look angry, lonely, look upset, look scared, happy face) or an answer that directs us where to observe (the face, the body, the voice, the eyes, the mouth) but not what to specifically observe (their facial expressions, face and voice, by their feelings, their face and hands, actions, behaviour, by their body expressions (sic), they act like they’re living humans). These responses could be (and frequently were) applied to all the above emotional states.

2 = an answer that gives something specific to observe that will be different for each emotional state. This could be pointing out basic features of the emotions (anger: the face goes red, making [a] fist, hitting property, stomp there (sic) feet, their frown, yelling [and] scowling; sad: crying, they weep, tears on their face, head down, upside down lips, they don’t talk to you; frightened: they are shaking, yelling for help, their eyes go big, they scream, shocked face, they run away, shivers, open mouth; and happy: smiling, they are laughing, excited and enthusiastic, they play and run around). Table 4.13 records some of the children’s more complex descriptions from across the range of schools, cultures, age and gender.

Figure 4.2 shows no significant difference between pre- and post-test scores (average 1.56 vs 1.53) for above measure of emotional literacy. There are, however, significant differences in the ability to describe different emotions with frightened and angry (average = 1.45, 1.47 both 56% scoring 2) being more difficult to describe than sad and happy (1.62, 1.64 or 70% and 71% scoring 2; p=0.000 for all comparisons between the pairs). There are also significant differences across age groups (under 11, 11 and over 11 years) with the range of 1.49, 1.53 and 1.60 (60% to 65% scoring 2, p=0.045), but with only the two ends *under 11 and overt 11) showing a significant difference in the Tukey’s sub-tests (p=0.042). Gender differences are more powerful (boys = 1.44, 54% and girls = 1.64, 71; p=0.000). There are also some differences due to culture and school. Pākehā/NZ/Europeans score significantly lower (1.46, 56% vs 1.58, 65% for the rest) as does FP2 (1.46, 56% vs 1.56. 64% for the rest), which has the highest proportion of Pākehā and the youngest cohort. The school with the lowest score is FP1 (1.40, 57%) and the highest is INTG (1.66, 74%, p=0.000). These schools have a similar average age (11.7 vs 11.8 years), but FP2 has a higher percent of girls (44% vs 38%), suggesting different causes than gender and age for FP1’s low score.
The data suggests that this measure does capture the ability to describe emotions without an external reference point and suggests the JSU programme has not improved this form of emotional literacy. However, the difference in ability to describe emotions between FP1 and INTG, schools, with a big difference in wellbeing scores, suggest that this measure could tap into an important area of change.

c) Matching pictures to one-line stories

The matching of pictures to stories is another emotional state recognition task, but a little more complex than the labelling of emotional state pictures in section a) above. An example is a picture of a man with a wide grin on his face that must be matched with the “story” they have just had good news. Unlike the task in section 1, although there were small gains in correct responses from pre- to post-test, these were not significant (see table 4.14). There were significant differences in the scores for each of the five pictures, with happy being easier than sad or angry (p=0.000), with the latter two, in turn, being easier than annoyed (p=0.000) which is easier than ashamed (p=0.007).

| Table 4.14: Children’s percentage correct in matching pictures of emotional states with brief contextual descriptions. Significant differences indicated by *=p<0.05, #=p<0.01, ^=p<0.001 |
|----------------------------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| Pacific vs the rest             | ashamed | annoyed | sad | angry | happy | average |
| Pākehā NZ European vs the rest  | 53.0%*  | 60.2%^  | 76.4% | 80.7% | 89.8% | 72.0%^  |
| FP1 vs the rest                 | 55.9% | 45.6% | 79.4% | 57.4%^ | 86.8% | 65.0% |
| AREA vs the rest                | 30.8% | 44.9% | 65.4% | 57.7%^ | 80.8% | 55.9%^ |
| FP2 vs the rest                 | 55.4%^ | 55.9% | 78.8% | 76.1% | 88.7% | 71.0%^ |
| Girls                           | 46.1% | 50.8% | 78.4% | 76.9% | 91.2%^ | 68.8%^ |
| Boys                            | 39.2% | 46.7% | 66.4% | 71.2% | 85.4%^ | 61.8%^ |
| Pre-test                        | 40.6% | 49.3% | 70.1% | 72.7% | 89.2% | 64.4% |
| Post-test                       | 44.9% | 48.4% | 74.8% | 75.5% | 88.3% | 66.4% |
| Average                         | 42.7% | 48.9% | 72.5% | 74.1% | 88.7% | 65.4% |

As in the previous section girls perform better than boys by about 7% overall, but there are no age significant effects, and cultural differences reverse what is in the previous section, with Pākehā NZ European doing best and Pacific Island worst. The latter difference is strongest in the task of matching the more complex stories of being ashamed and annoyed to pictures which could have many different representations within and across cultures. For example, the story they have just done something really stupid could have representations other than the picture of an ashamed woman with her hands covering her face, including pictures representing anger and annoyance.

There are also differences between schools which echo differences found in previous sections. FP2, in contrast to the previous section, scores best overall, due to its high Pākehā NZ European cohort, while FP1 and AREA, two schools with very low Pacific Island rolls and medium to high female cohorts that have been identified as at-risk elsewhere, have the lowest scores for this task. This again suggests that factors beyond age, gender and culture, such as socio-economic factors, have influence here.

d) Emotional responsiveness to unpleasant events

Our final test of emotion competency was to ask children to rate how you think people would feel if these things happened to them and to present 11 options for which they had the following five responses: not upset or don’t know, could be upset, upset, very upset, extremely upset. These were scored 0-4. The thinking behind this question was that children might need to be more responsive to unpleasant events as this would increase their motivation to adopt preventative and restorative solutions. The children are clearly discriminating (p=0.000) between the options (see Table 4.15) with
being punched, hit or pushed being the most upsetting (mean score on pre-test = 3.01 = very upset) and being beaten in a game or competition (mean score on pre-test = 1.13 = could be upset), being the least, and the logic of being more responsive to the more potentially damaging options is generally upheld.

However, the data (table 4.15) shows that children were significantly less responsive in the post-test (becoming less upset), overall and for four individual options (someone being unkind to you, being left out of games or activities, being put down or shamed and having mean lies told about you). An alternative hypothesis is that the JSU programme increases the resilience of children and that they feel less threatened by events described in the options. Because we are unable to argue that no emotional response is a good thing, there must be a mid-range of appropriate responses which will vary according to the upsetting situation. In table 4.29 we identify a small percentage of children who felt that the programme was of no use, or who were unable to comment on its value and who show up as vulnerable on a wide range of measures. These children are less “upset” on post-test than children who liked the programme (average = 1.8 vs 2.3), suggesting that while a weakening of the “upset” scores can be interpreted as a positive outcome, scores below (say) an average of 2.0 are of concern.

This view is supported by data from FP1, whose responses on this task were the only ones that were significantly lower than the responses from all other schools. FP1 had significantly weaker “upset” responses on 8/11 sub-questions and an overall average of 1.95 or below upset, compared with 2.28 average for the rest – between upset and very upset (see table 4.15). As we have noted in in other assessments of emotional competence (see sections b and c above), FP1 students do less well, and that there will be a point at which children are insufficiently responsive and it is possible that FP1 has reached that point. This view is supported by the fact that the more emotionally competent girls are significantly more upset than the boys, overall, and on all but one of the 11 options (Table 4.15).

Looking at these four emotional competence tasks:
- two tasks show improvements from pre- to post-tests,
- girls show greater competency across all four assessments;
- performance improves with age only when children have to describe emotions, rather than just label them;
• all cultures managed these tasks at a similar level and where there were significant differences, they were better explained by age differences (Pākehā low scores for the description task) or different cultural reference points (Pacific Island low scores for the one-line story task); and,
• one school, FP1, consistently shows, on all four tasks, a lower level of emotional competence.

4.5.2 The level of trust and safety.
The evaluation had five tasks that were designed to explore the level of trust and safety experienced by the children

a) Naming Trusted people
A series of questions were about connection to trusted people (see Table 4.16). On only one of these questions was there a significant difference between pre- and post-tests. After doing the JSU programme, 9% more students knew the phone numbers of important adults they trusted to help them in an emergency. In this question there are significant age differences, with 47% of the 8-10-year olds in the pre-test knowing some of the phone numbers compared with 71% for the 12 and 13 year olds (p=0.000), and the 11 year olds being in the middle at 60%. However, the younger improve faster (up 16%) compared to the middle group (9%) and the oldest group (6% - interaction p=0.000). There are no gender differences. There are significant cultural differences (p=0.000), with the Pacific Island students being at 53% (vs 67% - 70% for the other cultural groupings) but progressing 15% so that at post-test the difference between the groups has dropped from 17% to 6% (interaction p=0.000). Two schools stand out at pre-test, INTG and FPA, with 91% and 100% respectively of students knowing the phone numbers (p=0.000). The six other schools, sitting at between 50% and 64%, make progress of 5% to 15%, while INTG and FPA remain much the same (interaction p=0.002).

Table 4.16: % of students naming trusted people they could get support from or knowing phone number of key non-family people they could trust to help them. N=617 ns=not significant

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>% naming</th>
<th>Four trusted friends</th>
<th>Mum -trusted whanau or family member</th>
<th>Dad -trusted whanau or family member</th>
<th>A teacher -trusted non-family member</th>
<th>Mean across the four measures of trusted support</th>
<th>% knowing at least some of the phone numbers of the friends or adults (not family members) that they could trust if they needed help</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre-test</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-test</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p-value</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.17 shows no significant differences between the follow-up and post-tests, showing that the students are holding onto gains made on the post-test around knowing phone numbers of trusted non-family members who would help them at times of need (see Table 4.16). Comparing the 224 students who completed all three stages there is a significant difference in children’s knowledge of contact numbers between pre- (66.1%) and post-test (80.4%; p=0.022) and follow-up (79.5%; p=0.034), but no difference between post-test and follow-up.

Table 4.17: % of students naming trusted people they could get support from or knowing phone number of key non-family people they could trust to help them. N=319 repeated measure. ns=not significant

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>% naming</th>
<th>Four trusted friends</th>
<th>Mum -trusted whanau or family member</th>
<th>Dad -trusted whanau or family member</th>
<th>A teacher -trusted non-family member</th>
<th>Mean across the four measures of trusted support</th>
<th>% knowing at least some of the phone numbers of the friends or adults (not family members) that they could trust if they needed help</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Post-test</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Follow-up</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p-value</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4.18: Children’s response to the question What things are true about your best friend/s? Response options yes don’t know and no. Percentage yes given except in the average positive which includes 100%—yes adjustments made to can’t keep a secret, don’t do what they say would, look attractive and are popular with others. Significant differences indicated by *p<0.05, #p<0.01, ^p<0.001. For age, culture and schools’ comparisons there are more than two options: <11=under 11, 11= 11 years old,>11 =over 11, A=Asian/African, M=Māori, P=Pacific Island, Pa= Pākehā NZ European. N=609, repeated measure.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Condition/group</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>care how you feel</th>
<th>are good listeners</th>
<th>are reliable and consistent</th>
<th>get help for you if you are scared</th>
<th>enjoy your jokes</th>
<th>can’t keep a secret</th>
<th>say something truthful about you that might be a bit uncomfortable to hear</th>
<th>look attractive</th>
<th>are popular with others</th>
<th>average positive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1,218</td>
<td>72.7%</td>
<td>62.8%</td>
<td>73.4%</td>
<td>65.6%</td>
<td>65.2%</td>
<td>43.4%</td>
<td>38.1%</td>
<td>29.3%</td>
<td>19.7%</td>
<td>13.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pre-test</td>
<td>609</td>
<td>72.7%</td>
<td>62.6%</td>
<td>73.1%</td>
<td>65.5%</td>
<td>52.6%</td>
<td>44.3%</td>
<td>36.9%</td>
<td>19.5%</td>
<td>19.5%</td>
<td>13.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>post-test</td>
<td>609</td>
<td>72.7%</td>
<td>63.1%</td>
<td>72.4%</td>
<td>65.7%</td>
<td>56.0%</td>
<td>42.5%</td>
<td>39.2%</td>
<td>27.4%</td>
<td>19.9%</td>
<td>12.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>girls</td>
<td>620</td>
<td>61.5%</td>
<td>56.6%</td>
<td>75.3%</td>
<td>73.7%</td>
<td>54.5%</td>
<td>47.1%</td>
<td>41.5%</td>
<td>31.6%</td>
<td>15.3%</td>
<td>11.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>boys</td>
<td>598</td>
<td>63.7%</td>
<td>59.9%</td>
<td>70.1%</td>
<td>57.2%</td>
<td>55.9%</td>
<td>39.6%</td>
<td>34.6%</td>
<td>26.9%</td>
<td>14.7%</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;11years</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>76.1%</td>
<td>61.8%</td>
<td>67.2%</td>
<td>65.1%</td>
<td>48.7%</td>
<td>46.6%</td>
<td>44.5%</td>
<td>17.2%</td>
<td>18.5%</td>
<td>11.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 years</td>
<td>582</td>
<td>71.6%</td>
<td>61.3%</td>
<td>71.5%</td>
<td>65.1%</td>
<td>57.2%</td>
<td>46.7%</td>
<td>37.8%</td>
<td>27.8%</td>
<td>18.2%</td>
<td>10.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;11 years</td>
<td>398</td>
<td>72.4%</td>
<td>65.6%</td>
<td>77.9%</td>
<td>66.6%</td>
<td>56.0%</td>
<td>37.7%</td>
<td>34.7%</td>
<td>38.7%</td>
<td>22.6%</td>
<td>18.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian/African</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>74.4%</td>
<td>65.1%</td>
<td>75.6%</td>
<td>67.4%</td>
<td>50.4%</td>
<td>47.3%</td>
<td>39.5%</td>
<td>29.8%</td>
<td>21.3%</td>
<td>15.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Māori</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>71.7%</td>
<td>55.1%</td>
<td>72.8%</td>
<td>64.6%</td>
<td>52.0%</td>
<td>42.5%</td>
<td>40.9%*P</td>
<td>27.6%*P</td>
<td>20.9%</td>
<td>7.5%*Pa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific</td>
<td>375</td>
<td>68.9%</td>
<td>65.7%</td>
<td>71.8%</td>
<td>63.0%</td>
<td>62.0%</td>
<td>38.8%</td>
<td>29.3%</td>
<td>38.8%*P</td>
<td>17.3%</td>
<td>13.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pākehā</td>
<td>323</td>
<td>76.4%</td>
<td>63.7%</td>
<td>71.4%</td>
<td>67.4%</td>
<td>52.8%</td>
<td>47.2%</td>
<td>45.7%*P</td>
<td>19.6%*P</td>
<td>20.5%</td>
<td>11.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INT1</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>69.3%</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td>77.3%</td>
<td>68.3%</td>
<td>55.3%</td>
<td>39.0%</td>
<td>37.7%</td>
<td>39.3%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>7%*INTG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INT2</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>76.7%</td>
<td>70.7%</td>
<td>75.9%</td>
<td>67.2%</td>
<td>62.9%</td>
<td>46.6%</td>
<td>30.2%</td>
<td>37.9%*P</td>
<td>16.4%*INTG</td>
<td>11.2%*INTG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FP1</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>70.6%</td>
<td>55.9%</td>
<td>69.1%</td>
<td>54.4%</td>
<td>61.8%</td>
<td>33.8%</td>
<td>33.8%</td>
<td>30.9%*FP2</td>
<td>30.9%</td>
<td>7.4%*INTG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTG</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>74.1%</td>
<td>64.6%</td>
<td>73.4%</td>
<td>65.8%</td>
<td>51.3%</td>
<td>42.4%</td>
<td>33.5%</td>
<td>41.1%</td>
<td>31.6%*INT2, FP1, AREA, FPA, FP3, INT3, FP2</td>
<td>59.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AREA</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>69.2%</td>
<td>51.3%</td>
<td>56.4%</td>
<td>#INT1</td>
<td>57.7%</td>
<td>43.6%</td>
<td>46.2%</td>
<td>38.5%</td>
<td>26.9%</td>
<td>21.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FPA</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>92.9%</td>
<td>71.4%</td>
<td>78.6%</td>
<td>85.7%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>71.4%</td>
<td>57.1%</td>
<td>50.0*FP2</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td>7.1%*INTG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INT3</td>
<td>262</td>
<td>68.7%</td>
<td>57.3%</td>
<td>72.5%</td>
<td>64.5%</td>
<td>56.5%</td>
<td>47.3%</td>
<td>37.4%</td>
<td>20.6%*INT1, INTG, INT2</td>
<td>14.9%*INT2</td>
<td>4.6%*INTG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FP2</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>79.7%</td>
<td>64.4%</td>
<td>71.2%</td>
<td>67.1%</td>
<td>54.5%</td>
<td>44.1%</td>
<td>46.8%</td>
<td>12.2%*INT1, INT2, INTG, FP1, FPA</td>
<td>21.6%</td>
<td>9.5%*INTG</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
b) What are the characteristics of best friends and people you can trust?

There were two questions that were identical in their response options but began differently. The first asked: What things are true about your best friend/s? and the second: What things are true about people you can really trust?

Table 4.18 examines the first of these questions with 10 sub-questions, four of which (can’t keep a secret, don’t do what they say they would, look attractive and are popular with others) are not a good indicator of trustworthiness and are treated as negative options in the average score for this question. These questions do not show any pre-post-test shift in children’s perceptions of the trustworthiness of friends but discriminate well between sub-questions like are reliable and consistent and care how you feel which are integral to trust, and questions which aren’t, like look attractive and are popular with others. Girls score significantly higher on six questions of the sub-questions and are more positive overall than boys. Boys are significantly more likely than girls to think that their friends look attractive.

There are some useful transitions with age. There is a trend for older children to have more reliable and consistent and honest friends - friends who say something truthful about you that might be a bit uncomfortable to hear, who can keep a secret and who do what they say they would. reliable and consistent and truthful friends who can keep secrets. With culture, Pacific Island children are most appreciative of friends who enjoy their jokes, are truthful, and do what they say they would. Pākehā children are the most positive overall followed closely by Asian/African children. Asian/African and Pacific Island children like to have to have friends who are popular with others and this shows up with INTG, a school with strong Pacific Island and Asian/African cohorts, who are five times more likely to tick popularity as a key characteristic of friends than the other schools. In a separate analysis (Bridgman, Dyer, O’Hagan and McCarthy, 2017) we showed that this extreme difference was almost entirely due to the Filipino cohort at the school who place a different value on attractiveness and popularity from other cultural groups in this study. FP2, with the strongest Pākehā cohort, is the most positive of the schools (excluding FPA whose data must be largely set aside in school comparisons because of the school’s small size). AREA and FP1 schools are the most vulnerable in that their friends are the least trustworthy.

Table 4.19 asks the same questions as in Table 4.18 about people you can really trust. There are no significant differences between pre- and post-test, but there are differences between the two sets of questions. Being a good listener jumps 10% for people you can trust but can’t keep a secret also jumps 5% and saying something uncomfortably truthful falls 4%. The gender and age differences for this question are very similar to the previous question. With culture, Pākehā, who were the least likely to say their friends were being good listeners, became the most likely (jumping 15%) to want this in a trusted adult. Māori were the least likely and joined with Pacific Island children as the least positive in their requirements for a trusted adult, while Pākehā were the most.

The trusted adult questions had the most impact with schools. With friends there was only one difference between schools in the first seven sub-questions, whereas there are 32 for the trusted adult. These distinctions reflect that the AREA school and the full primary 1 (FP1) have expectations of trusted adults that are about 10% to 20% lower on the four core features of a trusted adult: i.e. that they would care how you feel, be good listeners, be reliable and consistent and get help for you if you are scared. These two schools are the least positive overall, whereas INTG and FP2 are most with the INT2 and 3 not
Table 4.19: Children’s response to the question *What things are true about people you can really trust?* Response options yes, don’t know and no. Percentage yes given, except in the average positive which includes 100%-yes adjustments made to *can’t keep a secret, don’t do what they say they would, look attractive and are popular with others*. Significant differences indicated by *p=0.05, #p=0.01, ^p=0.001. For the age, culture and schools’ comparisons have more than two options: <11=under 11, 11= 11 years old,>11 =over 11, A=Asian/African, M=Māori, P=Pacific Island, Pa= Pākehā NZ European. N=609, repeated measure.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Condition/group</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>care how you feel</th>
<th>are good listeners</th>
<th>are reliable and consistent</th>
<th>get help for you if you are scared</th>
<th>enjoy your jokes</th>
<th>can’t keep a secret</th>
<th>don’t do what they say they would</th>
<th>say something truthful about you that might be a bit uncomfortable to hear</th>
<th>look attractive</th>
<th>are popular with others</th>
<th>average positive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1218</td>
<td>75.9%</td>
<td>73.2%^</td>
<td>71.3%</td>
<td>67.5%</td>
<td>53.1%</td>
<td>48.5%*</td>
<td>37.4%</td>
<td>25.7%*</td>
<td>14.0%</td>
<td>20.9%</td>
<td>59.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pre-test</td>
<td>609</td>
<td>74.1%</td>
<td>73.9%</td>
<td>69.5%</td>
<td>66.2%</td>
<td>52.1%</td>
<td>47.6%</td>
<td>36.0%</td>
<td>27.3%</td>
<td>20.7%</td>
<td>14.1%</td>
<td>58.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>post-test</td>
<td>609</td>
<td>77.7%</td>
<td>72.6%</td>
<td>73.1%</td>
<td>68.8%</td>
<td>54.2%</td>
<td>49.4%</td>
<td>38.9%</td>
<td>24.1%</td>
<td>21.2%</td>
<td>13.8%</td>
<td>59.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>girls</td>
<td>620</td>
<td>82.7%^</td>
<td>76.3%^</td>
<td>75.6%#</td>
<td>74.5%*</td>
<td>53.5%</td>
<td>50.8%</td>
<td>39.4%</td>
<td>29.5%^</td>
<td>16.3%^</td>
<td>12.7%</td>
<td>61.1%^</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>boys</td>
<td>598</td>
<td>68.7%^</td>
<td>70.1%^</td>
<td>66.7%^#</td>
<td>60.2%^</td>
<td>52.7%</td>
<td>46.2%</td>
<td>35.5%</td>
<td>21.7%^</td>
<td>25.8%^</td>
<td>15.2%</td>
<td>57%^</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;11 years</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>76.1%</td>
<td>70.6%</td>
<td>63.9%^&lt;11,11</td>
<td>65.1%</td>
<td>45.7%</td>
<td>52.5%</td>
<td>44.5%^&lt;11</td>
<td>17.2%^&lt;11</td>
<td>19.7%</td>
<td>13.0%^&lt;11</td>
<td>59.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 years</td>
<td>582</td>
<td>74.2%</td>
<td>72.0%</td>
<td>72.0%^&lt;11</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td>54.3%</td>
<td>50.3%</td>
<td>37.6%</td>
<td>23.9%^&lt;11</td>
<td>18.9%</td>
<td>9.3%^&lt;11</td>
<td>58.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;11 years</td>
<td>398</td>
<td>78.1%</td>
<td>76.6%</td>
<td>75.1%^&lt;11</td>
<td>70.1%</td>
<td>54.8%</td>
<td>43.5%</td>
<td>32.9%^&lt;11</td>
<td>33.4%^&lt;11</td>
<td>24.6%</td>
<td>21.4%^&lt;11</td>
<td>59.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian/</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>80.2%^*P</td>
<td>75.2%</td>
<td>73.3%</td>
<td>69.8%</td>
<td>53.1%</td>
<td>47.3%</td>
<td>36.4%^Pa</td>
<td>27.1%</td>
<td>21.3%</td>
<td>15.1%</td>
<td>60.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>73.2%</td>
<td>66.1%^Pa</td>
<td>72.0%</td>
<td>63.8%</td>
<td>51.2%</td>
<td>46.5%</td>
<td>35.8%^Pa</td>
<td>26.8%</td>
<td>20.9%</td>
<td>11.4%</td>
<td>57.7%^Pa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific</td>
<td>375</td>
<td>70.5%^*A, Pa</td>
<td>72.3%</td>
<td>69.9%</td>
<td>65.4%</td>
<td>55.6%</td>
<td>45.7%</td>
<td>28.2%^Pa</td>
<td>30.1%^Pa</td>
<td>19.4%</td>
<td>17.3%</td>
<td>57.2%^Pa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pākehā</td>
<td>323</td>
<td>80.4%^*P</td>
<td>78.3%^#M</td>
<td>71.1%</td>
<td>70.8%</td>
<td>50.9%</td>
<td>54.0%</td>
<td>50.9%^#A,#A,#M</td>
<td>18.9%^P#M</td>
<td>22.7%</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
<td>61.6%^#P,*M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NT1</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>74.3%</td>
<td>77.7%^FP1</td>
<td>72.7%</td>
<td>68.3%^#AREA</td>
<td>57.7%^*AREA</td>
<td>44.7%^*FPA</td>
<td>33.3%^*FPA, *FP2</td>
<td>30.7%^FP2</td>
<td>18.3%^INTG</td>
<td>9.3%^INTG</td>
<td>58.4%^INTG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NT2</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>76.7%</td>
<td>75.9%^*FP1</td>
<td>75.0%</td>
<td>69.8%^*AREA</td>
<td>52.6%</td>
<td>48.3%^#FPA</td>
<td>22.4%^#FPA, *FP2</td>
<td>30.2%^#FPA</td>
<td>14.7%^INTG</td>
<td>6.9%^INTG</td>
<td>58.1%^INTG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FP1</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>77.9%</td>
<td>54.4%^#INT1, INTG</td>
<td>66.2%</td>
<td>52.9%</td>
<td>55.9%</td>
<td>45.6%^#FPA</td>
<td>30.9%^#FPA</td>
<td>30.9%</td>
<td>26.5%</td>
<td>11.8%^INTG</td>
<td>53.5%^INTG, *FP2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NTG</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>77.8%^#AREA</td>
<td>78.5%^#FP1</td>
<td>74.7%</td>
<td>70.3%^#AREA</td>
<td>45.6%</td>
<td>42.4%^#FPA</td>
<td>36.1%^#FPA</td>
<td>35.4%^FP1, INT3</td>
<td>48.7%^all bar FPA</td>
<td>62.8%^FP1, #FPA, *INTG</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AREA</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>61.5%</td>
<td>57.7%</td>
<td>46.2%^#FP2, #INT1, #INT1, #INT2, #INT3, #INT2, #FPA</td>
<td>37.2%^#INT1, #INT3, #INT2, #FP2</td>
<td>48.7%^#FPA</td>
<td>39.7%^#FPA</td>
<td>26.9%</td>
<td>23.1%</td>
<td>10.3%^INTG</td>
<td>53.8%^INTG, #FPA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FPA</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>92.9%</td>
<td>85.7%</td>
<td>92.9%^#AREA</td>
<td>57.1%</td>
<td>100%^#FP2, #AREA</td>
<td>100%^#FP2, #AREA</td>
<td>99.2%^#FP2, #FPA</td>
<td>35.7%</td>
<td>42.9%</td>
<td>35.7%^INT1, #INT2, #FP2</td>
<td>66.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NT3</td>
<td>262</td>
<td>74.8%</td>
<td>71.0%</td>
<td>73.7%</td>
<td>69.5%^#AREA</td>
<td>58%^#AREA</td>
<td>51.1%</td>
<td>39.7%^#FPA, #INT2</td>
<td>19.8%^INTG</td>
<td>17.2%^INTG</td>
<td>6.5%^INTG, #FPA</td>
<td>58.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FP2</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>81.5%^#AREA</td>
<td>73%#FP1</td>
<td>67.6%</td>
<td>71.2%^#AREA</td>
<td>51.4%</td>
<td>52.7%^#FPA</td>
<td>46.8%^#INT2, #FP2</td>
<td>14%^#INT2, *INT1, #INT2</td>
<td>18.9%^INTG</td>
<td>8.6%^INTG #FPA</td>
<td>61.2%^FP1, #AREA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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significantly different from the leaders. This data suggests that in some environments children have a difficult time determining who is a trusted adult and must make do with inconsistent versions.

c) Know somewhere safe you can go to? Where is this?
Did the children know somewhere safe where they can go to? The responses to this question were categorised as in Table 4.20. The *don't know unclear* category includes blanks, “IDK”s (I don't know), spoiled answers ("hruhru", "bosh") and a range of cheeky answers ("classified infrasonic"; "im not saying else it won't be safe"; "a secret", "Michael Jordan's house"); non-specific answers : "Somewhere with people you know and trust"; "any were I now how to get back"; "neighbourhood", "a plane", "Hotels all around the world"); or answers that suggest a lack of safety in their environment "its a hiding spot i go to have a sleep and have a rest", "I'm safe everywhere apart on the street and any place that can hurt me", "I always feel unsafe even in my house"). A quarter of INT3’s responses in this *don't know/unclear* category can be seen as cheeky. Ninety-one percent of *don't know unclear* response category are "don't knows", blanks, the word "no" (which implies there is nowhere safe) and very general non-specific words ("somewhere", "nowhere"). In this category all of the responses from AREA and FP2, the two schools with lowest wellbeing scores, are like this.

There were two areas of significant difference between pre- and post-test data for the 609 children who accessed this safety question on both tests, with pre-test scores significantly higher for *Home* and significantly lower for *Relatives* (see Table 4.20). There were significant gender differences: girls selected about a fifth more options for safe places than boys, favouring *friends and neighbours*, but were less inclined to see *police* as a safe haven. There were no significant differences due to age, but there are trends of decreasing naming of *Home* and an increasing naming of *Relatives* and *School* with increasing age.

The differences between *Home*, *Relatives* and *School* have important cultural dimensions. *Home* (“our house”, “home”, “mum’s place”, “dad’s place”, “my bedroom”, etc) is significantly more named by Pākehā as a safe place than it is by Māori and Pacific Island children. The reverse is true for *Relatives* (“koro’s”, "nana and papa’s", "auntie’s", "uncle’s", "cousin’s", "sister’s", "brother’s", "grandparent’s", etc), which Māori and Pacific Island children rate three times higher than Pākehā, and also significantly higher than for Asian/African children. This reflects the much larger role of the extended family in Māori and Pacific Island cultures. School was signified by naming “school” or a place at school – “art room”, “classroom”, “gym”, “music room”, “the big tree” and the teacher’s and the principal’s offices. It could also include the homes of teachers, coaches and music teachers. When it comes to *School*, it is the two migrant groups, Pacific Island and Asian/African, who name it as safe place much more than do Māori. *Church or Mosque* was also significantly more named as a safe place by Pacific Island children (22 namings of church) than all other cultural groups.

Culture is an important determinant of the differences that we see in schools. The schools with highest Māori (AREA) or Pacific Island (INT2, INT12 and INTG) rolls have significantly higher (2-4 times) naming of *Relatives* than FP2, the school with the highest Pākehā roll (apart from FPA, where children did not name any relatives). On the other hand, AREA and INT2 have the two lowest scores for the naming of *Home* as a safe place, whereas FP2 and FPA are among the highest, and with *School*, both AREA and FP2 are on the same side of the ledger, the lowest scores in naming *School* as a safe place.
The differences between INT3 and AREA are illustrative of the complexity of safe spaces. INT3 names the most safe places and AREA the least. INT3 has much more engagement with Home, Friend’s or neighbour’s homes and School, and much less with Other buildings and Quiet and/or distant places. For the AREA children these are secret and hidden buildings (“hide out”, “underground hut”, “bomb shelter that’s my safe place”) or quiet and isolated places (on the “coast”, the “beach”, “rose gardens”, “space”) or just somewhere well away from where they are (“Taupo”, “Hamilton”, “Hastings”, “another country”).

Table 4.20: Children’s response to the question Do you know somewhere you can go that is safe? Where is this? The mean options named per child do not include the don’t know unclear category. Significant differences indicated by *=p<0.05, #=p<0.01, ^=p<0.001. Age, culture and schools’ comparisons have more than two options: <11=under 11, 11= 11 years old, >11 =over 11, A=Asian/African, M=Māori, P=Pacific Island, Pa= Pākehā NZ European. N=609, repeated measure.
whereas for INT3 these are Other buildings (library, supermarket, rugby league club, rugby club, doctors, hospital, the mall, dairy) and the Quiet and isolated places ("one tree hill", "the beach is my safe place", "Mangere Mountain", "in a tree", "bush base") are much more local. The AREA children have fewer options for safe places at "home" or with friends and neighbours but make up for this with more Relatives (64% more than INT3) and nearly five times more quiet, isolated, secret and/or distant places. This may reflect small town vs big city options around buildings like sports clubs, malls, libraries and parks, but is also a reflection that AREA may be in a less safe community than INT3. Police is not seen as a safe option for AREA.

d) Knowing what to do when you’re feeling down or scared?

In a further exploration of children’s approach to safety we gave the children six response options to the question what are some ways that you can help yourself feel OK, when you’re feeling down or scared? Three of these were desirable options (e.g. talk to someone you trust - see Table 4.21) where the correct answer is “yes” and two were undesirable (e.g. get 'out of it' on drugs or alcohol) with the correct answer

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Condition/group</th>
<th>talk to someone you trust</th>
<th>stop and breathe slowly</th>
<th>say kind things to yourself</th>
<th>play a game on your phone/computer</th>
<th>pick a fight or start an argument with someone</th>
<th>get 'out of it' on drugs or alcohol</th>
<th>Average % appropriate responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre-test</td>
<td>92.0%</td>
<td>81.3%</td>
<td>77.0%*</td>
<td>66.0%*</td>
<td>92.9%</td>
<td>70.3%</td>
<td>80.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-test</td>
<td>90.6%</td>
<td>84.6%</td>
<td>71.8%*</td>
<td>72.2%*</td>
<td>91.3%</td>
<td>66.2%</td>
<td>79.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girls</td>
<td>92.3%</td>
<td>85.3%*</td>
<td>77.7%#</td>
<td>62.4%*</td>
<td>93.5%</td>
<td>73.1%^</td>
<td>80.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boys</td>
<td>90.3%</td>
<td>80.4%*</td>
<td>70.9%#</td>
<td>77.1%^</td>
<td>90.6%</td>
<td>63.2%^</td>
<td>78.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>under 11 years</td>
<td>92.9%</td>
<td>81.9%</td>
<td>82.4%</td>
<td>68.1%</td>
<td>95.4%</td>
<td>71.0%</td>
<td>81.9%*11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 years</td>
<td>89.3%</td>
<td>82.5%</td>
<td>71.6%</td>
<td>66.7%*</td>
<td>91.1%</td>
<td>65.8%</td>
<td>77.8%*&lt;11,&gt;11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>over 11 years</td>
<td>93.2%</td>
<td>84.2%</td>
<td>73.6%</td>
<td>74.9%*</td>
<td>91.7%</td>
<td>70.1%</td>
<td>81.3%*11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian/African</td>
<td>89.1%</td>
<td>83.3%</td>
<td>74.0%</td>
<td>74.8%</td>
<td>95.0%</td>
<td>62.8%^Pa</td>
<td>79.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Māori</td>
<td>90.6%</td>
<td>82.7%</td>
<td>70.5%</td>
<td>76.0%^Pa,P</td>
<td>91.7%</td>
<td>73.2%^P</td>
<td>80.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific</td>
<td>92.6%</td>
<td>82.2%</td>
<td>74.5%</td>
<td>64.9%^M</td>
<td>89.1%</td>
<td>59.0%^Pa,#Pa</td>
<td>77.0%^Pa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pākehā NZ European</td>
<td>91.9%</td>
<td>83.5%</td>
<td>77.0%</td>
<td>65.2%^M</td>
<td>93.8%</td>
<td>80.1%^A,M#P</td>
<td>81.9%^P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INT1</td>
<td>94.3%</td>
<td>82.7%</td>
<td>76.0%</td>
<td>76.3%^INT3</td>
<td>90.3%</td>
<td>66.3%^FP2</td>
<td>81.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INT2</td>
<td>91.4%</td>
<td>90.5%</td>
<td>75.0%</td>
<td>72.4%</td>
<td>94.0%</td>
<td>59.5%^FP2</td>
<td>80.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FP1</td>
<td>88.2%</td>
<td>79.4%</td>
<td>64.7%</td>
<td>75.0%</td>
<td>86.8%</td>
<td>60.3%^FP2</td>
<td>75.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTG</td>
<td>89.2%</td>
<td>79.1%</td>
<td>69.0%</td>
<td>72.2%</td>
<td>93.0%</td>
<td>69.6%</td>
<td>78.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AREA</td>
<td>93.6%</td>
<td>89.7%</td>
<td>75.6%</td>
<td>71.8%</td>
<td>87.2%</td>
<td>69.2%</td>
<td>81.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FPA</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>92.9%</td>
<td>57.1%</td>
<td>42.9%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>71.4%</td>
<td>77.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INT3</td>
<td>88.5%</td>
<td>83.2%</td>
<td>76.3%</td>
<td>59.5%^INT1</td>
<td>94.3%</td>
<td>64.9%^FP2</td>
<td>77.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FP2</td>
<td>91.4%</td>
<td>79.7%</td>
<td>77.0%</td>
<td>68.5%</td>
<td>93.2%</td>
<td>80.2%^INT1,FP1,#INT2,INT3</td>
<td>81.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
being “no”. The option play a game on your phone/computer was also seen as a desirable option, because of the ability of computer games to shift attention from negative thoughts, although they could possibly could be described as addictive.

Overall, there was no difference between pre- and post-tests. There was a significant increase in the computer/cell phone option, but a decrease in saying kind things to yourself. Significant gender differences show girls favouring over boys, stop and breathe slowly, saying kind things to yourself and NOT getting ‘out of it’ on drugs or alcohol while boys strongly favour play a game on your phone/computer. These last two issues discriminate between cultures and schools, with 59% of Pacific island children saying “no” to get ‘out of it’ on drugs or alcohol, and 65% of Pākehā saying “yes” to playing a game on your phone/computer, both significantly lower than other cultures, and four schools, including FP1, with similar low percentages of “nos” to the drug option. There are no overall significant differences between schools, and, while there are some significant differences, there are no clear trends with age.

e) What does “I have a right to be safe mean” to the participants?
In this final question looking at safety we gave children six statements they had to judge for congruence with the core belief of “I have a right to be safe”. Half of these options were supported in the JSU programme as congruent (correct answer “yes”) and the other half, incongruent (correct answer “no”). Table 4.22 gives the outcomes for these questions and shows no significant differences between pre- and post-test. Overall, only about half the children got the “correct” answer and struggled much more with the “no” correct answer questions. Only around 30% of children understood that being the best at everything was not a guarantee of the right to be safe. Girls were significantly more likely than boys to think being the best was important and there was a clear age trend for this option, with older children being significantly less concerned about being the best than younger children. Younger children were significantly less likely than older children to believe that no-one should ever make me feel scared and overall to have fewer correct responses.

Pākehā children had the lowest scores across all three of the questions where “no” was the correct answer, as well as being the lowest overall. Pākehā were significantly different from the cultures that scored the highest on each of these questions (Pacific Island and Asian/African). This suggests that Pākehā children feel less entitled to be safe, so that, as well as needing to be the best, they shouldn’t do risky things and they should all learn self-defence if they want to be safe. At the same time, they had the strongest “yes” response to the proposition that people should look after me when I’m scared – significantly higher than the Pacific Island or Asian/African response. Asian/African children were most likely to support the statement it’s not OK to bully or threaten others, while Māori were the least likely.

Two clear results stand-out when we look at schools. INT2, one two schools to make the strongest gain in wellbeing, has the highest overall percentage correct, is the highest for two options and in the top two for two others. INT1 has a strong Pacific Island cohort. Similarly, INTG, the school with the strongest wellbeing improvement and strong Pacific Island and Asian/African cohorts, has the highest level of correct responses on 3/6 of the options. At the other end, FPA (with only 7 students), one of two schools with a small and non-significant loss in wellbeing, has the lowest overall percent correct score and is the lowest

One child from a home where domestic violence used to occur now has parents separated. When she is with Dad she ‘takes the weight’ of Dad’s behaviour towards her younger sisters. She used to talk only with teacher about problems, since participating in the Jade programme, is now able to share with wider circle of peers as the programme has progressed and she feels less isolated from her peers.
Table 4.22: Response options chosen to the question *What are some of the things 'I have a right to be safe' could mean for you?* Response options were yes, don’t know and no. Significant differences indicated by *=p<0.05, #=p<0.01, ^=p<0.001. For age, culture and schools, comparisons have more than two options: <11=under 11, 11= 11 years old, >11 =over 11, A=Asian/African, M=Māori, P=Pacific Island, Pa=Pākehā NZ European. N=609, repeated measure. n=609

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Condition/group</th>
<th>% correct (“yes”) answers</th>
<th>% correct (“no”) answers</th>
<th>Average % appropriate responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>it’s not OK to bully or threaten others</td>
<td>no-one should ever make me feel scared</td>
<td>people should look after me when I am scared</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-test</td>
<td>61.2%</td>
<td>63.0%</td>
<td>56.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-test</td>
<td>61.0%</td>
<td>64.9%</td>
<td>54.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girls</td>
<td>62.7%</td>
<td>65.3%</td>
<td>57.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boys</td>
<td>59.6%</td>
<td>62.7%</td>
<td>52.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;11 years</td>
<td>56.3%</td>
<td>58.8%</td>
<td>64.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 years</td>
<td>59.6%</td>
<td>61.8%</td>
<td>51.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;11 years</td>
<td>66.6%</td>
<td>70.4%</td>
<td>56.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian/African</td>
<td>73.6%</td>
<td>69.4%</td>
<td>51.8%*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Māori</td>
<td>53.5%</td>
<td>61.0%</td>
<td>55.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific</td>
<td>60.6%</td>
<td>64.4%</td>
<td>49.3%*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pākehā NZ European</td>
<td>58.7%</td>
<td>62.4%</td>
<td>64.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INT1</td>
<td>63.7%</td>
<td>64.7%FPA</td>
<td>54.3%FP2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INT2</td>
<td>64.3%</td>
<td>71.6%#FPA</td>
<td>51.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FP1</td>
<td>67.6%</td>
<td>67.2%#FPA</td>
<td>58.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTG</td>
<td>69.0%#AREA,FP2</td>
<td>75.3%^FPA</td>
<td>46.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AREA</td>
<td>46.2%*INTG</td>
<td>59.0%</td>
<td>61.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FPA</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>21.4%INTG,#INT2,*INT1,FP1,INT3</td>
<td>57.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INT3</td>
<td>64.1%</td>
<td>61.5%#FP2</td>
<td>50.0%#INT1,INT2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FP2</td>
<td>51.4%*INTG</td>
<td>57.7%</td>
<td>68.5%INT3,#INT1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
for two options and in the bottom two for two others. Six of the seven children are Pākehā. These are children who 100% would talk to someone they trusted if they were scared and 100% would not pick a fight (see table 4.16) and yet on only 3/14 pre- and post-test opportunities did they agree that no-one should ever make me feel scared, and there were only 4/14 “no” responses to each of the three questions that had “no” as the correct answer. The paradox here is that these very safe children from a warm, cooperative teaching environment where the children have a lot of freedom and autonomy, don’t have a strong sense of their right to be safe, possibly because they are safe. INT2 children, from a boisterous and predominantly Pacific Island school, and INTG children (also with a strong Pacific Island cohort) are more keenly aware of the importance of this right. This also raises the possibility that an increasing sense of safety could, over time, reduce the need to claim the right to be safe.

In these five sections on trust and safety, the evidence that the JSU programme is having impact is that after doing the programme children are more likely to know the phone numbers of the people they can trust, more likely to use cell phones to play computer games when they’re feeling down or scared, and more likely to name a Relative’s home as a safe place. Against this, after doing JSU children are less likely to say kind things to themselves when they’re feeling down or scared and to name Home as a safe place. However, because naming Relatives is important to the cultures that have made the greater shift in wellbeing, and because of the shift from Home to Relatives that we see from younger to older children, higher nomination of Relatives could be seen as children gaining confidence and moving out into the world, with the differences in pre- and post-test seen as an expression of growing security.

The data on finding safety in other buildings and quiet and/or distant places also shows how challenging it is to come up with a simple formula of successful change. With AREA, the overriding impression from their naming other buildings and quiet and/or distant places (supported by the lowest score for Home) is one of insecurity, whereas INT3’s naming of other buildings and quiet and/or distant places feels more like a confident exploration of their community.

The questions asking for written responses, or questions about beliefs rather than about behaviours, show the strongest gender and cultural differences and suggest that different groups will require different approaches to resolve their safety concerns. For example, different emphases may need to be given in the programme to alleviate the Pākehā desire to be the best at everything, or to increase the Pacific Island sense of having the right to be looked after when I am scared and the Māori feeling that It’s not OK to bully or threaten others. Gender differences are common in these sections. Boys need help to be more prosocial, increasing their connections with friends and relatives, whereas girls need help to reduce their perfectionist urges.

4.5.3 Using the skills learned in the programme.

The evaluation had three tasks that were designed to explore how the skills of the programme were being used in post-test at the end of the programme and then in the follow-up survey 5-6 months later.

a) Since doing the Jade Speaks Up programme how often have you used any of these actions?

This next set of questions asked children to look at how their behaviours might have changed after the JSU programme had been completed. These are questions only used in the post-test, so we do not have anything to directly compare the answers with. However, some of the behaviours looked for, like Made a safety plan and remembered the messages, and Told someone about your feelings using “I feel”, are specific to the teaching in the programme, and as such set a benchmark for assessing how other behaviours, with multiple potential sources, might have been inspired or consolidated by the programme. Looking at table 4.23, we can see that these two specific behaviours are being used by about 40% of the
children some or a lot of the time. All the other actions are used more often, suggesting that the learnings of the programme have taken a substantial hold with a majority of the children, with around two thirds of children supporting and being supported by well-chosen friends. If we add in the children who say they do these actions a little, the percent engaged ranges from 64% to 82%.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Condition/group</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Made good choices about who your friends are</th>
<th>Supported a friend who has a problem</th>
<th>Asked for help from a friend</th>
<th>Kept calm in a time when you could have been angry</th>
<th>Keep yourself safe in a frightening situation</th>
<th>Talked with a friend about your worries</th>
<th>Told someone about your feelings using &quot;I feel&quot;</th>
<th>Made a safety plan and remembered the messages</th>
<th>Average score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>804</td>
<td>2.81</td>
<td>2.77</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td>2.49</td>
<td>2.42</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>2.03</td>
<td>2.03</td>
<td>1.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% “some” + % “a lot”</td>
<td>804</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>girls</strong></td>
<td>402</td>
<td>2.93*</td>
<td>2.97</td>
<td>2.71</td>
<td>2.54</td>
<td>2.47</td>
<td>2.30^</td>
<td>2.19#</td>
<td>2.14#</td>
<td>1.99^</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>boys</strong></td>
<td>402</td>
<td>2.69*</td>
<td>2.57</td>
<td>2.55</td>
<td>2.44</td>
<td>2.38</td>
<td>2.03^</td>
<td>1.87#</td>
<td>1.91#</td>
<td>1.81^</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;11</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td>2.73</td>
<td>2.59</td>
<td>2.48</td>
<td>1.97</td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td>1.95</td>
<td>1.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;11</td>
<td>282</td>
<td>2.89</td>
<td>2.87</td>
<td>2.76</td>
<td>2.51</td>
<td>2.49</td>
<td>2.32</td>
<td>2.12</td>
<td>2.10</td>
<td>2.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Asian/African</strong></td>
<td>172</td>
<td>2.82</td>
<td>2.80#Pa</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>2.39</td>
<td>2.45</td>
<td>2.26*Pa</td>
<td>2.16</td>
<td>2.16</td>
<td>2.03*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Māori</strong></td>
<td>164</td>
<td>2.87</td>
<td>2.91^Pa</td>
<td>2.58</td>
<td>2.55</td>
<td>2.45</td>
<td>2.18*Pa</td>
<td>2.21</td>
<td>2.01</td>
<td>1.94*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pacific</strong></td>
<td>255</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>2.94^Pa</td>
<td>2.76</td>
<td>2.64</td>
<td>2.48</td>
<td>2.51*Pa,^Pa,^A,M</td>
<td>2.05</td>
<td>2.08</td>
<td>2.08*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pākehā</strong></td>
<td>208</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>2.42^M,P,#A</td>
<td>2.47</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>2.30</td>
<td>1.82^P,A,M</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>1.86</td>
<td>1.52*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>INT1</strong></td>
<td>199</td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td>2.98*FP2</td>
<td>2.85</td>
<td>2.68</td>
<td>2.51</td>
<td>2.35</td>
<td>2.24</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>2.04*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>INT2</strong></td>
<td>118</td>
<td>3.15*FP1, INTG</td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>2.49</td>
<td>2.58</td>
<td>2.41</td>
<td>2.23</td>
<td>2.03</td>
<td>2.09*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FP1</strong></td>
<td>38</td>
<td>2.42*INT2</td>
<td>2.76</td>
<td>2.53</td>
<td>2.26</td>
<td>2.39</td>
<td>2.47</td>
<td>2.24</td>
<td>2.39</td>
<td>2.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>INTG</strong></td>
<td>96</td>
<td>2.55*INT2</td>
<td>2.66</td>
<td>2.46</td>
<td>2.26</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>1.97</td>
<td>1.91</td>
<td>1.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AREA</strong></td>
<td>48</td>
<td>2.79</td>
<td>2.76</td>
<td>2.42</td>
<td>2.52</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>1.96</td>
<td>1.85</td>
<td>1.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FPA</strong></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.29</td>
<td>2.43</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.43</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>1.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>INT3</strong></td>
<td>150</td>
<td>2.71</td>
<td>2.71</td>
<td>2.47</td>
<td>2.49</td>
<td>2.35</td>
<td>2.15</td>
<td>1.88</td>
<td>2.08</td>
<td>1.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FP2</strong></td>
<td>148</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>2.53*INT1</td>
<td>2.61</td>
<td>2.45</td>
<td>2.36</td>
<td>1.88</td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td>1.84</td>
<td>1.51*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Compared with boys, girls appear to have actioned significantly more of the programme overall, and on a majority of the tasks, with the actions around emotional control – managing fear, using “I feel” statements, *talking about your worries* – being less used by boys. There are no age differences, but there some clear cultural differences. Pākehā are overall significantly less enthusiastic than the other cultural groups, with only 25% making a safety plan – at the other end of the continuum, this compares with 45% for Pacific Island children. Pākehā have the lowest scores for all the tasks with Pacific Island highest for all but three tasks. There is one action (*kept yourself safe in a frightening situation*) where Pacific Island children are significantly more committed than Asian/African children or Māori.

There is a significant overall average difference between schools (1-way ANOVA, p=0.037), but no significance differences between individual schools (Tukey’s sub-test), and few significant results for the individual tasks. Excluding FPA, FP2 has the lowest overall score and in a pattern similar to Pākehā, only 25% have made a safety plan and they struggle with *supporting a friend who has a problem*.

A child at one of our smaller schools had her parents involved in a very hostile and rather public divorce, and she now spends time in two households. Her behaviour noticeably changed. Prior to this happening she had been more joyful, communicative and trusting. During the divorce, she became very watchful, quiet and distant to the other children and adults. Her teacher invited the girl to take on observing Jade in the exercise unpacking the feelings and actions of the family in the DVD. Her observations were that Jade feels things but doesn’t know how to say them, and that she didn’t know how to balance out what her cares and concern for her parents were compared with the ways that they appear in public. After she had received reassurance that this was an OK, ‘normal’ way of coping, the girl significantly lightened up. Her friendships with the other children improved, she was more caring and much happier, noted by other teachers in the school.

Similarly for boys, the tasks around emotional control are more challenging than for girls, although not significantly so.

**b) If you were scared of someone what would you do?**

This question was asked in the post-test and follow-up questionnaires. The options were part of the JSU training. Figure 4.3 shows that there was no fall off in the number of options chosen in follow-up, and two avoidant responses (*got to a safe place* and *walk away when the person was there*) were significantly higher, but two engagement responses (*just breathe and keep calm* and *talk to the person you are scared of*) were significantly lower. This last option is the least popular, at half the level or less of the other options, suggesting that it is harder to put into practice and that children are not confident about talking their way out of a scary situation. Table 4.24 shows that girls are significantly more likely than boys across
the range to choose these responses, with the exception of *walk away when that person was there* and *talk to the person you are scared of*. The biggest difference of 12.7% is for *just breathe and keep calm* which moves into the area of emotional monitoring that boys are less comfortable with.

Table 4.24: Response options chosen in *JSU, CAU to JSU* and follow-up (FU) tests to the question *If you were scared of someone what would you do?* Response options were 0=no, not sure, don't know, 1=yes. Significant differences indicated by *p<0.05, #p<0.01, ^p<0.001. For age, culture and schools, comparisons have more than two options: <11=under 11, 11= 11 years old, >11 =over 11, A=Asian/African, M=Māori, P=Pacific Island, Pa= Pākehā NZ European. FU Follow-up

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Condition/group</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>go to a safe place</th>
<th>talk to an adult</th>
<th>about what happened when you could</th>
<th>just breathe and keep calm</th>
<th>walk away when that person was there</th>
<th>ask a friend to help sort things out</th>
<th>call for help</th>
<th>talk to the person you are scared of</th>
<th>Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>JSU &amp; CAU to JSU post &amp; FU</td>
<td>1,285</td>
<td>72.0%</td>
<td>61.5%</td>
<td>61.0%</td>
<td>59.4%</td>
<td>53.5%</td>
<td>51.6%</td>
<td>26.7%</td>
<td>55.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>girls</td>
<td>662</td>
<td>77.3%#</td>
<td>66.9%^</td>
<td>67.2%^</td>
<td>61.0%</td>
<td>57.3%^</td>
<td>56.0%#</td>
<td>28.0%</td>
<td>59.1%^</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>boys</td>
<td>622</td>
<td>66.5%#</td>
<td>55.8%^</td>
<td>54.5%^</td>
<td>57.6%</td>
<td>49.5%^</td>
<td>47.1%#</td>
<td>25.3%</td>
<td>50.9%^</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;11</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>74.0%</td>
<td>62.3%</td>
<td>59.2%</td>
<td>55.2%</td>
<td>46.2%</td>
<td>52.5%</td>
<td>26.6%</td>
<td>53.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>615</td>
<td>71.6%</td>
<td>62.9%</td>
<td>61.8%</td>
<td>60.9%</td>
<td>55.7%</td>
<td>52.0%</td>
<td>25.3%</td>
<td>55.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;11</td>
<td>447</td>
<td>71.6%</td>
<td>59.1%</td>
<td>60.9%</td>
<td>59.3%</td>
<td>54.1%</td>
<td>50.8%</td>
<td>29.1%</td>
<td>55.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian/African</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>72.7%</td>
<td>57.9%</td>
<td>65.8%</td>
<td>62.9%</td>
<td>54.3%</td>
<td>49.6%</td>
<td>27.7%^Pa</td>
<td>55.9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Māori</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>67.7%</td>
<td>56.8%</td>
<td>58.6%</td>
<td>55.3%</td>
<td>50.8%</td>
<td>49.6%</td>
<td>30.1%#Pa</td>
<td>52.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific</td>
<td>417</td>
<td>73.6%</td>
<td>65.2%</td>
<td>60.9%</td>
<td>58.5%</td>
<td>57.8%</td>
<td>57.3%</td>
<td>31.2%^Pa</td>
<td>57.8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pākehā</td>
<td>315</td>
<td>72.7%</td>
<td>63.8%</td>
<td>59.0%</td>
<td>60.6%</td>
<td>49.8%</td>
<td>47.6%</td>
<td>17.5%^P, #M,*A</td>
<td>53.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INT1</td>
<td>348</td>
<td>73.7%</td>
<td>61.6%</td>
<td>65.9%</td>
<td>62.4%</td>
<td>54.6%</td>
<td>55.8%</td>
<td>31.5%#FP2</td>
<td>57.9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INT2</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>78.8%*FP1</td>
<td>64.7%</td>
<td>65.3%</td>
<td>61.8%</td>
<td>65.3%#FP2, *FP1</td>
<td>61.8%</td>
<td>32.4%</td>
<td>61.4%#FP1, AREA,FP2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FP1</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>59.1%*INT2</td>
<td>53.0%</td>
<td>57.6%</td>
<td>60.6%</td>
<td>42.4%#INT2</td>
<td>42.4%</td>
<td>18.2%</td>
<td>47.6%*INT2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTG</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>68.6%</td>
<td>55.4%</td>
<td>61.2%</td>
<td>50.4%</td>
<td>53.7%</td>
<td>44.6%</td>
<td>27.3%</td>
<td>51.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AREA</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>63.0%</td>
<td>47.0%</td>
<td>57.0%</td>
<td>58.0%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>44.0%</td>
<td>24.0%</td>
<td>49%*INT2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FPA</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>57.1%</td>
<td>57.1%</td>
<td>57.1%</td>
<td>42.9%</td>
<td>42.9%</td>
<td>42.9%</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>44.9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INT3</td>
<td>268</td>
<td>72.7%</td>
<td>67.0%</td>
<td>59.2%</td>
<td>62.9%</td>
<td>56.2%</td>
<td>50.9%</td>
<td>25.8%</td>
<td>56.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FP2</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>73.7%</td>
<td>64.9%</td>
<td>54.6%</td>
<td>53.7%</td>
<td>43.9%^INT2</td>
<td>48.3%</td>
<td>19.0%*INT1</td>
<td>51.1%^INT2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There were no significant age differences, and cultural differences were centred on the reluctance of Pākehā to *talk to the person you are scared of* when compared with the other three groups. This finding flows into FP2 with its high Pākehā cohort and low score for this action. FP2, along with AREA and FP1, was the least likely overall to use the response options for this question and, with FP1, the least likely to. This shows the pattern of vulnerability we have seen for FP1, AREA and FP2 throughout the analysis compared with INT1, INT2, INTG and INT3.
c) What do you think would happen next if you did these things?
The final question in this section on the use of skills learnt in the JSU programme pushes children to think a little more about their responses to being scared by asking for comments around what would happen if they did carry out these actions. Figure 4.4 shows that, at follow-up, children anticipate fewer bad outcomes, have more positive outcomes, feel safer and are more prepared to get help than they were at the post-test.

In analysing the comments made to the *what would happen next* question, data used is from the 805 children who did the post-test and the 480 who did the follow-up. Table 4.25 shows the analysis of these comments in relation to the demographic features of the participants. With the *don't know, not sure, no response* category 36% of the boys were in this category, compared to 21% of the girls. The Asian/African group is clearly more engaged than the Māori and Pākehā groups, and the three intermediate schools (INT1-3) more than the AREA school, where 44% did not make a meaningful response. Overall 2% of children felt that *nothing much would happen*, but there were no significant differences between groups for this response.

At one of our intermediate schools, the teachers relayed an incident when a particularly disturbed student ‘lost it’ during combined PE, and took up a baseball bat, threatening other children. The teachers were impressed with how calm the children remained, and a group of older boys created a protective circle around the more vulnerable students. When they were debriefing the incident later, several of them from different classes reported using the ‘breathe/ think/ do’ mantra as a way of keeping themselves calm in a very unsettling situation.

---

**Figure 4.4: Comments made to the question on post-test and follow-up:**
What do you think would happen next if you did these things (the things referred to in Table 23) n=319 repeated measures.
Table 4.25: Children's comments organised into categories in JSU, CAU to JSU and follow-up tests to the question: What do you think would happen next if you did these things? (referring to the response options in Table 4.24). Significant differences indicated by *p<0.05, #p<0.01, ^=p<0.001. For age, culture and schools, comparisons have more than two options: <11=under 11, 11= 11 years old,>11 =over 11, A=Asian/African, M=Māori, P=Pacific Island, Pa= Pākehā NZ European.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Condition/Group</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Don't know, not sure, no response</th>
<th>Nothing much would happen</th>
<th>Bad outcomes</th>
<th>Good or Happy outcome</th>
<th>Feel safe</th>
<th>Getting help</th>
<th>Calm down</th>
<th>YOU Leave</th>
<th>THEY leave</th>
<th>Be friends</th>
<th>Positive outcomes total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>JSU &amp; CAU to JSU post &amp; FU</td>
<td>1,285</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girls</td>
<td>662</td>
<td>21%^</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>31%^</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>71%^</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boys</td>
<td>622</td>
<td>36%^</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>18%^</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>56%^</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;11</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>615</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;11</td>
<td>447</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian/African</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>21%*</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>72%*M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Māori</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>33%#A</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>56.6*A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific</td>
<td>416</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pākehā</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>32%*A</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INT1</td>
<td>348</td>
<td>24%^AREA</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>26%^INTG</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>68%^AREA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INT2</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>22%^AREA</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>29%^INTG</td>
<td>2%^INT3</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>67%^AREA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FP1</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTG</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>12%^INT1, INT2,INT3</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>9%#FP2, *INT1,INT3</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AREA</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>44%^INT1, INT3</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>43%^INT1, INT2,INT3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FPA</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INT3</td>
<td>268</td>
<td>22%^AREA, *FP2</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>27^INTG</td>
<td>10%^INT2</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>3%^INTG</td>
<td>71%^AREA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FP2</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>35%^INT3</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%^INTG</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

With bad outcomes there were no significant differences between the groups. There were a range of bad outcomes. Many children across cultures say "bad things will happen". It will be "bad day" or even a "bad life" (Māori boys) or as a Pākehā girl explains "I would be in a bad situation at the wrong place at the wrong time", or the response would just be "sad". Bad outcomes include that "you might get into trouble" (Asian/African boy), "be called a trouble maker" (Pacific Island boy) or get the person who is scaring you into trouble and "probably make it worse" (Māori girl). Other concerns were about being "hurt" (Asian/African girl), getting a "growling" (Māori boy), being threatened, bullied, followed or shamed -"my parents would be very upset and everyone would not like me" (Pacific Island girl).
The outcome for a quarter of this group could be "horrible" (Pacific Island girl), where a someone could "run at you" (Pacific Island boy), "a fight would start" (Pacific Island girl) and "you might be biffs with them" (Pacific Island girl), get "beaten" (Pacific Island boy) or "knocked out" (Māori girl), or, alternatively, "beat his ass: game over" (Asian/African boy). As this last response suggests, getting into fight is not necessarily negative from the child’s perspective as one Pacific Island boy explains how he would "just take my time and be calm, then bash them up", and as a Māori boy concludes: "If he or she throws a punch at me then it’s over for them". One of the worst outcomes is the child’s feeling that if trouble erupts they won’t be believed by teachers - "the teachers would not know what is going on with me" (Asian/African girl) or "he/she might of got angry and beat you up and then made up a story and probably said that you started it first" (Pacific Island girl). Consequently, even though the bad outcomes are small at 8% in the post-test, it is great to see them drop to 2% in the follow-up.

The good outcomes category covers the non-specific positive comments, which are 20% of the of the total. There are no significant differences within the groups. Nearly a quarter of the good outcomes are where the children say that they "feel better" (Pākehā girl), "have a better mindset" (Māori girl), have "a better time in school" (Pacific Island boy) or that "everything would be better than ever" (Asian/African girl). Some children refer to becoming "a better person", "be better at self-control" (Pākehā girls) or being "better about myself...[having] exercised and developed my mental skills" (Māori boy). For others "everything will be fixed, and my life will get better" (Pacific Island girl) and you will have "a better life" (Pākehā boy).

Many comments just say "good". "Good" comes up in 20% of the comments in this category - "good things", "all good", "a good outcome", "good stuff", and "good things will happen". Some Asian/African girl comments are very positive "I WILL FEEL GOOD" (girl) or that they will "be a good person who needs to stay calm" (girl), whereas one of the Pacific Island girl’s comments reflect the challenge of some of the actions she might take: "good but at the same time cringe " – having to engage positively with an adversary. "Fine" and “great” are other descriptors used by all cultures for 6% of the responses in the good outcome category - "everything will be just fine", “you’ll have a great life” say another two very positive Asian/African girls, and a third reports that “I’ll be happy and smiling all the time". Being happy turns up in 15% of the good outcome category – mostly as “I’ll be happy” – with the following longer responses: "I would be happy and not afraid any more" (Pākehā boy); “[I will] be happy for myself and be proud” (Pacific Island boy), and “there would be a happy ending” (Māori boy). More than that “your life will change", a Māori girl believes, to “a different future” adds a Māori boy. And a Pākehā girl says she’d be “way happier !!!!!!!”

Others are less positive but still affirming, with some children from all cultures saying that “I’ll be OK”, “everything with be alright”, or that “hopefully everything will be all right” (Pākehā girls) – 9% of the category. One Pākehā boy brings an element of retribution to his comment “ever thing will go right for me, not for them” in contrast to the Māori girl who writes “that everything would be ok and no one would get hurt”. Another 23% of responses in this category state, in one form or another, that “the problem will be solved” or “everything will get sorted” (boys and girls from all cultures); “it would ease off” (Pākehā boy) and “everything will be normal again” (Pākehā boy). At the minimum for a good outcome a Pacific Island boy and girl insist that “nothing bad will happen”, you might even be able to have “a fun time” (Pacific Island boy) or “a nice rest" (Pākehā boy). Some Asian/African boys and girls signal a degree of uncertainty by predicating their statements with “hopefully".

A quarter of the children responded that their safety would improve, with girls much more likely to feel their safety would improve than boys, with the three intermediate schools (INT1-3) showing as
significantly better than the INTG. Children reported that they "would be safe", "not be afraid", "I won't be scared"; that they could be "brave"," proud", "confident", and that they "won't get hurt". Many responses were more expansive – e.g. noting that success and happiness are important outcomes of safety. "I might be more safe and successful" says a Māori boy, and a Māori girl agrees that she might "achieve more things". A Pākehā girl thinks she "would be more brave"; a Pacific Island girl would "feel safe and happy", and an Asian/African girl states that she would have “a more happy life as a kid my age and to feel I am good enough in situations like getting bullied for my looks”.

Being staunch is part of being safe: “I’m not scared of anything” says a Māori boy; “stand up to them unless they are a creepy stranger and not someone from your school” advises a Māori girl, and she is supported by a Pacific Island girl who warns “that someone will either become friends or ... regret it.... just as long as you can stand up to the person you’re scared of then things can be running smoothly”. The same Asian/African girl as in the paragraph above asserts her resilience (“i wouldn't care what they say, because it’s coming out from their mouth, not mine”) as do Pacific Island boys by dint of their enthusiasm – “I think something really great will happen. i would be really safe not talking or making any eye contact to the person” and "I will be more courageous than ever".

There are some detailed and analytical responses. A Māori girl writes:

“If I ask a friend I’ll be able so [ ]rt things out without violence. if I go to a safe place I’ll be safe, if I call for help i’ll have someone that'll help me, if I talk to an adult i’ll be able to have support on the situation.”

and an Asian/African girl writes:

“Since I would have told an adult i would have pretty much been out of the danger and would have felt much calm. Now that I would have been at a safe place I would most probably not have been in the danger zone anymore. Once I had walked away from them I wasn't near them anymore so it was quite unlikely for me to get hurt. Next time I would make sure that i always tell someone I can trust so I can be safe at all times.”

Pākehā responses, where they are expansive, reflect a desire for a happy life free from bullying and harm. A boy states "I would be safer than normal" a girl will be able to “live a safe and happy life” and another girl feels that the “bully would care about her life instead of focusing on me getting hurt and upset”. This need to be protected comes out most negatively in two different schools: from a Pākehā boy – “ill be safe and the person will probably go to jail and no-one will bail him out”, and a Pākehā girl – “the police will find him and they will lock him up >:D” (and he’ll be unhappy). The Māori and Pacific Island girls who “will tell the cops” don’t add the systemic retributive consequence. Instead, says the Pacific Island girl, “I will never talk to that person any more”.

For getting help (6% of responses) INT3 does better than the other schools. Help can be from an adult, a parent, a teacher, a friend or someone you trust. Some are just “call[ing] for help” (Pacific Island girl) or “run[ning] and find[ing] help” (Asian/African boy). Help comes from “the people you trust” who would “maybe talk to the person [you are scared of]” (Asian/African girl). “Tell a teacher or the principal” (Pacific Island boy) is another option, although this has some caveats. A Pākehā boy would “tell the teacher and walk away” and a Māori girl satirises the JSU process, saying “If they don’t stop, tell a teacher then give them the survey: Are u gud bro!?”.

Pacific Island children dominate when it comes to getting help from parents – “call mum and dad” (girl), “I will tell my parents” (boy) and a frightened 10-year-old would “wait until my mom or family member
comes and gets me”. An Asian/African boy will “go to a parent and discuss what happened”, as would a Pākehā girl, while another Pākehā girl “would be happy at home with my mum dad and brother”. A Māori boy’s response (“in the deans office - teachers talking to you - phone to parents”) has the implication of a distressing event, hopefully with a good outcome, that has previously occurred.

With friends, a Māori boy would “ask a friend [and] I’ll be able sort things out without violence” and an Asian/African boy would “go to my friends because I can trust them”, a Pacific Island girl would ask a friend “to give me advice” and a Pākehā girl’s “friend that I told will support me”. Finally, for getting help, there is “someone” who can help – “someone ... i can tell ... everything that happened and I’ll ask for advice” (Asian/African girl), or someone who will “try their best to sort or help things out” (Pacific Island girl). The uncertainty suggested by “someone” is strengthened by the addition of ‘hopefully’ as in “hopefully someone will help me” (a Māori and a Pākehā boy.)

The programme encouraged children to get into a calm state when they were worried about bad things happening and 5% of the responses are in this category; 1.4% of responses across the cultural groups were about being “calm” recognising that if they were “able to calm down ... [they could] figure out a solution” (Pākehā girl). Sometimes it is the protagonist who becomes calm, “maybe they will calm down?” (Asian/African girl), or the whole situation, “the bullying or fighting would calm down and stop” (Māori girl) and not just the respondent. Some children refer to “breathe, think and do” (Pākehā girl), others say they “won’t get angry” (Asian/African boy), or they will be “self-controlled” (Pacific Island boy), or do things that make you feel “comfortable” (Pacific Island girl), like “play on the ps4” (Pacific Island boy), “take a nap” or “sleep on it” (Pākehā girls).

Leaving the scary scene or avoiding the scary person as a response (2.6% of the total) is more typical of Asian/African children. They would “get away from the scary person”, (a girl), or “avoid the person I am afraid of and maybe he would be able to forget everything” (a boy), or “avoid a fight” (a boy), but all groups have a response in this category. A Pākehā boy and a Pacific Island boy would “hide somewhere” or “go to my next door”, while a Māori girl would “get da fucc otta theerre”. To “run away” is an option chosen by all groups and genders. While this option is seen as positive in that no one is hurt, a more positive response is from the slightly higher number of children (3.3%) who feel that the situation would be defused and it would be the scary person who would leave the scene – again across all groups, “the person will go away”, “stay away” or “leave you alone”. More dramatically there is an Asian/African group of mainly boys who write that they “won’t get bullied”, “there wouldn’t be a fight”, and from a boy who had chosen all the options for If you were scared of someone in table 4.24 “that person will never bully me again”. Similar comments come from Māori, Pacific Island and Pākehā boys, while the girls are focussed on “hopefully” stopping the bullying (Pākehā), and being “safe from the predator” (Asian/African). There is also a group of comments from Pākehā, Pacific island and Māori children (mainly boys) that state that “that person won't bother me again”, “they will stop annoying you”, “they won’t be mean” and they will “act nice to me”.

Looking at be friends, and extending the theme of “niceness”, 3.5% of the children, particularly Pacific Island and Asian/African, suggested friendship - “Well I think I could make new friends” (Pacific Island girl) and “we would be good friends”. A Māori boy goes further “Maybe they could understand my feelings, and possibly help clear them up, by for an example, hanging out with me or re-assuring that I should not be scared of him/her”. Saying “sorry” is part of Pacific Island boys’ and girls’ approach to friendship which recognises that they might have some responsibility for the scary situation, as does the response of the Māori boy thinking that “the person will forgive me”. Talking to the scary person helps. “You talk to them, and they talk to you, and you then realise that there is nothing to be afraid of, they're only human”
(Pākehā girl) and Asian/African and Māori agree. Pacific Island boys thoughtfully add that “that you and the person your scared of can sort things out and stop whatever has gone wrong” and that this “will change the way I act and the reaction to others in what I do”.

Finally, in the overall picture, 64% of the comments on the outcomes of taking some form of preventative action to the presence of a scary person are positive, more so for girls as opposed to boys, for Asian/African as opposed to Māori students, and for the intermediate schools (INT1-3) as opposed to the AREA school. These differences are the standout differences between groups that have been present across many sections of the analysis. However, also present in parts b) and c) of this section is the strength of the Pacific Island students and the vulnerability of the Pākehā students and the two full primaries, excluding the alternative school.

4.6 Comparison and summary for section 4.5.3
4.6.1 Comparison of responses of children completing the Jade Speaks Up programme with responses of CAU children at CAU post-test
All the questions in this section, 4.5.3, were new questions looking at the skills developed by children completing the JSU programme. These questions were also answered by children doing the Class as Usual (CAU) post-test. As we have explained above, many of the CAU group had already begun the JSU programme when their post-test was done but would be unlikely to have completed the programme before the post-test. Figure 4.5 compares the responses of the JSU and CAU-JSU post-tests to the questions in sub-sections 4.5.3 a-c above, with the response of the CAU group. For every measure except for the be friends with them, YOU Leave, walk away, avoid contact and getting help - parents, teachers, friends, police outcome comment responses, the JSU and CAU-JSU groups do better than the CAU group, and for 17 of the 29 comparisons the difference is significant at p<0.05 (1-way ANOVA, with age, gender and culture as covariates).

The biggest relative difference between the CAU post-test and the other two groups is the number of Bad outcomes made – nearly double the percent (13.4% vs 7.1%) for JSU and CAU-JSU post-tests. More than half of the bad outcomes for the CAU children are serious and are more than 3 times more frequent (7.1% vs 2.1% of the respective totals) than the serious or “horrible” outcomes described for the JSU and CAU-JSU post-tests. For the CAU group the seriously bad outcomes include, at the mild end, the quietly tragic “been in a situation that no one can help you with” and the frustrated

to me i think i should just avoid my friends cause they always punch me and say negative things about me and stuff like that they are not good friends to be with. i wish i was with my primary school friends, my friends now are disrespectful towards other and they try to influence me to do bad things and say bad stuff about others. there names are ..[xxx] and ...[yyy]”

The children’s comments move to the general descriptions of “big trouble”, “Shite”, “I’d get bullied”, and “got into a fight” or a “mean rumble”, to the more specific comments stating that they would get “hurt”, “beaten”, “bashed down”, “punched in the face” or that they “will be a dead pep” or “die”. Some of the comments suggest that the children are happy to fight – “IM NO A WUSS BRO”, “you would get them back”, “fight and sort it” and “B-mod to the Bully”. B-mod refers to body modification and is picked up by two other children for whom violence, detention and expulsion seem current

A year 7 female student went to the neighbours and phoned the police during a domestic violence incident. The student had recently shifted to the town and did not have a strong support network. She also self-referred to the school counsellor after the incident and talked the counsellor through the steps she had taken in implementing her JSU safety plan to keep herself and others safe.
Figure 4.5: Comparison of responses of children completing the JSU programme with responses of CAU children at CAU post-test to questions on the use of JSU strategies, how to manage a scary person and their perceived outcomes from using the strategies chosen from the scary person question. *=p<0.05, #=p<0.01, ^=p<0.001
4.6.2 Summary of outcomes for section 4.5.3

Figure 4.6 looks at the connection between the number of options chosen for a scary situation and the perceived outcome. It shows that children who choose few options (and have high don’t knows) find it difficult to imagine a positive outcome from their options, thus have a low percentage of positive outcomes. Up to five options, the more options chosen the better the outcome. This suggests that focussing on a small set of options tailored to the attributes of individual children might help. For example, for the children who wanted to say “sorry”, talking to the other child is clearly a good option, even though it is the least chosen, whereas a vulnerable child might need to focus on options around safe places and the support of friends and adults. The other obvious implication from figure 4.6 is that being taught some options on how to deal with “scary” people gives children confidence in their ability to deal with such situations in the future. The CAU post-test children had not had the JSU training needed to develop their positive options and thus were more likely to create negative outcome scenarios.

The narratives in the comment data and the quantitative analysis tell us something of the approach of different groups to using the skills taught in the JSU programme. It is clear that girls are engaging more and expecting better outcomes, and nowhere is this more noticeable than with Pākehā boys who have 22% fewer comment responses than Pākehā girls for positive outcomes (52% vs 74%). And it is part of Pākehā children’s vulnerability that shows up in less willingness to talk to the person you are scared of, support a friend who has a problem, make a safety plan or use a be friends strategy. A few Pākehā comments have a retributive feel (throw them in jail, get them into trouble) not present elsewhere, and which, when coupled with the stronger Pākehā support for perspectives that people should look after me when I am scared, all kids to be safe all the time and never do anything risky and the need to be the best at everything, implies a protective, individualistic and slightly anti-social stance around safety and the response to bullying and other acts of violence. This emergent pattern is present in FP2, the one school in our project with a clear Pākehā majority.

Māori children also present as vulnerable, and many of them come from two schools (AREA and FP1) which are in low decile areas with a major gang presence. In these environments children can struggle to find trusted adults to support them. One of the consequences is that children have to toughen up and
watch out for “creepy” people and people outside their territory. Some Māori have to be prepared to “fight”. Another feature, however, of the Māori children’s response is the attempt of some children to engage at a more activist level with the project. For example, the girl whose solution to the scary person was to “tell a teacher then give them the survey: Are u gud bro!” could be seen as gently mocking the evaluation process. A more in-depth example of this questioning is from a Māori boy who wrote:

“how do we know that you people from the ministry of education (behind close doors) - you guys are just "Researching for personal info"... look i know that we have been told to have nothing to worry about and ... you guys can be trusted but i am mean you can’t judge a person for being curious i mean you can never be to sure. BTW I would be a totally different person id be more humble. Id go on with life making the right decisions.”

Although Māori have often been the most vulnerable group, in this section when it comes to response options to a scary situation, they were just as likely to choose positive safety actions as were the Asian/African and Pacific Island children, and significantly more so than the Pākehā children.

The Pacific Island children bring an almost physical energy to the project. When it comes to friends, Pacific Island children are those who will ask a friend for help, support friends and try to befriend a person who is a bit scary. Along with Māori, they have the strongest connections to relatives and they like others to enjoy their jokes because laughter is a big part of Pacific Island culture. The parent role is highlighted by Pacific Island children and embarrassing their parents or being shamed are key considerations. In some circumstances you have to stand up for yourself and maybe fight, but Pacific Island children were the only ones seeing that saying sorry, acknowledging a responsibility in the conflict, was part of the solution.

Along with the Pacific Island children, Asian/African children name school as a safe place much more than Māori or Pākehā children. The focus that these children generally bring to their school work seems to have transferred itself to the JSU programme. On most measures these students do well, never poorly, and their comments are engaged, sometimes detailed and thoughtful, and sometimes very enthusiastic. The JSU programme can be a very important one for these children, at risk of teasing and bullying and needing to make friends outside of their often very small cultural cohorts.

Overall, this section speaks to a high level, enduring and complex engagement of children with the content of the JSU programme. When coupled with the gains we have seen in well-being, emotional literacy and the use of skills and resources, this suggests that solid progress has been made in violence prevention and relationship learning in a relatively short space of time.

4.6.3 Analysis of questions, what was "not so good" and what was "helpful, interesting or fun"

In the evaluations on the completion of the programme students were asked to evaluate what was not so good or what was helpful, interesting and fun about Jade Speaks Up (see table 4.27), and then comment on the reasons for their evaluations. Overall, the average ratings for the total group showed that: 78% found the JSU programme interesting and for 31% that was a lot; 75% found it fun (27% a lot); 81% found it useful (45% a lot), and 50% said yes they would recommend JSU, 11% said no, and 39% said maybe. They responded in three different ways (see table 4.26).

d) Neutral responses
Firstly, there were neutral responses from about a fifth of the students (not responding, "not sure", "don't know", "??" or a response that was difficult to attribute meaning to - e.g."rtyu"). Secondly, there were the responses which ran counter to the question. For example, for not so good, 42% were unable to
identify anything that was not so good and instead chose to make a positive statement about the programme. Thirty percent wrote that there was "nothing" that was not good. Another 9% wrote versions of the theme that it was "all good" saying that "it's really good to do", "all of it is helpful in more than one way so it's great", "it was all amazing!!" and it was "fun". Some of these comments went on to identify the impact of the programme around helping "kids speak for them self [and] have the courage to stand up to bullies and get on their feet" and "helpful for other children like me, who live in abusive/financially unstable lives". Others referred to what JSU teaches – "lessons about bullying and safe places to go when you are scared or in trouble"; "a lot of safety things"; "new things to help me find new [solutions] to problems"; and helping children "think about problems" by building "trust" and giving "people more options and personal views" and "it stops violence".

For the helpful, interesting, fun question, 6.2% of the students could not report anything helpful, interesting or fun, instead mostly reporting "nothing", but occasionally adding that the programme was "boring" with "too much question[s]" or that Breathe, Think. Do was "dreary". The comment from one student that "I'm not seeing any changes" suggests an interest in, and perhaps desire for, the changes that JSU promotes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment question: what was:</th>
<th>response type</th>
<th>negative</th>
<th>neutral -</th>
<th>positive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>not so good</td>
<td></td>
<td>37.1%</td>
<td>20.9%</td>
<td>42.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>helpful, interesting, fun</td>
<td></td>
<td>6.2%</td>
<td>17.7%</td>
<td>76.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

"boring" with "too much question[s]" or that Breathe, Think. Do was "dreary". The comment from one student that "I'm not seeing any changes" suggests an interest in, and perhaps desire for, the changes that JSU promotes.

b) Negative responses

There were clear negative and positive responses that aligned with the two questions in table 4.26. Thus 37% of the children identified a not so good feature of JSU, 5% less than those answering in the positive, counter to the question. It was "boring" or "repetitive", wrote 14% of the participants. For some the project wasn't "entertaining and fun", but was "a waste of time", and "pointless", taking up "learning time" that could be used for more important tasks. Others suggested that the "activities are not very interesting, because they are always about the same kind of problems", while others criticised the way in which the programme was delivered, such as having "to sit down for long periods of time" or "to watch the same video over and over again" "a million times" and one wanted to "shorten or completely remove the 'trying to remember stuff from last week' thing. Another 1.5% stated that everything was "not good".

Around 6% of the comments were about the evaluative questionnaires and quality of the resource materials. The evaluation process was criticised by 4% of the students as "tooooooooooo long" and "boring and a waste of time". "Doing a similar quiz again and again was...frustrating". As well there were students who "dont like taking tests". Critiquing the resource materials, two students claimed that in the Jade video "every person looked like a lollipop with legs, arms, hair and things like clothes and voices" and "their running was totally out of proportion and looked like they were playing hopscotch". In The "Breathe, Think, Do [poster, Jade] looks fake". One disliked " the song by that teacher" in the video, and one felt that "some people were very stupid in the road rage video".

This left 7% of the responses criticising the purpose of the programme, and 10% commenting on the impact of the programme. Just over 6% felt uncomfortable about the way the programme engaged with the "personal" and "private" in "the way it wants to know way too much about our family situations" as
"people may not want to talk about some private things", and they felt that they "do not need it". A small sign of discomfort with the personal was that about 1% of the students doing the post evaluation were concerned that they had been asked in the survey, amongst other questions on how friends/trusted people are chosen, to what degree "attractiveness" was a factor. One boy's response was "im not gay or girl!!!!!". In the bigger picture, many felt "It's hard"..."listening to a lot of the problems in other people's lives because they were quite sad and emotional".

The JSU animation is "uncomfortable" for some children as "some of it related quite close to things that were already happening at home". The impacts can be graphic – "the sound of Jades mum being hit was really horrible", and long lasting – "the videos gave me bad memories". One child supposed that "if they had to 'go to personal' then it was alright", but others thought "it was a bit babyish", after all "not all people have problems". Why, one asked, should I "have to talk out loud" and another opined, "we worked in groups too much".

In the last piece in this section on not so good aspects of the programme, 11% of students reported on upsetting features in the videos (mainly the JSU video). Thirty-nine students (4.8%) of mainly Māori and Pacific Island cultures were upset about the Dad's swearing and/or the poking of a finger in a rude gesture. "That is not a good example!!!", exclaimed one student. Picking up on the theme of delving into the personal and emotional sphere, over 6% of children (49) felt in some way scared or depressed by the Jade video. "The dad was scary and very violent", "slamming doors and breaking plates", "hitting jades mum", the "crying" and "the fighting" generally was upsetting, particularly for girls and children in stressed environments such as the Area school and Full Primary 1. Some were worried that "Jade did not speak up before something bad happens" and that "Someone Might Get Hurt If It's Too Late To Tell Someone You Trust", while others noted that "Jade uses the breathe think and do method and calls her nana and pop to help". How can a "dad [be]so selfish and stupid to mum in front of kids?", one asks, while another replies "It made me feel a bit frightened knowing that some people do really nasty things". Despite, the possibility that students are being re-traumatised by the video, it is clear that this group also has a lot to say that is very positive and that their rating of the helpfulness of the programme at 3.35/4 (n=49) is much higher than those who don't identify that they are scared or depressed by the video (2.75/4; n=759).

Finally looking at positive responses in the comments on what was “not so good” and what was interesting, fun or helpful, 76.1% of responses were positive. Table 4.27 shows how the two open-ended questions on the value of programme align with responses to the four rating questions on the value of the programme that were also asked at the end of post-programme evaluations. Not surprisingly, those responding positively to the comment question have much higher value ratings than those responding neutrally or negatively.

Positive responses
The positive responses to the rating questions fell into five groups.
A. Everything: 10.3% said “everything was helpful, interesting and fun about Jade Speaks Up”, “the programme, the staff", “everything”. Students liked “the whole cause of it”, “it was cool work” and
some wanted “to work about it again – [do] the lessons”. One summed it up by writing, “I enjoyed everything”.

Table 4.27: Perceived value ratings associated with responses to the two comment questions on “what was” not so good” and “helpful, interesting or fun” about Jade Speaks Up. The value ratings for interest, fun and helpful are 0=not at all, 1=not sure, 2=a little bit, 3=some and 4=a lot. For recommended 0=no, 1=maybe and 2=yes. The wellbeing scores are the combined CES-DC and CORS, where 100 is total wellbeing (total n for completed wellbeing assessments at post-test = 714). The response categories are explained above.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment questions</th>
<th>Response type</th>
<th>Average Perceived Value ratings (%)</th>
<th>Wellbeing /100</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%n (=808)</td>
<td>interesting /4 fun /4 helpful /4 recommended /2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both All responses</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>2.56 2.40 2.79 1.39</td>
<td>78.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>not so good</td>
<td>negative</td>
<td>37.1% 2.30 2.11 2.63 1.26</td>
<td>77.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>neutral</td>
<td>20.9% 2.12 1.95 2.21 1.19</td>
<td>75.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>positive</td>
<td>42.0% 3.01 2.90 3.22 1.60</td>
<td>80.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>helpful, interesting, fun</td>
<td>negative</td>
<td>6.2% 0.96 1.00 1.36 0.74</td>
<td>74.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>neutral</td>
<td>17.7% 1.74 1.67 1.77 1.03</td>
<td>74.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>positive</td>
<td>76.1% 2.88 2.69 3.14 1.53</td>
<td>79.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>games</td>
<td>19.1% 2.90 2.81 3.18 1.55</td>
<td>81.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>learnings/actions</td>
<td>34.3% 3.05 2.69 3.34 1.60</td>
<td>78.79</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

b) The videos – 12.5% were positive about the videos, emphasising what they were learning from them.

i. The Jade video – 7.8% referred to the Jade video, and although some children found the video disturbing, others said “the fun part was watching the video”, which “at time was historical” “when he [the Dad] puts the finger up”. Others described the Jade video as “very helpful when they had sang a song to tell us what to do in a bad situation” or because “I can use it when I feel scared”. Students were encouraged by the way that Jade “did the right thing” “calling her grandparents for help when the dad was drunk”. The whole story was “helpful” because it” tells you a lot about the feelings that the characters had” and “what the “problem was and what she did [to solve it]”. For one student “the interesting part was [the surprise] when Jades dad swore at the drivers and how he messes up the dinner and food. I thought he would be happy with his family". Another student observed "it was interesting when her teacher asked if she was alright, not a lot of teachers do that”.

ii. The other videos: Nearly 5% commented on other videos, particularly, Would you slap her? which “shows... we should not put pressure on someone”, and the I Trust You video about the man who asked people for hugs” These videos “help us control ourselves better”, “educate us and make us more engaged”, “support people” and “made ... [us] think about life”. “The videos are cool”.

B. Games and activities – these are at the core of the programme. As we have seen with negative not so good responses, boredom can easily set in where the activities are not run well. Table 4.27 shows that the 19.1% of students who made a positive response around games and activities also had very positive responses around the helpfulness of the programme. Of these students, 96% found the programme helpful.
i. **Games overview**: 7.5% talked about games and activities generally. They said that “the activities were really fun”. They were “cool” and students liked “how some parts were made into games and activities”. They liked “the arty bits [making posters] and outdoor activities”. The emotion bus, charades and acting, the stone soup game and the balls game were all mentioned. It wasn’t just fun, “the tips they told us [as part of the activities] were very helpful” and “we gained more confidence doing the activities”. Some children liked doing “cool worksheets” which was a “really helpful thing about the programme”.

ii. **Breathe Think Do**: This is the most cited activity named by 9.2% of the students and is the key to staying “calm”. The mantra goes “BREATHE, THINK AND DO AND I HAVE THE RIGHT TO BE SAFE!” One student wrote “stay calm that when your dad or mum is abusing you. You should always feel like you have the right to be safe. Just breathe think and do.” Several found it “interesting and “helpful” to “learn the Breathe, Think, Do’ when you are in a scary situation” and some put it into practice “breathe, think, do when I got in situations I [where] couldn’t do anything”. One liked the card that “is there ... [to] always ... remind you to......Breathe, Think and DO!” Another found that “being calm” helped her “find out how people felt” and to see “new emotions that I haven’t heard in a long time.”

iii. **Songs and the hand**: Another 3.7% of the students liked the songs and the song to the hand game where you write “111 on your thumb”. Singing boosted the feeling of “having the right to be safe”. Students liked the “songs of safety”, the “helping hands”, “using our hands as a ‘people we trust’ thing” where “we got to draw a hand and write the peoples names”.

iv. **Storytelling**: The stories were what was “really interesting about Jade Speaks Up” for another 1.5% (12) of the children. They felt that “they were well written and helped me think about the issues in them”. “The messages from the talks and Malosi’s story” had particular impact. Students also liked “sharing each others storys”, the “stories of how other people handle it” (life challenges).

C. **Learnings and Actions** – The focus of the above sections has been more on the level of interest and fun the students got from the games and activities and videos, rather than the helpfulness of these resources in keeping children safe, although clearly this is a major theme of 1-3 above. This last section looks at how children are learning about keeping themselves safe, what they feel they have learned and whether that learning is put into practice. Over a third of the children (34.3%) who completed the post programme assessment made a comment that related to the theme of learnings and actions, and 94% rated the programme as helpful, with 59% as a lot helpful, the highest of any thematic group.

i. **Keeping yourself safe**. Not surprisingly this was the biggest section for learnings and action, with 11% of the students raising this issue. Some emphasised that they “have Learnt Lots Of
Important Facts How To Keep Yourself Safe” and “different ways we could be safe and how we could help others be safe”. The programme had “a really strong message about being safe and doing the right things”, including having “the right to be safe”. Many students referred to practical outcomes such as “deciding to learn all my friends phone numbers and my families just in case of an emergency”, doing a “safety plan … because … I’d be prepared and safe” or learning “the ‘I have the right to be safe’ sayings [which] helped me know what to do in tough situations”. Doing “the ‘111, write it on your thumb’…was very useful” because you know “there is someone out there to talk too”.

There were also references to the “dangerous situations” in which this learning has to be applied, such as “how to deal with family violence”, “how to be safe in bad (“scary”, “unsafe”) situations” and how to keep “kids … safe … from bullying”. One student reported “it was helpful for me because I learnt what I need to do when there is violence in my area”. As another student said “I know now that the world isn’t always safe”, telling us of the risks of learning unpleasant truths, but where the teachers “were so kind” this learning could be “really fun” so that even though they were using “real life situations”, “it makes me feel better” because “it is okay to be safe and ask for help”.

ii. Trust and expressing feelings, honesty and truth. Trust is the centre around which everything in JSU revolves and 8.5% of the students directly referred to trust and the need for classroom environments in which people can be truthful. Many of the responses referred to the activities and resources that engendered trust. One said, “it was fun when we played that game in the chapel and we had to trust one another and work as a team”, others liked the “google slides for trust, who to trust and more” or the game where “the man was blind folded … [and had to be] trusting people”. The “strategy” behind “google slides for trust” was “a lot of fun”. “Speaking to an imaginary person… was fun and we learnt more confidence”. Just “talking to us about trust was also helpful”.

More often students wrote about the outcomes of being in a trusted world. Students can start “BEING HONEST”. “Its really helpful … because you let those things off your chest”, “because you can know how i can feel”, “because i can tell you how my family is going and school and who i trust”. Also “it makes you tell the truth” and “telling the truth [is]… getting to show how i feel in the inside”. There is more to being truthful than just letting off steam. “Being open about feelings and interacting with others” means that when “we are in a tuff situation we can talk to somebody we trust” or “call a family member”. We move from “expressing my feelings to finding solutions”, we arrive at what one student described as the “very good and interesting question” that comes up when you “get to work with other people” and this makes you “think about life”.

One of our observation students at an intermediate school noted in the lesson on safety planning the phone number for CYFS. On his own initiative, he later called the 0508 number and told them that things were not OK at home. CYFS took prompt action and have placed him in a safe home with extended family and he is now in a different school and community.

Teachers at one of the full primary schools reported that there were initial concerns from students that talking of home situations would, as one teacher said, ‘contaminate’ their safe/happy place within the school environment. Once the talking had happened and appropriate support given, children settled down with new understanding and appreciation of what happens when a child talks with a trusted adult (teacher, SWiS, counsellor).
Trust was also recognised by “how [well] we all got to express our feeling in class”. In one class
the students “all had the courage to stand up and not be afraid of anything and have the courage
to speak in front of the class.” In other classes students were “able to say things you might not
want to say to a friend or adult”. They got “to find out new things and ... to discover how well
you know your emotions.” They “got to speak to people ...[they] don’t normally speak to”. Most
schools had a class where everyone “in the class were able to share what was on their mind” and
where “everyone spoke up and got along with each other”.

iii. Problem-solving with families and frightening situations. This theme, identified by 8.7% of the
students, is similar to the keeping safe theme in a) above, but here the focus is on addressing
current situations of need and problem-solving around them, and includes how to get help and
knowing what to do when feeling scared. So, students report “I Learnt How To Get Out Of A
Family Problem”, that they know “what you should do when a family fight happens”, that “it
helps kids learn what to do when they’re getting abused/bullied at home”, or simply that they
“know where to go for help”.

The problem-solving approach helps students to “think about the problem better”. It gives
“people who have family problems a chance to talk about it”, “to speak up” and learn the tips
about how to solve a problem”, “like tell a teacher when you are getting bullied”. The problem-
solving approach could be “very fun, getting all the ideas ... about what could help me - made me
[want] to learn!” It sensitised students by giving “an insight to how kids with abusive parents or
people feel or may deal with a situation” and gave some the capacity to make very difficult future
decisions – “if my parents are fighting, call someone to stop them. even if i love them i still have
to do the right thing” As one student concluded “it was like a plan for life so we know what to do
in the future”.

iv. Having been helped. Some 36 children, 4.5% of the sample, suggested that they had been helped
by the programme but weren’t very specific about the context. A number just reported that the
programme was “very helpful” or that it “helped me” or that “it applies a lot in my life”. Some
referred to being able to “control my emotions”, and “to find my confidence”, to being “more
happy”, less “uncomfortable”, “more positive”, “a better person” or to “not to getting angry fast”
and “to walk away from bad situations”. Some felt they had more skills – “I learnt how to handle
certain situations”, to “express my feelings”, “to solve some things”, to “stand up to what i was
scared [of]”, to do “a safety plan”. The social context of help was also mentioned (“It helped me
through my social life”) – “we could have a laugh ... and it helped out a lot”. Two students
suggested that significant changes had occurred (“it helped me very much and changed things”
and “it was helpful for my friend who may or may not have PTSD”). Finally, one student found it
“very helpful and fun” being asked “about how i was doing”. Another agreed saying “i love being
asked questions” and “helped when im in the wrong space”.

v. Good information. In this theme, 2.1% of the children refer generally to information that has
been presented and learning that has occurred. Students felt that there was “a lot of important
info” in the programme and that “they were taught to do the right thing”. They appreciated that
the programme uses “good real life situations” showing “what happens daily in nz” and that
“people out there still care about child abuse” and “that violence is not OK”.

D. Doing the Survey – Above we have seen the children who disliked doing the survey mainly because it
was boring. In this section there are almost as many children who liked answering the questions and
were some of the very strongest promotors of the programme (68% yes. 32% maybe). As one promoter said “I enjoyed every bit of the survey and I think that it is the best course that I've ever done”. Another said “I like doing surveys”, but wondered if there might be “some weird reason” for this. For some students “the thing that was fun was matching up the faces with the emotions”, while others referred to the consolidation of learning that occurred. “The fun part was watching the video and the helpful part was when we got like surveys and got asked questions and we all said the right thing to do.” Students appreciated that the surveys were about getting “to know student[s] - how they feel”. The survey can be a stimulus to learning as one student noted “some questions ... made me realize I should do more stuff.”

What can be concluded from the narrative analysis of the student responses to the programme evaluation questions, is that there has been a hugely rich, complex and very positive engagement of students with the content and processes of JSU. The diversity of responses hints at very different deliveries of the programme across schools, some more successful than others, depending not only on the teachers and the school environments, but also on the gender, age and culture of the students. The fact that 76.1% of the 808 students who did the post-programme evaluations were positive about the programme, that 42% could not find anything to criticise about the programme, and that only 6.2% had nothing positive to say about the programme, is proof of a very high degree of success in the delivery of the programme and its ability to reach deep into the hearts and minds of this very diverse group.

4.7 The relationship of the negative, neutral and positive categories to other assessment data

a) Overview

The success of one group raises questions about the nature of the two groups (negative and neutral responders) who did not agree, in the comment questions, that the programme was interesting, fun or helpful. Table 4.28 is a summary of the features of the negative and neutral groups in relation to the positive responders. We have excluded students who made incomplete responses to the two wellbeing assessments (the CES-DC was at the beginning of the questionnaire and the CORS was at the end) in order to eliminate students who were not sufficiently engaged in answering the questions. What becomes clear from Table 4.28 is that the negative and neutral groups have a number of features which suggest they are more at risk than the children who are positive, with the negative group generally, but not always, being more vulnerable than the neutral group. Almost all of the comparisons show a significant difference at p<0.05 or less.

Firstly, the positive group has a higher CES-DC/CORS wellbeing score than the two other groups. The CORS scores for SCHOOL are the lowest of all the four CORS subscales, with the biggest difference between the groups being in the SCHOOL scale. In the area of trusted supports, the positive group has more than the neutral group, but this is the only area where the negative group is not the most vulnerable. Thus the negative group is the least likely to know safety phone numbers, and is the least likely to get help from friends or trusted others. The people they trust listen to them and care for them less than those in the neutral group, who in turn, are less supported than the positive group.

The negative and the neutral groups are less likely to pick up on ways that you can help yourself feel OK, when you’re feeling down or scared than the positive group. Thus, they are less likely to stop and breathe slowly or to say kind things to yourself, and they are more likely to pick a fight or start an argument with someone. Similarly, with understanding what does ‘I have a right to be safe’ mean – the negative and
Table 4.28: Demonstration of the vulnerability of students making negative and neutral comments to the question on whether the JSU programme was interesting, fun or helpful. All factors show a significant difference of $p<0.05$ or less except for those with an *.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response sub-category to the question – what was interesting, fun or helpful about Jade Speaks Up?</th>
<th>negative</th>
<th>neutral</th>
<th>positive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>n (%of total group)</td>
<td>41 (6%)</td>
<td>117 (16%)</td>
<td>563 (78%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Wellbeing assessment

| CORS school score out of 10* | 7.49 | 7.86 | 8.15 |
| CES-DC/CORS combined score out of 100. 77=at-risk cut off | 74.6 | 76.2 | 79.4 |

### Trusted supports

| number of trusted friends named up to a maximum of 4 | 3.76 | 3.4 | 3.79 |
| % mother named as a trusted family member | 90% | 80% | 91% |
| % father named as trusted family member | 78% | 72% | 82% |
| % teacher named as trusted adult | 73% | 62% | 77% |
| % four friends, mum, dad and teacher | 83% | 73% | 85% |

### Safety processes

| % having safety phone numbers | 68% | 72% | 83% |
| % are good listeners | 59% | 68% | 78% |
| % care how you feel | 68% | 75% | 80% |
| % get help for you if you are scared | 54% | 68% | 72% |

### Doing things that could make you feel OK

| stop and breathe slowly | 49% | 84% | 89% |
| not pick a fight or start an argument with someone | 76% | 85% | 94% |
| say kind things to yourself | 34% | 73% | 78% |

### What does ‘I have a right to be safe’ mean?

| it’s not OK to bully or threaten others | 49% | 56% | 69% |
| no-one should ever make me feel scared | 56% | 58% | 70% |
| all kids should be safe all the time and never do anything risky | 59% | 48% | 43% |

### Things that upset you

| being punched, hit or pushed | 2 | 2.6 | 3.1 |
| having mean lies told about you | 1.9 | 2.5 | 2.9 |
| average rating over 11 upsetting issues | 1.5 | 2 | 2.3 |

### If you were scared of someone what would you do?

| % talk to an adult about what happened when you could | 30% | 51% | 67% |
| % just breathe and keep calm | 32% | 47% | 72% |
| average % over 7 actions | 32% | 44% | 61% |

### What do you think will happen next if you did these (above) things?

| don't know, not sure | 54% | 55% | 23% |
| feel safe | 12% | 10% | 26% |
| all positive outcomes | 30% | 40% | 67% |

### Since doing the Jade Speaks Up programme how often have you used any of these actions?

| made good choices about who your friends are | 2.5 | 2.7 | 2.9 |
| asked for help from a friend | 1.8 | 2.5 | 2.8 |
| asked for help from an adult you trust | 1.8 | 2.2 | 2.6 |
| told someone about your feelings using "I feel" | 1.1 | 1.9 | 2.1 |
| talked with a friend about your worries | 1.1 | 2 | 2.1 |
| supported a friend who has a problem | 2.2 | 2.5 | 2.9 |
| kept calm in a time when you could have been angry | 1.8 | 2.1 | 2.6 |
| made a safety plan and remembered the messages | 1.1 | 1.8 | 2 |
| kept yourself safe in a frightening situation | 1.4 | 1.9 | 2.4 |
| average of ratings over 9 actions | 1.6 | 2.2 | 2.5 |

### Rating of the programme

| average rating for interesting | 0.90 | 1.91 | 2.88 |
| average rating for fun | 0.78 | 1.78 | 2.69 |
| average rating for helpful | 1.24 | 1.92 | 3.14 |

### Rating for recommending this course to a friend

| 2=yes. 1=maybe, 0=no | 0.63 | 1.14 | 1.52 |
neutral groups are more likely to think it’s OK to bully or threaten others, to make people feel scared, and that all should be safe all the time and never do anything risky.

Negative and neutral groups get less upset when unpleasant things happen. If punched, hit or pushed or when mean lies are told about them the negative group gets upset whereas the positive group gets very upset and the neutral group is somewhere in between. Compared with the positive responses to these questions, the negative and neutral responses suggest a lack of empathy which is significant overall (p<0.00) for the 11 questions in this section for the negative group (see section 4.5.1d).

The negative and neutral groups are less likely to have used any of the individual keeping ourselves safe actions from the JSU programme and are less likely to use JSU strategies if they were scared of someone in the future, with the largest differences being about going to a safe place, talking to an adult about what happened and just breathing and keeping calm. When asked about the likely outcome of these actions, the negative and neutral groups were more than twice as likely to be not sure and half as likely to feel safe or believe that there would be a positive outcome. This disconnection with the programme carries through for negative and neutral groups into the final ratings given at post-test.

In figure 4.4 we have shown that the children at follow-up use more JSU actions that they do at post-test, and figure 4.7 shows this is truer for the negative/neutral children than it is for the positive children. For five of the seven actions, plus the average, that children could take where there is a scary person situation, the negative/neutral group’s identification of actions they would use increases to the point where there is no longer a significant difference between the negative/neutral group and the positive
group. For two more actions, there is no significant difference at post-test or follow-up between the two groups, but for one action, *call for help*, the difference between the two groups becomes significant in favour of the positive group at follow-up.

Summarising the comments on the consequences of the actions taken (see figure 4.4 and table 4.28), the percent of *don’t know/not sure* comments drop by 17% to 43% (vs a 1% drop for the positive group) and the percent of *positive outcomes total* improves 18% to 53% (vs an 7% improvement for the positive group). In both cases, because of the small negative/neutral sample size, the difference between negative/neutral and positive is still significant at follow-up, but, with an increase in *feeling safe* from 8% to 22% in the negative/neutral group (vs a 4% gain in the positive group), there is no longer a significant difference between the two groups at follow-up. These improvements suggest that *JSU* has produced an enduring culture change which strengthens over time, drawing in the most vulnerable children.

b) **Demographic factors that are related to student’s perceptions of the level of help delivered by JSU**

Given the large differences between the negative/neutral groups and the positive group for the final rating questions it is important to ask how these ratings change as a function of the key demographic variables of age, gender, culture and school. In the following analysis, age has been excluded because the mean age for the negative, neutral and positive groups is almost identical at 11.4, 11.3 and 11.4 years respectively. Table 4.29 shows that girls find the programme more helpful than boys, the full primaries find it less helpful than other schools, and that Pākehā NZ Europeans find it less helpful than the other cultures. The significant interaction effects can be seen, for example, in Pākehā girls being the most positive group in INT3 and INTG, and Pacific Island boys being the least positive in FP2. The most negative and neutral students appear to be Pākehā boys in full primaries, with Pākehā girls and Māori girls in full primaries close behind.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>INT1</th>
<th>INT2</th>
<th>FP1</th>
<th>INTG</th>
<th>AREA</th>
<th>FPA</th>
<th>INT3</th>
<th>FP2</th>
<th>Total schools/cultures</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asian/African</td>
<td>2.71</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>2.46</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Māori</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>2.85</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.71</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.81</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pākehā NZ European</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>2.26</td>
<td>2.97</td>
<td>2.27</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>2.36</td>
<td>2.10</td>
<td>2.24</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total boys</td>
<td>2.98</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>3.73</td>
<td>3.39</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>2.49</td>
<td>2.69</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>347</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian/African</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Māori</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>2.69</td>
<td>2.38</td>
<td>2.74</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3.73</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>3.26</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pākehā NZ European</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td>2.41</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total girls</td>
<td>3.03</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>2.41</td>
<td>2.99</td>
<td>359</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total boys and girls</td>
<td>3.01</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>2.88</td>
<td>2.43</td>
<td>2.88</td>
<td>2.27</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>706</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A 3-way ANOVA showed significant differences (p=0.000) within gender, school and culture and for all the interactions between these factors. N=706
Table 4.30 explores reasons (through some of the significant differences) as to why some boys, Pākehā and Māori, and certain schools, might be less positive about the value of JSU. It shows for example, that boys compared to girls were less likely to use “I feel” statements, to talk to the person they were scared of, or to feel upset when unpleasant things were done to them. They were more likely to think bullying/threatening was OK and more willing to pick a fight or start an argument. They appear to have a lower level of trusted support people and less belief that a trusted person would get help for them when they were scared. In many respects their beliefs run counter to JSU teachings, so it is not surprising that 38% of them (compared with 21% of girls) were unsure about what would happen next if they used JSU strategies to keep themselves safe. Despite these issues, boys’ wellbeing scores on the CES-DC/CORS were higher than girls.

Table 4.30: Post-test scores for selected variables for the demographic variables of gender, school and culture. Scores in italics (not greyed) show that there are significant differences within each group at p=0.00.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>% Not sure about what would happen next if JSU strategies were used</th>
<th>Mean rating for Told someone about your feelings using “I feel”</th>
<th>Mean rating for Talk to the person you’re scared of</th>
<th>Mean rating for Using JSU actions to stay safe</th>
<th>% Not OK to bully or threaten</th>
<th>% Willingness to avoid a fight/argument</th>
<th>% belief a Trusted person will get help when you are scared</th>
<th>Mean level of Trusted support/4</th>
<th>Mean Upset rating/4</th>
<th>Mean CES-DC/CORS/100</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>boys</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>1.90</td>
<td>1.54</td>
<td>2.29</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>2.07</td>
<td>80.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>girls</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>1.51</td>
<td>2.51</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>2.39</td>
<td>77.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INT1</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>3.41</td>
<td>2.10</td>
<td>81.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INT2</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>1.94</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>2.52</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>3.48</td>
<td>2.26</td>
<td>80.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FP1</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>2.37</td>
<td>1.53</td>
<td>2.44</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>1.88</td>
<td>69.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTG</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>1.90</td>
<td>1.65</td>
<td>2.28</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>2.29</td>
<td>79.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AREA</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>1.93</td>
<td>1.64</td>
<td>2.41</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>2.23</td>
<td>78.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FPA</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>1.90</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>1.81</td>
<td>79.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INT3</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>2.04</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>2.30</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>77.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FP2</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>1.88</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>2.26</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>3.26</td>
<td>2.30</td>
<td>78.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>culture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian/African</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>2.12</td>
<td>1.62</td>
<td>2.47</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>2.27</td>
<td>79.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Māori</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>2.03</td>
<td>1.63</td>
<td>2.42</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>77.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>2.05</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>2.18</td>
<td>80.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pākehā NZ European</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>1.91</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>2.21</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>3.26</td>
<td>2.29</td>
<td>77.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Two factors stand out for FP1 children. Firstly, their wellbeing average score is around 10 points lower than the average for other schools and their mean level of trusted support people is 16% lower. The compound score does not tell the full picture. FP1 has a much lower level of trusted mothers and fathers than other schools and less than half the students name their dad as a trusted family member. This, perhaps, explains why these at-risk children (along with AREA), in a poorly resourced interpersonal and economic environment, give the weakest support of any school for the belief a Trusted person will get help when you are scared and willingness to avoid an argument or fight. The use of JSU strategies (50% are unsure what would happen if they did) might seem to be a forlorn hope to some of these children.
FPA and FP2 also have lower levels of trusted support people, though this time they are well supported by both parents, but often don’t name teachers as trusted non-family members. However, they have a high confidence that trusted people will get help for them (100% for FPA). FPA is a small intimate self-governing school whose pupils do not have to worry about making “I feel” statements or talking to people they are scared of, because they are already in a high trust environment where their views are sought and respected. We can argue that in fact they do not need the JSU programme, but while one boy felt the programme was not at all helpful, he still recommended it, and FPA students generally found the programme interesting and fun (mean of 3.0) as well as helpful (2.83). We might say the same for FP2, that they also do not need the JSU programme - however two thirds say it is useful and 23% say a lot useful. FP2 students also are more likely than students from almost all other schools to get upset when unpleasant things happen, and in this respect, may be more vulnerable than other schools’ students.

A pattern similar to FPA and FP2 (schools with a high percentage of Pākehā enrolments) exists for Pākehā students over all. They have higher expectations of support from trusted people, which may be a reason for lower use of JSU strategies generally, and, being able to talk to a person they were scared of or use “I feel” statements. Similarly, the Māori students’ responses, particularly around a lower level of concern about bullying and threatening behaviours, look like FP1 and Area schools, which have a high percentage of Māori enrolments. Again, even though there are challenges in addressing Pākehā and Māori student needs around trust and right relating, 79% of Māori children say they are helped, and 41% are helped a lot. For Pākehā the figures are 74% and 26% respectively. On the other side of the picture are the Asian/African and Pacific Island girls, where 92% are helped and 62% helped a lot by the programme.
5. Teacher surveys and feedback from training, supervision and debriefing sessions

5.1. Introduction
In chapter 2 the methods of data collection from the teachers and other members of the schools are described. Essentially these are online pre-, post- and follow-up tests, plus an analysis of notes from information gained in supervision sessions, post-test and post-programme debriefings. In the pre- and post-tests, we asked the teachers to describe special characteristics of their classrooms or schools, as well as their exposure to other programmes with content that focused on building student confidence around keeping safe. Table 4.1 gives something of the flavour of the eight schools in the JSU programme. All the low decile schools emphasise their multi-cultural nature, and most identify Māori practices and values that underpin their teaching, the positive qualities of their students, and a focus on relationship and learning challenges.

The programmes referred to are:
- MATES (Great Potential) – Youth academic mentoring programme,
- DARE (Drug Abuse Resistance Education) – NZ Police,
- Life Education (food and nutrition, human biology, relationships & communities, identity & resilience and substances) – Life Education Trust,
- STAR (Secondary Tertiary Alignment Resource) – funding for education directed at Vocational Pathways,
- PB4L (Positive Behaviours for Learning) – School-Wide – Ministry of Education,
- Keeping Ourselves Safe (learning and applying a range of safety skills children can use when interacting with others) – NZ Police,
- Cool Schools Peer Mediation Programme – Peace Foundation,
- Positive Puberty Plus – Nest Consulting.

5.2 Teacher and child individual CORS, safety and progress data
In the pre- and post-test questionnaires, teachers were asked to do a CORS assessment on two students in their class, one high scoring and one low scoring, in the children’s pre-test. Table 5.2 shows that the teacher and child scores on the CORS are moderately correlated and the means are almost identical. However, the range of scores used by teachers is more restricted than the children’s – with teachers’ scores being significantly higher than children’s for the low group, and significantly lower for the high group. Where there is a four-point difference between the low group and the high group for teachers, there is 15.4-point difference for children. Half of the teachers at pre-test have a difference of five or less in their pre-test CORS score for their high and low child, which suggests that they may not know their children all that well, an issue we shall further explore shortly.

Table 5.2 also shows that the low scoring children make a significant 7.3 gain in their self-testing pre- and post-scores, but that the high scoring children make a significant 4.2 loss. Teachers also report a gain and a loss, but this is small and not significant. Overall there are small but not significant gains from 29.2 (for both teachers and children) to 29.4 (teachers) and 30.5 (children) from pre- to post-test.

In table 5.3 we explore other questions that teachers were asked about the two children they were given to evaluate. These questions explored how much the teachers knew about their children. For example, 56% of teachers were able to answer the question did the student know somewhere they can go that is
Table 5.1: Teacher information about the eight schools in the *Jade Speaks Up* project.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School type</th>
<th>Teacher description of special characteristics</th>
<th>Related programmes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>INT1: An Intermediate school year 7 and 8. Decile 2</td>
<td>A warm, supportive, caring, fun and very kind culture where students are engaged, honest, hardworking and trustworthy. The school student body is diverse, multicultural, family oriented, supporting the practices of awhi (cherishing others) and manākitanga (hospitality). The students are of average ability and are making good academic progress</td>
<td>MATES, DARE, Life Education, Internal Hauora (health) Programmes, STAR, PB4L - School-wide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INT2: An Intermediate school. Years 7 and 8. Decile 2</td>
<td>In this multicultural school with awesome kids and Māori and Samoan bilingual units, students are open to discuss feelings, are allowed to make mistakes and are challenged. The foundations are aroha (care and compassion), manākitanga (hospitality), whakawhanaungatanga (relating well to others), tikanga Māori (Māori practice), a great team work and nga hau e whā - knowledge and culture is shared and brought in by the four winds. There are many students with learning needs. Interactive digital pedagogy is used.</td>
<td>Keeping Ourselves Safe, DARE, Life Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FP1: A full primary Years 1-8. Decile 2</td>
<td>In this school there is a focus on cultural practice performing arts. Students in the class are aware of the different levels of learning and help the low ability students - they have empathy for one another and are protective of each other when students from other classes target members of the class.</td>
<td>DARE, Cool Schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTG: a private integrated school Years 1-15. Decile 2</td>
<td>Very boisterous, loyal but quite self-conscious students in a multi-cultural/multi-national school with more boys than girls. Low socio-economic status, mixed abilities. Their learning has been disrupted over the past 12 months with changes in staffing,</td>
<td>DARE, Life Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AREA: a rural school Years 1-15. Decile 1</td>
<td>Following the principles of kotahitanga (working together, collaborative), whānaungatanga (building relationships and whānau connections), awhi (cherishing others), ako (learning), tuakana-teina (older students supporting younger students). Sporty.</td>
<td>PB4L - School-Wide, peer support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FPA: an alternative school Years 1-8. Decile 6</td>
<td>A small school in a semi-rural, highly social, inclusive learning environment where decisions are made democratically. Whanau involvement in the class, strong home -school connections</td>
<td>No other programmes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INT3: an Intermediate school Years 7 and 8. Decile 5</td>
<td>They are a lovely group of students, kind-hearted and generous, great behaviour and attitudes towards each other, collegial supportive environment, very open-minded and communicative, my favourite class. One autistic child, one with violence issues, three with dyslexia, one also has dysgraphia and dyscalculia, two ESOL, two whangai. Diverse range of cultures, levels, home lives.</td>
<td>DARE, Life Education, Keeping Ourselves Safe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FP2: A full primary Years 1-8. Decile 9</td>
<td>Humour, teamwork, positivity - a very kind and caring group and a very supportive environment. Strong learners and a focus on enjoying learning, high literacy level (some find it difficult keeping attention for long periods of time) high level of interest in competitive sport. They are special and unique students from cross-over backgrounds. Mainly well-off families, but many with semi-absent Dads (due to the type of work they do).</td>
<td>Keeping Ourselves Safe, PB4L - School-Wide, Positive Puberty and Positive Puberty plus</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

safe? Where is this? at pre-test, and those that did focussed most on school (classroom, office, teacher), an environment that teachers are familiar with. In the post-test the proportion of responses demonstrating ignorance halved, from 44% to 21%, and those showing some knowledge about the context of home and relatives nearly doubled, from 24% to 45%. On the positive side the percent of children relying on a social worker, counsellor or the church for a safe place fell significantly from 9% to 2%.
Table 5.2: Comparison of teacher vs child CORS data. n=145 completed assessments from pre- (92) and post-tests (53) and matched samples for high and low scoring children on the children’s pre-test. *p<0.05. #p<0.01, ^=p<0.001

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>pre/post</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>ME: Individual personal well-being</th>
<th>HOME: Interpersonal - family, close relationships</th>
<th>SCHOOL: Social - school, friendships</th>
<th>EVERYTHING: general sense of well-being</th>
<th>CORS total average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>pre/post</td>
<td>all</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>7.05</td>
<td>6.82</td>
<td>7.14</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child</td>
<td>pre/post</td>
<td>all</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>7.09</td>
<td>7.52</td>
<td>7.24</td>
<td>7.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Correlations</td>
<td>pre/post</td>
<td>all</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>0.40^</td>
<td>0.42^</td>
<td>0.34^</td>
<td>0.39^</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All completed assessments that could be matched for pre- and post-test. Cprl=child pre-test low, cpol=child post-test low, cprh=child pre-test high, cpoh=child post-test high, tprl=teacher pre-test low, tprh=teacher pre-test high

Teachers were also asked to separately estimate the number of trusted friends, family members and other non-family adults that their two students could get help from. Again, more than a third of teachers struggled to identify a single trusted family member at pre-test, although this improved significantly at post-test.

Table 5.3: Teachers’ perceptions of the safety environment and the progress made by the two children they assessed with CORS. + = 1=no, 2=not sure, 3=one person, 4=two people, 5=more than two people. *p<0.05. #p<0.01, ^=p<0.001

| Group | pre/post | n | Does the student have people who they can ask for help? % using options 3-5 above | Does the student know somewhere they can go that is safe? Where is this? | What is your impression of the change (if any) in the student’s ability to keep themselves safe? |
|-------|----------|---|---------------------------------|-----------------|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|------------------|
| All teachers | pre | 86 | 86% | 65%^ | 70% | 44%^ | 31% | 15% | 14% | 9% | 9%* | no comment |
| All teachers | post | 86 | 91% | 88%^ | 81% | 21%^ | 33% | 23% | 15% | 22% | 2%* | 9% | 8% | 20% | 62% |

All completed assessments that could be matched for pre- and post-test

low child | pre | 43 | 79% | 56%# | 67% | 53%* | 2% | 30% | 7% | 9% | 5% | 5% | 9% | 7% | 26% | 58% |
| low child | post | 43 | 91% | 84%# | 77% | 23%* | 7% | 28% | 23% | 16% | 16% | 2% | 9% | 7% | 26% | 58% |
| high child | pre | 43 | 93% | 74% | 72% | 35% | 2% | 33% | 23% | 19% | 14% | 14% | 9% | 9% | 14% | 67% |
| high child | post | 43 | 91% | 93% | 86% | 19% | 5% | 40% | 23% | 14% | 28% | 2% | 9% | 9% | 14% | 67% |
What is also reasonably clear is that the teachers know less about the low CORS group than they do about the high CORS group. More than half the assessments of the low CORS group had a nil return for the question on whether the student knew somewhere they can go that is safe, compared with just over a third for the high CORS group. However, by the post-test, there was a significant 40% fall in the percent of nil responses to the somewhere safe question for the low CORS group and, with the space being filled by homes, family and relatives, a significant (23%) increase in the teachers’ knowledge of trusted family members. Low CORS children, as shown by the CORS data in table 5.2, make greater progress than high CORS children, but much of table 5.3 is also positive for the high CORS group, with strong (not significant) percent gains around trusted family, trusted other adults, and safe relatives. In fact, when we look at the quality of outcomes seen by the teachers in their impression of the change, only 8% of the children are recorded as making no change, with 62% recording a marked change and both low and high CORS groups doing equally well.

Teachers comments for the question on the change (if any) in the student’s ability to keep themselves safe fell into four categories:

• no comment recorded;
• no change – includes reasons why (“he has always been happy” and he “has always been able to keep himself safe physically”);
• small/possible change – comments here include “not sure”, “not much” and comments saying that the student didn’t need to change (“this was something she was already aware of”, “he was very capable of keeping himself safe”), some of which added a hint of progress (“slightly more willing to engage others”, “seems a bit happier”, “a closer connection with school and home”). There were also one or two comments referring to the struggles of children “through a tough time” where they might be “a bit neglected by family. Low resilience, so any improvements seem to be short-lived”. Finally, there are comments about positive change that has little to do with JSU – “he changed a lot due to them going overseas for a wedding”.
• noticeable improvement – ranged from small but encouraging changes to the potentially transformational. Teachers wrote that students were “slightly more confident”, “more ready to talk”, “building confidence to kōrero”, “being more vocal about her thoughts and opinions” and, more specifically about safety, “were more wary [in discerning where] they can be safe”, “knew safe places to go”, that “a teacher is a safe person to talk to” and an awareness of the “trustworthiness of people they can call on for help to keep them safe”. Children are more “aware”, “sensitive”, “assertive” and “forthcoming with their problems”. Their “social skills have improved”, “work ethics have improved”, children are “showing more resilience and organisation”, are “more social, and a lot happier”. Students recognise “emotions” and can “read the body language of people” and understand how they “impact others”. Teachers report for anxious students, through “being more aware of their own hardship”, that their “problem isn’t as serious as ...[they] first thought”, and they use new skills, for example, to plan for a worrying high school transition or to defuse incidents that have troubled them in the past. “JSU has only strengthened his self-belief” says one teacher, while another comments that her student “is showing/developing some leadership skills and qualities”. A third teacher is grateful because “I wouldn’t have known there was any issue at all with this student if it wasn’t for JSU, [he] keeps these issues well hidden”. The issue for one child was “feeling suicidal and having self-harming attempts”, demonstrating the gravity of what can be addressed through the JSU programme.

Table 5.4 links, through correlation, the teacher CORS data in table 5.2 and the teacher ratings of the degree of trusted people in student lives in table 5.3. All correlations are significant and moderate to strong, notably between SCHOOL and trusted friends, and HOME and trusted family members, showing just how
important knowledge of the child’s social context is in the teacher’s perception of child wellbeing. This section reinforces many of the themes that have been important elsewhere, such as the importance of establishing trusted adult relationships, and making a special effort to listen to individual children, particularly those who are vulnerable. It shows that the JSU approach with the most vulnerable children is effective, particularly where attention is paid to the support systems that these children need.

5.3 Perceptions of child vulnerability in the classroom

The CES-DC/CORS measure is one effective way to assess child vulnerability. Another set of measures was used to identify teachers’ perceptions of the vulnerability of children in their classrooms. In the pre-test, we asked teachers to rate the vulnerability of their pre-programme children on a number of different factors shown in figure 5.1 below. Teachers rated each factor against a set of criteria which paid more attention to the extremes than the middle ground. For each factor, teachers were asked to assess its frequency within their classroom in five steps—0-5%, 5-25%, 25-75%, 75-95% and 95-100%. This data was then aggregated using the middle value within each group—2.5%, 20%, 50%, 80% and 97.5%. An overall vulnerability measure was computed as an average of all the factors. These show (figure 5.1) a very high degree of

![Figure 5.1: Teachers assessment of student vulnerability factors. Data from 8 schools and 46 classrooms](image)

3 There were 50 classrooms in the study. Three of the CAU classrooms did not progress to JSU due to school issues that were unrelated to the JSU project. In one school, two teachers covered four classrooms over two different semesters across the Christmas break, and one other teacher did not provide post-test data. The data provided here is from 44 teachers over 46 classrooms.
vulnerability in areas in which JSU is highly relevant – *not being able to talk about feelings, not knowing how to stay safe, not being supportive of other children and not being able to ask for help* – all of which were happening for between a third and half of the children on average.

Teachers wrote about student vulnerability in the feedback on the training day. They were aware of what their students were dealing with in their lives and how both the children and the system can conspire to hide the violence that occurs. We need to “bring to light that violence really affects our tamariki”, because “violence can be subtle”. Some teachers realised that they “didn’t know as much about my student’s home life as I should”, and that they needed a “full break down of how to help students who come from violent homes but are too scared to talk!” Teachers recognised that there are “cultural perspectives around violence” that they need to understand along with the level of “violence...[in] NZ culture?”. These comments confirmed that children in the participating schools had violence in their daily lives that the teachers were aware of but were largely untrained to address.

Training was not the only limitation. School culture could be negative and school procedures for responding to sensitive disclosures absent or unclear. Attitudes towards the management of disclosures were that “it’s not your job” or “pass them on like a hot potato”. Prior to JSU, teachers would get messages like, “you are a teacher not a social worker” from colleagues or school management. On top of this, teachers also acknowledged that sometimes there wasn’t enough time for dealing with student issues from home as “everyone in their school was just too busy”.

During the first supervision sessions teachers commented on the difficulty that students have in expressing their emotions (talking about their feelings) and their “limited emotional vocabulary”. One teacher said that the students often knew what emotions felt like in their body but didn’t know the name or the meaning of the name. Teachers appreciated that the first module of JSU was on emotional literacy. The first module also addressed another key vulnerability issue perceived by teachers – needing to trust another person enough to be able to ask for help.

The transitory nature of life in some children’s neighbourhoods meant that they didn’t necessarily know or trust their neighbours because both the neighbours and children are frequent movers. Schools had discovered many students do not even know their home addresses due to constant shifting. As well, home life could be unstable. In one class, 72% of the students were in rental accommodation, including living in garages. Of the rest in family-owned homes, most were living in homes owned by grandparents. Several children didn’t feel well supported by their parents, particularly where both parents were working and there were no other adults (like grandparents) to support them. As school holidays came closer, teachers reported that several of the at-risk kids were acting out and anxious about being away from the structure and safety of their school, their peers and their teachers.

The children were “brutally honest” about life at home in their comments made within the setting of the programme. One boy said, “Mum gave me a hiding last night because I put the tea towel in the wrong place”. Another commented that his ‘butt’ was sore because Dad had “kicked it yesterday”. Some teachers were uncertain whether the students were in a slight competition to ‘top’ one another’s stories or not, but a lot was coming out. Most of these stories were emerging as the classes unpacked the concept of trust.

The safety planning section of the programme highlighted the children’s lack of phone numbers for people they can trust. Initially, the only idea some boys had for keeping themselves safe was to go to the police. They had no strategies for personal safety, no ownership of personal safety nor any
understanding that they had the right to be safe. Teachers commented that even adults in their community may have limited ideas for personal safety. One summarised the state of affairs for her classroom – “you don’t need to scratch too deep to uncover or revisit the violence in many student’s homes”.

Many of the children were very reluctant to expose any vulnerability to each other early in the year. Students spoke of their fear of being labelled a ‘snitch’ if they tell about parents. They recognised pressures on parents of high rents, having two or more jobs, overcrowding in their homes and lack of money, along with parents not knowing options to punishment as a form of discipline. The need for connection to a trusted adult was sometimes powerful, as with a student who was in their 7th foster home, separated from their older brothers and sisters and struggling to manage the new foster siblings. This student was approaching their teacher often for advice on what to do in situations such as when a younger foster sibling took their food out of their hands.

In one intermediate class between one third to a half of the 23 students made sensitive disclosures during the JSU programme. These included disclosures of:

- Physical harm
- Emotional harm
- Inappropriate stepfather behaviour towards children
- Suicide in the whanau
- Mental health issues in the whanau
- Depression
- Major family health issues
- Major family financial issues
- Combinations of the above

In another school a student copied down the Oranga Tamariki phone number written on the whiteboard. That student later phoned Oranga Tamariki and asked for help. The school had known the parents were not doing well with the children and had tried to support them, with little success.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vulnerability factors: The children in the class -</th>
<th>interpersonal problem</th>
<th>depressive</th>
<th>positive</th>
<th>Total CES-DC</th>
<th>ME</th>
<th>SCHOOL</th>
<th>EVERYTHING</th>
<th>Total CORS</th>
<th>Total CES-DC+CORS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. are often sick</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
<td>-0.29*</td>
<td>-0.16</td>
<td>0.25*</td>
<td>0.28*</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. are supportive of children who are struggling to keep up</td>
<td>-0.36#</td>
<td>-0.36#</td>
<td>-0.27*</td>
<td>-0.33#</td>
<td>0.31#</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.27#</td>
<td>0.36#</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. have indicated non-school issues of concern</td>
<td>-0.1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-0.18</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.41^</td>
<td>0.31#</td>
<td>0.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average vulnerability score</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.31#</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-0.23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The relationship seen above between teacher perceptions drawn from the narratives from supervision and the quantitative measures of vulnerability is nicely triangulated by the children’s self-assessment of the CES-DC and CORS (table 5.5). The depression subscale of the CES-DC correlates significantly with the average vulnerability score. The non-school issues of concern discussed above and, according to the
teachers in figure 5.1, affecting 10% of the children, are highly correlated with EVERYTHING on the CORS and the total wellbeing score. The data suggest that children who are often sick (10% of the children) and score poorly on the ME and positive subscales, may not like SCHOOL. However, when teachers notice the support a child gives to others who are struggling to keep up, they are tapping into something that correlates with positive child-assessed outcomes on the CES-DC and the CORS and on half of the subscales. That is to say, the children’s ability to be compassionate towards others can be seen as an indicator of their own wellbeing.

5.4 Teacher perceptions of the value of the training and the programme
The overall response of the teachers to the one-day PLD workshop was that the training was helpful. Some aspects of training could be improved. As one teacher said, “we are all busy teachers coming in with a million other things on our minds, we need the basics at the start to orient ourselves”. Understanding the time-frame of the programme was a “basic” and some felt this was not clearly explained or kept changing. Underpinning this was a worry about how to incorporate JSU into “an already busy schedule”, and some felt that “the timeframe in which the program is done is very limited and trying to incorporate this … can at times be demanding”.

Introducing JSU puts additional pressure on teachers knowing that it could be their responsibility with a disclosure of abuse “to record and tell correct people and then follow up”. What would be the impact on teacher wellbeing hearing the as yet unspoken stories of distress and abuse of their students? There were concerns about teacher wellbeing and the need for pastoral care of teachers and the role that supervision might play in this. As one teacher said, “here are many students who are suffering – how can we all empower ourselves to help them?”. A complicating issue is the potential for memories and emotions relating to a teacher’s own personal experience of domestic violence or childhood abuse to be revisited. For one teacher this resurrection of childhood abuse memories both empowered her, “this is my driving force behind being a teacher” and left her feeling vulnerable.

While there were aspects of the training that “could be minimised… [like] lesson planning” and “going through parts of the manual … we could do … on our own”, a much more common comment was “wish we had more [training] time”. More time on “admin requirements” such as “the practicalities” of delivery (e.g. “the amount of copies per student - our staff are on a tight photocopy allowance”), to discuss “what was on the USB”, and for access to manuals at the training and in the delivery of the programme. Teachers wanted more on “how to deliver in class”, more depth on “the violence aspect”, and time to work out how to link activities “to where we could use/adapt them during the course”.

An important component of the PLD was the inclusion of an Oranga Tamariki social worker to present the role, procedures and the ‘human face’ of Oranga Tamariki. Teachers signalled that they wanted to know more of the procedures such as “what happens after you call or refer” a child to Oranga Tamariki. They wanted “more social work contact if possible” and felt that schools could “invite the CYF liaisons …. along to connect with schools and create relationships”.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 5.6. The helpfulness of the following features of the Jade Speaks Up training session? n = 44.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Training component</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher involvement with evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How to the use of the manual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How to respond to disclosures of abuse/issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding of family violence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How the JSU programme is delivered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value of the training session overall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Generally, there was an appreciation of the “holistic pedagogy and approach to supporting students”, and frequent comments were about the value of specific components (“family violence” and the “excellent work on abuse”, “role playing and character-related stuff”, “mindfulness”, “breathing techniques”, and stories in the manual) and of the collaborative learning approach taken by the facilitators. Thus, the workshop was a “great forum to explore serious issues of concern” and for “gaining new and relevant information”, in part because the “group discussions were brilliant”, and the “feedback from each person very informative”, “especially...the sharing of stories and ideas”.

Teachers felt the “space was held well while collegial knowledge and wisdom was pooled” and they “appreciated the passion and care for the programme from the facilitators” and the value of “listening and learning from experts” with whom it was “awesome to engage in conversation”. Some teachers summed up the training saying, “the whole programme was very helpful”, “all of it was fantastic” and even the “food was great!!!!!!”.

5.5 Teacher perceptions of the value of the programme

In the post-test for teachers, they were asked to rate and comment on the feature of the JSU programme outlined in figure 5.2. Overall, across all features, the programme was viewed as helpful, with the most least-popular feature (feedback from the CORS assessment) viewed by 64% of the teachers as helpful or very helpful. For one teacher the CORS feedback “didn’t make sense”, while another said that CORS “gave me an insight of how my students are feeling- some that I wouldn’t have thought, were struggling in certain areas”. Handouts – bookmarks, safety plans, stickers were helpful or very helpful for 64%, and for the manual in general there was strong approval. It was “detailed”, “comprehensive”, “invaluable”, “easy to follow and adapt” with the bilingual charts popular across cultures, with one student providing additional words for emotions from his Pacific Island background. There were also clear suggestions for improvement. Some teachers said it was “quite hard to use electronically as you flick between the main activities and appendix”, “a bit chaotic for first time use”, and difficult “to work out where... [one] was up to”. There was “a lot of reading to do before teaching as the “manual [is] quite long”. Many teachers might “have been better off with the hard copy”.

The modules were between 75% and 89% helpful or very helpful, with keeping myself safe and making choices to keep myself and others safe being the most successful. Seventy percent found the extensions helpful or very helpful particularly where students “already had a good understanding of the module concepts...[as there were] different options for how to deliver and consolidate these understandings”. The extension activities were “useful for giving the lessons some variation and giving...[teachers] an opportunity to meet...class needs”. One teacher who struggled to find the right extension for keeping myself safe said:

“My students found it difficult to identify people that would help keep them safe. Unfortunately, there is widespread mis-trust of the 'system' of police ... [and] CYFS and generally of telling anyone about any violence in their homes. This caused me to wonder about the effectiveness of this programme, but I think at the end of the day the best we can do is try to keep our students safe and try to give them strategies to not perpetuate a cycle.”
This was a teacher who especially valued the training and the supervision (the external support facilitator/researcher involved) which is an indication of the commitment that she and other teachers were putting into the programme and the feeling of being up against the odds. The biggest barrier to teaching relationship skills may be one that is constructed by the education system or the teachers themselves. As one teacher, who rated the programme on the average of all factors as between slightly helpful and helpful, said, “allocating enough time to the jade program proved to be a difficult task, especially with an already busy schedule”. Another explained that “the time frame with our school programme limits the time for me to complete the programme properly” because within each module “a lot of the lessons took at least 2 lessons to get through”. Not everyone agreed. One teacher felt 50 minutes for a lesson was “way too long” because “if a student cannot grasp the concept in 20-30 mins then it’s no use”, suggesting that teachers could be spending too much time doing JSU. The consensus seemed to be that we needed to take more time to deliver JSU “over the course of a term” at least. Other things would help – second time round teachers and schools would have had enough “time to go through the manual...and make...[the programme] their own” and not have the burden of “the research element...[which] put a lot of pressure on us to get things completed within a short time frame”.

On the average of factors, the “programme, planning and activities were all helpful”, “it is well structured and scaffolds the students through” and, according to one teacher, “was helpful and beneficial to all students and teachers involved”. Noted were how “the links [the programme] made across the curriculum made it easier to justify in my planning”, and how the programme “generated opportunities for children to discuss these things [issues of concern] with their teacher”. The centre-piece of the programme and the most valued feature was the JSU video, with its capacity to “lead to many useful discussions and outcomes” and as a resource that could be “referred to regularly”.

Figure 5.2: Ratings of the value of Jade Speaks Up. n=45 (3=slightly helpful, 4=helpful and 5=very helpful)
An example of how the JSU video and other videos were effective was where a teacher observed how easily children in randomly assigned groups were discussing the JSU video with children outside their normal group of friends. As one child would open up to talk, others would follow in sharing their stories. There appeared to be no underlying tension and no issues regarding teasing or comments. In another school one student spoke of the ‘tearing’ inside that the young boy character, Jasper, experienced in the JSU movie when Dad tried to get him to side against Mum. All the students reflected on the “you are in my club/out of my club” splitting that can occur in school and began a conversation about how they are going to grow up and be able to contribute without being “sucked into doing what everyone else does”.

Table 5.7 breaks this down into a set of correlations that contrast post-test teacher and children’s evaluations. Most features of the teacher evaluation correlate with either, both the average children’s recommendation rating per classroom, or, the percent of positive comments about the programme per classroom from the children. Most of these correlations are with the fundamental aspects of the programme – the training, the weekly teaching of JSU, the work on safety planning and the use of the hand out materials to reinforce safety messages – so it is unsurprising that if the teacher felt positive doing these things, the children would experience and reflect this. What is more revealing are the correlations of teacher support for the feedback systems (with the CORS assessment, review and evaluation and external supervision) and the children’s level of positivity. As well as the correlation with positive recommendations and comments, feedback from CORS correlates with children’s perceptions of the usefulness of JSU, and external supervision (at r=0.60, the strongest connector to child positivity) correlates with the children’s perceptions of the JSU programme being interesting and fun. These correlations reveal the importance of supporting teachers in this mostly highly challenging work on relationship, where feedback is vital because often it is unclear how individual children are coping and whether the JSU strategies are working, and where acknowledgement of what is being achieved by
teachers is essential as individual lives, and classroom and school cultures, are being turned towards the warmth of relationship.

Table 5.7: Post-test correlations of teacher ratings with student ratings and with comments on the value of the JSU programme, n=43. *= r=0.31, p<0.05; #= r=0.39, p<0.01; ^= r=0.48, p<0.001.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Features of the JSU programme rated by the teachers</th>
<th>Correlations with the average or % per classroom</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interesting doing JSU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the training sessions</td>
<td>0.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the weekly classroom teaching session</td>
<td>0.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the feedback from the CORS assessment</td>
<td>0.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the module on safety planning for home and school</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the module on personal safety plan</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the session on review and evaluation</td>
<td>0.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hand out materials e.g. bookmark, safety plan, stickers</td>
<td>0.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>having an external support/ facilitator/ researcher involved (external supervision)</td>
<td>0.34^</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average of factors</td>
<td>0.08</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.6 Teacher perceptions of change in the children in their classrooms

In their assessment of change at post-test, 45% of the ratings of change by teachers were 0 (= no change) and in 5 instances (1% of the total), teachers felt that their classroom had gone back (-1 or -2). However, 54% of the ratings were positive (+1 or +2), with the biggest improvements occurring for the four factors, in the pre-test, that showed the highest level of vulnerability in their classrooms (see figure 5.4). There was a significant correlation between these pre- and post- ratings, except for bullying and the overall rating of change (r=0.30 to 0.65; p<0.05 to <0.0001). The average score for the overall rating of change was 4.0, indicating that either JSU has been of considerable value for a minority of children, or some value for a majority of children.

Seventy to ninety percent of teachers said their children had improved in being able to talk about their feelings, knowing how to keep themselves safe, being supportive of children who are struggling to keep up and being able to ask for help. Greater emotional literacy was one of the most important areas of change in vulnerability that teachers commented on as they observed student’s increased use of emotional language in classrooms to articulate feelings. They noted that the programme brought out topics not normally discussed at school, including real life domestic violence between siblings as well as between parents and children, and including more abstract discussions on the rights of children and the United Nations Conventions to protect children, the difference between discipline and punishment and the agencies in New Zealand available to protect and look after children. Another commented that with the cross-curricula format of the programme there was lots of writing, poetry and ‘soul searching’ in his class. Two Asian/African students wrote their autobiographies, one whose uncle had held the AK40 of a relative who was later killed in a gunfight. Students who had not seen family violence could take on roles and see how they might feel as a victim. Others who had been exposed to family violence were able to express their feelings. It was valuable for those who had experience of either end of the family violence spectrum to have these experiences expressed in class.
Trust is key to supportive relationships between children. Teachers felt that students’ friendships were helped by the programme as students shared their stories with each other, especially their issues about life at school. Students became more empathetic towards each other, realising that everyone had hard days, and there was “less bickering within the classroom”. Being able to trust teachers meant that children were more likely to ask for help, One teacher of an all-boys class spoke about the boys: “opening up about their personal experiences at home and talking about how they can keep themselves safe – who they can talk to, who they can trust. The programme is creating a ‘safe space’ for the boys including ESOL students, to go into their life experiences and discuss domestic violence. The boys also love singing and have created a suitable rap including lyrics such as "I feel _______ when Dad gets drunk and this is what I do………".

Teachers reported how safety plans and strategies were being used by children. The *Breathe, Think, Do* strategy was implemented by students both in the classroom and outside. Teachers heard the *Breathe, Think, Do* jingle sung a lot. One student was overheard reminding another to use this strategy – in Maths.
One new student in a rural school had no extended family or friends established, yet when a domestic violence incident occurred in her home she was able to apply her *JSU* safety plan and get out of the house, borrow a phone from the neighbours and phone the police. When she went to the school counsellor it was to seek assurance that she had done the right thing, saying that all she could think of was *Breathe, Think, Do* as she responded to the frightening situation. There was also an incident with a child who became violent during PE with a baseball bat. Students calmly used proactive strategies, as learned in *JSU*, to be protective of other students. Later in class the teacher followed up by helping the class process their shaken emotions.

Also, in more than 50% of the classrooms teachers noted reductions in *bullying* and less worry about *non-school issues of concern*; in 39% of classrooms there were reductions in *anger* issues, and 25% had fewer children off *sick* – all areas that were not identified as particularly important in the pre-test assessments of vulnerability. An example of how *JSU* helped a *non-school issue of concern* is from a school where two sets of parents separately approached a teacher to inform him that their marriages were dissolving. In both cases their children had instigated a conversation with their parents, speaking of how the issues at home were developing and thought their parents needed to be talking with someone. A parent from each family approached the class teacher and the Special Education Needs Coordinator.

### 5.7 The sustainability of the Jade Speaks Up project at follow-up

Twenty-five of the 44 teachers who completed the post-test questionnaire also completed the short follow-up questionnaire five to six months later at the end of the school year when there are many other competing activities. In evaluating the progress made between *post-test* and *follow-up* from the teachers’ perspective, we matched the teacher response against the previous response only for the group of 25 *follow-up completers*. In excluding the other 19 who *did not attempt the follow-up questionnaire*, we note in table 5.8 below that this latter group is slightly less enthusiastic about *JSU* than the *completers*, but not significantly so, except for the *overall value of JSU*. There were no significant differences between the two groups in any of the sub-questions under the *support of programme factors* or *change observed* questions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Completed follow-up</th>
<th>Did not attempt follow-up</th>
<th>significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average support of programme factors</td>
<td>4.08</td>
<td>3.89</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average change observed</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practically of <em>JSU</em></td>
<td>3.72</td>
<td>3.32</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The overall value of <em>JSU</em></td>
<td>4.24</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>p&lt;0.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The follow-up had two comment questions looking for reasons for change and suggestions for the future of *JSU*, and two rating evaluative questions, one of which was a comparison with the assessment of vulnerability in the pre-test, and the other a comparison with the assessment of change in the post-test. Figure 5.5 examines the pre-test/follow-up vulnerability comparison and shows that on every question bar two (*non-school issues of concern* and *being often sick*), teachers feel more positive about their class than at the pre-test. (Note that pre-test scores are higher than the follow-up scores for the negative factors in the class, and lower for the positive). Three factors, as well as the overall vulnerability rating, are significantly better at follow-up: the percent of children *who know how to keep themselves safe* is up 27%; the percent who *can talk about their feelings* is up by a third; the percent of *disruptive children* falls by a half, from roughly four per class to two per class, and the *overall vulnerability of the class* falls by 26%.
In commenting, teachers reported the willingness of children to talk about issues such as “bullying and peer pressure”, and that they are “looking for solutions”. A number of teachers report on how students will now approach them if there are “things going on at home”, or just to “share their own experiences at home”. Some students are more willing to come to teachers if “someone else is having a problem”. Part of the keeping safe message is “knowing what avenues to take in having a safer community”, and a teacher of a culturally diverse class ensures her class understands “we all deserve to be safe and cared for even if it’s just by the class and teacher”. Another states: “they all know how to keep themselves safe and where they can access help”, and this is seen as JSU “building on the PB4L focus” of creating a safe/ family-oriented school. JSU has given students strategies where previously they had none.

Figure 5.5: Comparison of pre-test and follow-up teacher assessment of class vulnerability. Data from 8 schools and 25 classrooms *=p<0.05, #=p<0.01, ^=p<0.001

Figure 5.6 compares the teacher assessments of change at post-test and follow-up. The gains made at post-test are confirmed, with change at follow-up being judged greater on all factors apart from being able to talk about your feelings, and with two factors making major and significant improvement (low level of literacy and frequent anger issues). The right-hand column shows the percent of classes which are judged, six-months after the programme has finished, to have improved (a bit better or much better) on a particular factor because of JSU, minus those instances where things got worse (six instances where things got a bit worse – four for being often sick and two for being regularly disruptive in class). As far as the teachers are concerned every child has improved in knowing how to keep themselves safe, and nearly three quarters have improved in areas of key JSU teaching (being able to talk about their feelings, being able to ask for help and being supportive of children who are struggling to keep up).

In their comments, the issues of students supporting other students and asking for help were emphasised by more than a third of the teachers. One found that “the children who were socially removed and somewhat isolated by issues at home were now happy and connected with their peers because they went through a process and shared something that they previously held inside”. Students realised “that if they or someone else has a serious problem, they need to share with an appropriate person to receive help, so it does not escalate”. Children being “supportive of ... [other] students with learning and health needs”
and “being more sensitive to the needs of others”, “has big benefits in the realm of communication and kindness to one another”. JSU creates connection: becoming “close and cohesive as a class, helpful and supportive to each other”, “closer as a group” and, with “many ... learning to be more assertive”. *

This supportive process underpins the significant decrease in frequent anger issues, because the children have “a greater understanding of reactions and actions in situations, there is more consideration for others and they are able to pick up on the signs of anger”. The programme was teaching them how “to identify and...take more notice of different emotional and physical signals...and how they can keep themselves safe in a variety of situations”.

It was not only the attention given to communication that helped improve social skills, the children’s “receptiveness to mindfulness, breathing activities and other JSU processes” helped to keep classrooms calm. Children made “reference to Jade Speaks Up during class discussions, particularly when making decisions [using] Breathe, Think, Do” to calm the mind. As well, attitudes changed – “viewpoints and attitudes towards bullying and violence [changed]” – resulting in less bullying and less disruption in classes. A further pleasing outcome from this improved classroom environment is the significant increase in literacy. Half the teachers have noticed this change, which is a striking demonstration of how relational learning leads to improvement in academic learning.

Some of the concluding comments from teachers were about the limits of JSU. “The value in the programme is different for different children” and “different children” are what one teacher describes as “as [having] a privileged upbringing (abundant wealth, time with parents, frequent holidays). Many found it hard to relate to the source material... and it is questionable about whether ... [these] students have applied their learning in real life situations.“

The other “different” group is the children with “an ingrained gang mentality” or “a significant disruptive element ... who have experienced adults with anger... [and] violent tendencies. They act up and revel in the violent parts of the animation and applaud the character who gave the middle finger”. These children, many from “lower socio-economic areas have a good street-smart awareness of violence in the
community and will not talk about things or...[participate in] an agenda to do with it, when violence is discussed at school”. As a teacher explains:

“Theyir home environment overrides a lot of what we try to do at school. Students are... not prepared to 'dob on' others, so issues which arrive in the playground are difficult to resolve as a classroom teacher. Not sure what can be done. I'm not sure we can help all students in violent situations. Our students seem to have a distinct lack of trust in the authorities/ ‘the system’. Also, there is often more trouble if they disclose. My hope is that at least we can give them strategies to look after themselves and hope that we can break the cycle of violence.”

These two groups are not necessarily lost from the programme. It was argued, for example, that some children who “have never (and may never) experienced any violence in their homes...may gain value from being able to name their feelings and knowing how to help others”, while, on the other hand, for “those who have experienced violence...sometimes it's just finding out that their home life is 'not normal' is what helps”. However, adjusting the programme “to suit the needs of specific children” means taking more time. Many teachers wanted “more time to teach it and link...[it in] with other areas of the curriculum such as health and social science so that it can be covered”. “It felt a bit rushed” – “we had to deliver so much in a short period, students got tired of it by the end”.

Some teachers wondered if the JSU teaching should be a specialist role – “having a Jade Speaks Up person to teach the sessions” in full or for the introduction.

“It would be good if one of the pilot team actually came into our schools and had a workshop for a block with each class to introduce the programme and us teachers do the follow up activities. As the kids see us everyday day, it would be good if a fresh new face came in and introduced the kaupapa, did some activities and then us teachers do the follow-up activities as a weekly rotation.”

Other suggestions were wishing teachers were allowed “to hug our students and awhi them if they open up, to show our support”, and wanting the inclusion of “more connections to bullying and other forms of violence familiar to most students”.

At the end many of the teachers wanted to express an appreciation of the programme.

- “This has been an excellent programme, I feel that the students got so much out of the programme, opening up and feeling safe being one of the most important and knowing where to go for help.”
- “It was beneficial to my class and myself as a teacher as I am able to help them focus on not just their physical health but their mental and emotional health as well.”
- “This is a very effective programme.”
- “It is a valuable programme, for sure. I was close to putting the highest rating in the last question.”
- “I feel I have had a very successful year with my class and their mental health and right to be SAFE. Thanks JSU. XX.”
- “Because it is holistic and contains holistic strategies for self-care, it is a superb programme for anyone, not just people suffering violence in the home.”
- “We need to openly talk about difficult subjects with our young people more and anything that promotes and supports this communication well in schools is gold.”
• “You guys have developed a great resource. I am so grateful to you all for the amazing work you have done and hope that it continues to be rolled out nationally. “
• “This programme just worked in so well with my own personal beliefs around anxiety, yoga and mindfulness. It can be so terrifying to talk about deep topics (in case we stuff it up) that we avoid it entirely to the detriment of our students their whānau and ultimately our society.”

5.8 Disclosures and Supervision

As discussed in section 5.5 and table 5.7 above, external support for teachers involved in the JSU programme, consisting mainly of supportive supervision, is a key element that is strongly connected to student appreciation and enjoyment of the programme. There was a clear correlation between students’ appreciation of the programme and the teacher’s attitudes towards and valuing of supervision. JSU promotes a more intimate relationship between teachers and children within a field of trust in the classroom, in which the teacher is exposed to disclosures of challenging and at times traumatic events in their students’ lives. Without appropriate effective supervision, these disclosures hold the potential to derail teacher engagement with students and to lessen teachers’ commitment or desire to engage in this type of programme.

5.8.1 School policies, procedures and teacher training for disclosures

When we held follow-up interviews with teachers six months later, several made it clear that they thought there was a lack of certain areas of professional development for teachers and perceived a lack of structure within their schools for dealing with students at risk:

“There is not good structure around dealing with kids at risk. Sometimes it’s just amazing that they have even turned up at school, let alone not got their uniform right or having their gym gear. There needs to be more listening, more PD, more approachable staff. More modelling from management...not just focus on achievement but the whole person who has often come from shit backgrounds. Too many kids are ‘model Jades’ and need different responses, supportive, not an authoritarian one.”

In response to questions in our post-programme interviews on previous teacher training in this area, most teachers acknowledged that teachers can be the first to hear of problems such as cutting, drug abuse and family violence, and commented that they had received little or no training in their initial professional development as teachers. A few teachers could recall small amounts of training on handling disclosures as part of their initial teacher education programme, and while it is possible that they had had some in-house professional development (PD) in handling disclosures — teachers noted that some schools used to do this — it seems that in recent times this type of PD has not been held in schools. At one of the few primary schools where some teachers had received disclosures training, it was from organisations they were involved with outside school, such as Lifeline. Once JSU began in one of the intermediates, the in-school coordinator recognised the need for such training and created an in-house session on responding to disclosures in alignment with the school policy.

Several teachers in different schools said that while their schools may have developed, or were developing, clearer policies and procedures, these were not always clear to staff. One group of teachers recommended that the schools’ disclosure policy be displayed prominently in the staff rooms, with guidelines on what must be done, what questions to ask or not ask, who to go to. This measure would allow any relieving or student teacher to easily access the school policy and procedures for disclosures. Other recommendations included:
● Ensuring that school policy and procedures on disclosures is included in PD for teachers prior to beginning to teach in a school and needs to focus on scenarios that can be discussed and worked through to see how to deal with situations. The in-school and school-to-agency process is unclear to teachers, and there is low trust that the process is followed consistently
● Making teacher pastoral support a priority and strengthening teacher support networks
● Clearly naming the boundaries of inexperienced teachers’ responsibilities
● Schools supporting their teachers where parents become upset about disclosures.

Additionally, from one of our intermediates, the suggestion was made that schools provide a space where agencies, such as speech therapists, counselling, social workers and Oranga Tamariki, could offer services for families of students referred to them. By having the agencies within the school grounds, access would be easier, and any stigma or guilt felt by parents around their involvement with such services reduced.

5.8.2 Impact of disclosures
Many teachers felt personally impacted by the programme. Teachers often took their student worries home with them, using personal or family time to think about their students, attempting to work out what they as a teacher could do next for their students. It could be daunting for teachers to open up the subject of student well-being on their own, particularly for some teachers who have to contend with their own histories/personal experience of family harm. Two schools used a team-teaching approach and reflected on the value of being able to do this work alongside colleagues, allowing two adults to attend to any child who needed to make a disclosure or because they felt upset. Team teaching, and teaching with involved teacher aides, also allowed a student to approach an adult less conspicuously and kept the teachers safer, with adult back-up in the room if needed.

Age and life experience of teachers also contributed to how well-equipped they felt for dealing with disclosures. Younger, less experienced teachers felt unconfident and inadequately prepared, with one commenting that he received no training or PD for handling disclosures and had none in his teacher training years. One young and inexperienced teacher spoke of becoming afraid to even ask students “Are you OK”? and wanted to leave teaching because of her experiences of feeling unsafe and unsupported when she took a disclosure to management.

5.8.3 Importance of supervision
Pastoral care through supervision for teachers was a cornerstone of the JSU programme. The supervision sessions provided an impetus, as we have seen, for teachers to examine their ways of responding to their students. Normally, in working through a disclosure process, teachers would not be provided with external supervision, challenging for teachers in a small school or a single cell situation. Challenging, too, for the larger schools. Staff at an intermediate asked: “Where do we go from here?? How do we look after ourselves as well as the kids? ...We have few self-care strategies, especially once we’re home. Pastoral care of staff is REALLY important”. Supervision was important for the fine grain work of JSU. Teachers recognised that the JSU kaupapa of care for others occurred throughout the training and supervision sessions. Supervision provided a space for teachers to report on the challenges in using the JSU resources and receive coaching in some of the activities. Teachers found it helpful to consider how the experiences of the programme influenced their management of their own classrooms and relationships. One experienced male teacher said that the supervision had “reminded me of the values that I used to have as a new teacher.” He subsequently changed the layout of his classroom, putting his desk as part of a semicircle and reinstituting circle time with his class. Another very experienced teacher described the changes in integrating new students into their classroom. In the past she would have “just brought the new kids in”. Because of the increased openness nurtured by JSU, she consulted with the
class on ways to invite new students into their room and revisited the class agreements as a way of sharing the class culture with these students.

Supervision with small groups of teachers helped engage a bigger perspective. Conversations arising during the supervision sessions were valued as opportunities to collectively share ideas that had worked well. Teachers began voicing possible ways to improve the level of staff pastoral care, such as holding a well-being survey with the involvement of their Board of Trustees. This perspective flowed through into some staff room conversations about “problem students” which became more an exploration of what might be the cause of the students’ behavioural problems – the culture shifting from a complaint about a “difficult student” to that of problem solving. Reports from both teachers and management noted the change in the tone and quality of collegial discussions about students, suggesting the conversations in the hour-long supervision sessions between colleagues were as important as the responses received from external supervisors. At times as part of debriefing, teachers reflected on the gaps in their work and the value of supervision saying, for example, “on a personal level it helped me recognise my own reactions to one of my students and that it is up to me as an adult to overcome that and cut through my resistance”.

Teachers were worried about being left out of the information/feedback loop after disclosures are handed over to management and outside agencies. For example, the reading of Moana or Malosi’s stories provoked a spate of disclosures about physical punishment in the children’s homes in two schools, the first time these practices had been openly addressed with their students. Teachers were uneasy about how Oranga Tamariki might address this issue and so JSU arranged for an experienced Samoan social work academic to visit the two schools and address the issues. The teachers later commented:

“We are untrained for the amount and the types of disclosures that came up. Having L present provided an opportunity for us to discuss the cultural aspects of their students’ home life and parental discipline of their students. This helped some of us feel [we were] on the right track with our beliefs. It would have been good to have had our school social worker also attend that face to face supervision session.”

Supervision was also used as a venue where teachers could examine the results of the children’s CORS self-assessment. Teachers were asked to use these results to alert themselves to some of the areas where students might be struggling. On more than one occasion teachers were shocked to see a star pupil giving, for example, a low rating for SCHOOL. Subsequent sensitive enquiries of the students about the low rating revealed that these children were being bullied. Teachers found CORS helpful in identifying a problem at home, feeling that without CORS they would not have approached these possibly at-risk children. In supervision, teachers expressed a desire to use CORS beyond the pilot programme to help monitor student progress.

While the delivery of the JSU programme appeared to be the main focus of supervision, it was also an opportunity to affirm the teachers for the successes they shared. Too many teachers function in a vacuum of quality acknowledgment of their work and resourcefulness, particularly acknowledgement from listeners who understand the complexities of their role and the material. Teachers relaxed, smiled more broadly and visibly grew in confidence. Such moments of encouragement are a source of empowerment in their work which, for teachers, can be all too scarce.
5.9: School management perspectives on *Jade Speaks Up*

5.9.1 Positive impact of *Jade Speaks Up* on schools
Alongside the conversations with the teachers, towards the end of the year the *JSU* team also interviewed the management teams. While not actively involved in the classrooms, these people had an oversight of the *JSU* programme and were there to support and supervise teachers and to manage the referrals that could come because of disclosures arising out of the programme.

Management staff reinforced teachers’ observations of increasing student vulnerability to external influences such as gangs. They saw the increase in student anxiety, recognised the normalisation of family violence in their children’s lives, and were concerned by the vulnerability of students to online bullying. Management noted that the programme had been a factor in increased openness in the school, with students beginning to approach teachers to make known what was happening to them and asking, “what should I do?” when experiencing uncomfortable situations.

Management staff could see that *JSU* was addressing these issues of vulnerability and anxiety. They noticed how new students responded to *JSU* work still on classroom walls, had heard children around the school singing the “catchy and memorable...Breathe Think Do”, knew that the positivity of the students towards *JSU* was genuine, and saw the effort that teachers were putting into documenting experiences and encouraging students to do so as well. *JSU* “helped the teachers build confidence in knowing what could be done”. A school coordinator explained how this worked:

“The programme definitely had concepts we need to be talking about. It brought things out from behind closed doors. Kids blossomed over the 5 weeks – open about topics not normally discussed. There was a process of gradually checking out if it was OK to speak up. Students got it that there were significant people in the school interested in them and their lives”

5.9.2 Responding to disclosures
Management often commented on the increase in disclosures during the programme as something that they had not initially expected. Some schools had never had so many disclosures in ‘one go’ before *JSU* was taught. Others commented that it was similar after the police had conducted *Keeping Ourselves Safe*. There were more disclosures from the first *JSU* group than the second group.

One intermediate named five disclosures known to the coordinator, with three going through to Oranga Tamariki due to domestic violence, as well as 12-15 lower level disclosures. All these increased the awareness of the importance of training the teachers, and highlighting gaps existing between the school’s policies and practice. For example, training of school staff in handling disclosures usually happens at the start of the year, rather than towards the end of term 1 when teachers may be more likely to be having disclosures made to them, or the beginning of term 2, when trust between teachers and children has been established.

Some schools felt their procedures around disclosure and communication between management teams and teachers could be improved. Others were satisfied with school policies and procedures after having addressed aspects arising from *JSU*. One school management team felt that their policies and procedures worked well for teachers participating in *JSU*, with teachers withdrawing any students who became upset or wanted a personal conversation into “the cave”, a safe space within the modern learning environment. The student could chat with the teacher who phoned the counsellor within an hour of the disclosure. The counsellor would see the student and call in outside agencies where appropriate.
Measures for the safety of the student would be in place by the end of the school day so, for example, the student did not go home to an unsafe situation.

One rural school noted that all the disclosures were from girls. Their counsellor sees pressure on the boys having to be staunch, influenced by gang projections of gender and the environments of poverty in which these projections prosper – you don’t talk about your feelings and you don’t talk about what’s happening. The CORS feedback was one way of getting access to student distress. Management agreed with teachers that CORS feedback, with the researcher’s interpretations of the data for teachers, was very helpful in identifying areas where students were struggling. They were also surprised to discover that some of their high performing students were having issues at school, which could be addressed when teachers were alerted to them (e.g. bullying). A senior teacher commented that:

“Some of our students don’t expect their days to ever rate 10/10. Six or seven is a high score for how well a day is going and is as high as it can get, according to one student, unless something fantasy-like happens such as ‘being taken to Disneyland’.”

However, she added “more stories of student’s [poor] wellbeing came from teachers enquiring what was happening for students [partly as a result of CORS] rather than from students directly asking for help”. One suggestion for helping students to talk about what worries them was to pre-frame the programme with empathy building activities such as “how do I support a person going through a hard time?” as a collaborative exploration.

5.9.3 Training
It became JSU practice to invite management to attend at least the first half of the PLD day to get an overview of the programme and what the teachers were being prepared for. This buy-in at senior levels in the school was important to support teacher uptake of the work. The Special Education Needs Coordinators (SENCOs) and deputy principals able to attend the training day were pleased and recognised the real need for teachers to be trained in skills such as taking another perspective or ratcheting down emotions when talking with colleagues about students and scenarios.

Availability of relievers for training days was an issue. In one small town, there is a small pool of relievers and the teachers team-teach, so the cohort of students is significantly affected if all 3 teachers are away. School coordinators of the programme appreciated the supervision element of the training. External supervision for teachers was seen as important because management advocates for students, so their focus is on the needs of the children rather than the pastoral care of the teachers.

Looking to the future, one suggestion was refresher training for teachers already delivering the programme. This could be a catch up/follow-up session half way through the programme, done through an online forum and supporting any teachers, support staff or SWiS who missed the initial training days. Follow-up training would also provide an opportunity for the core teachers to come together to hear from teachers of all local participating schools, providing a platform for wider collegial support. It was thought that there should a greater emphasis on the benefits of team-teaching the programme.

5.9.4 Cultural fit with school and community
Most school management commented that JSU was a “good fit” with the culture of their school and worked well alongside other school programmes such as PB4L, Restorative Practice, and Small Circle Time. One school named Keeping Ourselves Safe as being a particularly complementary programme to run either alongside or on alternate years with JSU. Similar comments were made in other schools and with programmes such as Everyday Theatre and Turn your Life Around.
Two schools which include secondary level classes were exploring how other programmes could create a more seamless path of well-being development for their students. They named *Mates & Dates* and recommended links made between the two programmes for continuity of language and concepts. The counsellor in the second school was keen to implement *Mates & Dates* next year for Years 9-13 and thought *JSU* will be a ‘brilliant fit’ for Years 7 & 8. She was also keen to bring in *Roots of Empathy* for Year 7s and spoke of the *Loves me Not* programme for Years 11-13 which looks at healthy relationships.

Several schools commented that they would appreciate a Te Reo Māori translation of the programme. The unavailability of such a resource was a barrier for some Kura who were approached to participate at this stage. We heard from teachers in the bilingual units that they made several modifications to fit more readily with their kaupapa.

### 5.9.6 Parent engagement
Several schools commented that their parents had been very positive about the *JSU* programme. Feedback (informal chats when teachers asked for feedback) was positive and parents were pleased this issue was being addressed and that children had a forum for their voices. Some schools presently refer parents to programmes such as *Positive Parenting*, *The Incredible Years* and *Turn Your Life Around*. Schools would like to give parents, particularly those with limited English, some more accessible information about the programme and training regarding positive discipline and bullying.

### 5.9.7 Suggestions for change
For the one school involved in the 2016 pilot, the amount of direct email communication with teachers provoked a ‘no, not again’ response. In 2017 we ran the emails through a coordinator rather than directly to teachers and simplified the emails and demands for paperwork from teachers. This helped as no complaints arose in this area from any of the 2017 schools. Management staff reported that completing online student questionnaires was difficult for under-resourced schools, where students shared devices or, in one case, took their evaluation links home to complete the questionnaires as “homework”. ESOL students needed help to complete the questionnaires, considered too long and difficult. Such support had to come from already over-stretched teachers. While the necessity of the evaluation process was understood, much reduced questionnaires would help ensure the sustainability of the programme.

Because running *JSU* elicited unexpected and, at times, serious disclosures from children, schools became more aware of the distance between community agencies which could take a vital role in supporting vulnerable children and the school. This question of how to access supportive agencies was also a challenge for families. As a result, several schools commented that they deliberately built closer connections with Oranga Tamariki during the programme, to ensure a more seamless path when schools needed help following a disclosure. Schools liked the suggestion of involving staff from community agencies in *JSU* training as way of building connections.

As with the teachers, management staff commented on the tight time-frames of the programme roll-out. While they understood the requirements of the research to have the programme in manageable blocks, this put considerable pressure on the teachers and students. Running the programme with a tight five to seven weeks’ time frame gave teachers insufficient time to fully explore the depth of the programme. While still appreciating the programme being done, teachers were stressed by getting it completed.
Consequently, any fragility within a school around staffing could present difficulties in running it. One school withdrew their planned roll-out with their *Class As Usual* group in the second term of the programme due to some tensions within the staff team.

One suggestion to reduce time pressure was to cover modules one and two in the busy term 1 of getting to know students, running camps, market days etc. Then doing the rest of programme over terms 2-4. Term 1 would have a focus on trust and emotional literacy, before beginning content directly connected to family harm in term 2. This would allow classes to settle into a safe, strengths-based environment before tackling student vulnerability. It would also allow a fuller integration of the material into the school culture, with a new section being taught every week or two, developing a longitudinal thread throughout the year. This was particularly important in the intermediate schools where new sets of relationships were being established.

School managers and senior staff were enthusiastic about using the programme again. For some intermediate schools, a bi-annual roll out would work better because they could do the whole in one go, rather than coping with too a large cohort across several year levels. Some senior staff, while very positive about the programme, felt there had to be realism about how much of it could be done over a year:

“This programme trumps other programmes, so present it to schools as: - here’s the ‘everything’ but if you can’t teach in its entirety there are the one or two parts to really focus on and reference alongside other programmes/units of work.”

One big advantage noted by management teams was the ability of the *JSU* programme to dovetail with or support other programmes. A final comment from one school deputy principal:

*I like Jade Speaks Up. Our kids are walking differently, more upright. They are confident and able to talk about what is going on for them. Jade Speaks Up should definitely be supported to continue.*
6. Discussion

6.1 Introduction
This chapter draws together the evidence that JSU, with its focus on building relationships of warmth and trust, and on creating effective strategies for children to use to keep themselves safe within a values framework that aligns well with PB4L School-Wide, can be a powerful tool in creating resilience and wellbeing for the 10-14-year-old age group. Our recommendations for the continuation and further development of JSU, drawn from the learnings from the first stage of the pilot are presented in chapter 7.

6.2 Measures of wellbeing
Our measures of wellbeing, the CES-DC and the CORS assessment, confirmed the high level of children at Years 7 and 8 who are at risk of a mental illness. Of the 974 children who did the pre-test, with the combined assessments, 48.1% met the criterion for being at risk. This is higher than in a 2012 study (Clark, Fleming, Bullen, Denny, Crengle et al, 2013) where 30% of secondary school students showed up at risk of depression, but very similar to the 48% of children in that study, who could only report that “life was OK” or worse and not that they were “satisfied” or “very happy with life”. It is also higher than in the 2018 Ministry of Health survey into the Social, Emotional and Behavioural Difficulties of 5-14-year-olds which reported that around 26% of children had at least one “concerning” scale on the Strengths and Difficulties Questionnaire (SDQ, Goodman, 1997). The older half of the cohort (10-14-year olds), Māori, and the “most deprived” groups were between 1.3 and 3 times more likely to have an issue of concern. As these are some of the key attributes of the JSU cohort, it is easy to see that SDQ levels of concern could be around 50%.

The two assessments used (CES-DC and CORS) correlated well and demonstrated high validity in relation to teacher assessment of child wellbeing (CORS) and to other indications of risk. This was particularly in relation to the significant CES-DC/CORS difference between the groups who were negative and neutral in their evaluation of the programme and the positive group, with the latter having a much superior performance on a whole list of measures relating to mitigation of risk (sec. 4.7). Consequently, when the programme produces a significant overall shift in the wellbeing measure from pre- to post-test and 11% drop in the number of children at risk at post-test, there is cause for hope.

6.3 Children’s growth with Jade Speaks Up

6.3.1 Emotional competence
This study provides evidence of students’ learning gained from the JSU programme in emotional literacy, emotional competency, the concept of trust and being able to name trusted people and safe places. The data suggested that emotional competence was important for wellbeing in that the school with by far the lowest wellbeing scores struggled with all the tests of emotional competence and the group children who were negative or neutral about the programme (the negative/neutral group) and whose wellbeing scores were much lower than the positive group showed a very flattened emotional response on the task of identifying how upset you would be in a range of unpleasant situations. The tasks clearly demonstrated the expected superiority of girls in emotional competence, and that older children were better at describing emotional states (as opposed to labelling) than younger children. Emotions whose representations are subtle, such as frightened, surprised, anxious and annoyed, were more difficult to label than the more straightforward emotions of happy, sad and angry.
In two of the four emotional competence tasks there was a significant pre-test/post-test difference. There was a significant improvement in the labelling of the more frightened and surprised emotions. Children were also significantly less responsive to the “upsetting” scenarios in table 4.15. This was viewed as an improvement; on the one hand JSU increases the resilience of children so that they don’t feel as threatened by “upsetting” events such as being left out of games or activities, and on the other hand, because of JSU, the classroom environment has changed so that the children are less likely to be left out and therefore do not sense it as a possibility to the same extent.

6.3.2 The importance of trust and safe places
In the three sections on trust and safe places, it was clear that for vulnerable children trust was a critical issue. For the negative/neutral group it mattered significantly less than for the positive group that people who were trusted would listen to you, care how you feel or get help for you if you were scared. The negative/neutral group were less likely to know their safety phone numbers. The environments where children are more vulnerable, such as FP1 with only half the children putting their father in the list of trusted family members, and AREA where children struggle to name safe people and places, had low scores in the three factors listed above. While there are no pre- and post-test differences on the two questions that directly explore trust, the distinction was made that trusted adults had to be good listeners compared to children who were your friends.

The factors in the two questions that explored the nature of trust showed significant differential effects. Older children thought reliability and consistency, keeping a secret, doing what you said you would do, and coping with an uncomfortable truth, were all more important than did younger children. Girls added caring, good listening, and giving help when you were scared to this list of factors which were more important for them than for boys who significantly favoured looking attractive. Being listened to and care taken about how you feel were more important to Pākehā, whereas Māori and Pacific Island cultures placed more importance on keeping your word and being truthful.

There were some pre/post differences in the questions about naming trusted people and safe places. Children were more likely to know safe phone numbers at post-test and this continued into follow-up. In the naming of safe places, there was a significant shift from naming home as a safe place to naming relative’s homes as safe places. An interpretation of this shift is that it is the result of children being asked in JSU to explore wider options than home and thus is a positive shift. This shift is greatest for Māori and Pacific Island children who place much greater importance on the role of relatives as safe havens compared to Pākehā and Asian/African children. However, where there are poorly resourced environments, such as for AREA (with a high Māori enrolment), children were much less likely to name home as a safe place and the naming of relatives did not compensate for the shortfall, there was a much higher naming of quiet places (hideaways) and distant cities, a sign that these children are struggling to find safe people and places. Once again, the social competence of girls was apparent, selecting about a fifth more options for safe places than boys, particularly friends and neighbours. Boys were more likely than girls to name the police as a safe option.

6.3.3 Safety knowledge and rights
These questions were sensitive in the identification of vulnerable children. The negative/neutral group was much less positive than the positive group about stop and breathe slowly, say kind things to yourself, it’s not OK to bully or threaten others and no-one should ever make me feel scared, and inappropriately more positive about pick a fight or start an argument with someone and all kids should be safe all the time and never do anything risky statements. These consistencies across questions that shift from negative to positive formats show that this negative/neutral group is well engaged with the evaluation process.
The two questions on safety knowledge and rights also showed useful demographic distinctions. Pākehā were the least likely of all the cultural groups to see using drugs and alcohol as a solution to feeling down or scared and were the least vulnerable for that question. However, on the meaning of the right to be safe, Pākehā were vulnerable because of their expectations to be the best at everything, to be taught self-defence and to be safe all the time and never do anything risky. Asian/African children had the best understanding of their rights as did older children compared to younger children. Girls had no overall advantage over boys for these questions, with their higher scores in stopping and breathing slowly and saying kind things to yourself being undercut by more boys using computer games to calm themselves and being less concerned to be the best at everything.

These questions showed little pre- post-test difference, with playing a game on your phone/ computer making a positive change and saying kind things to yourself a negative change. This latter was the only significant difference in the JSU evaluation that was not a positive outcome for the programme.

6.3.4 Use of the Jade Speaks Up strategies at post-test and follow-up
In two questions looking at the use of actions or intentions arising from JSU strategies (one direct and one asking about their responses to a scary person), on the first question over nine sub-questions, 53% to 55% of children on average had used a JSU action. These ranged from 67% – some or a lot of the time making good choices about who your friends are, supporting a friend who has a problem – to 37% – making a safety plan and remembered the messages. For the second question over seven sub-questions, intentions ranged from 72% who would go to a safe place and 62% who would talk to an adult about what happened when they could, down to 27% who would talk to the person you are scared of. On all 16 measures from these two questions the negative/neutral group was significantly and substantially lower than the positive group, at an average difference of 42% vs 57%.

On these two action/intention tasks, girls are significantly superior to boys on ten of the 16 sub-questions, with the greatest differences being, using the breathe and keep calm strategy, and, knowing how to keep yourself safe in a frightening situation. There are no age differences, but there are some clear cultural differences. Pākehā overall make significantly less use of JSU strategies than the other cultural groups, with only 25% making a safety plan compared with 45% for Pacific Island children. Pākehā are also significantly less likely to talk to the person they are scared of – 18% vs 30% for the rest. Pākehā have the lowest scores for all the action tasks and Pacific Island are highest for all but three tasks, with only one (kept yourself safe in a frightening situation) where Pacific Island children are significantly more engaged than Asian/African children or Māori.

The question if you were scared of someone what would you do?, was also asked in the follow-up and overall there was no significant difference between post-test and follow-up, demonstrating the sustainability of the impact of JSU programme well after the teacher has finished. This was further reinforced by comments made by students on “what would happen next if you did these things”. A statistical analysis of the categorised comments showed, at follow-up, children named more positive outcomes, and fewer bad outcomes than at post-test. Children felt safer and were more able to get help, and bad outcomes dropped from 8% in the post-test to 2% at follow-up. The negative/neutral group, possibly because they had chosen relatively few options, were much more unsure about the outcomes than the positive group (55% vs 23%), and much less likely to feel safe (10% vs 26%), showing how important the JSU learning is for that outcome. The demographic analysis on this question reinforces that girls do better than boys (more positive outcomes), that Māori and Pākehā students are the most
vulnerable and that the intermediate school students are less unsure, safer and more positive than the full primary school and the AREA school students.

We tested the outcomes to the questions in this section against the Class as Usual (CAU) control cohort which had been dropped from the analysis because a large part of the cohort was already well into the JSU programme before the CAU post-test was done. We used the CAU post-test on the understanding that the CAU post-test was done in advance of the completion of the JSU programme. The results clearly demonstrate the value of completing the JSU programme (figure 4.5), with the CAU cohort having almost twice the level of bad outcomes as the JSU cohort.

6.3.5 Valuing the Jade Speaks Up programme
Most children valued to some degree what they got out of the programme: 78% found the JSU programme interesting; 75% found it fun; 81% found it useful, and 89% said yes or maybe they would recommend JSU. The analysis of the comment questions that explored the reasons behind these ratings revealed a student body deeply engaged in the programme. When asked what was not so good about the programme, 42% made only positive comments and just 6% made only negative comments when asked what was good. Negative comments included that the programme was “boring” or “repetitive” or "pointless"; the questionnaires were too long; the content was “too personal”, and the “hitting”, "crying" and "fighting" were upsetting in the JSU video. The students who were concerned about the violence in the JSU video none-the-less rated the programme very highly. The positive comments made were about “everything”, the videos, the games and activities, the learnings and actions and even doing the survey.

A summary of the demographic differences would conclude that Asian/African and Pacific Island students get the most from the JSU programme and value it most. Pākehā children benefit the least and value it less than other cultural groups. Girls’ better relational skills mean that on most assessment tasks they do better than boys and claim more value from the programme, although boys’ wellbeing (CES-DC/CORS) scores are higher and show more improvement. There is also an advantage of age, with older children doing better on some tasks and valuing the programme more. These culture, gender and age differences flow into schools where they add to the socio-economic context of the school community, some of which are poorly resourced and unsafe. The two most challenged schools do not do as well on many JSU tasks, but may still value the programme, while support for the programme by the highest decile school was the weakest, yet it still had two thirds of the children saying the programme was useful. These three schools contributed nearly half the children of the negative/neutral group, and less than a quarter of the positive group.

The 24% of children who made negative comments or were neutral (no comment, don’t know) make up the negative/neutral group which we have shown in many ways to contain the most vulnerable children. Their failure to progress is a failure of the programme, so what happens to them at follow-up is highly relevant to how we view the potential of the programme in subsequent iterations. At follow-up, children made significant progress in the actions they would take in keeping themselves safe compared to post test, but the negative/neutral group made exceptional progress, such that for most actions there is now no significant difference between the negative/neutral group and the positive group. In the analysis of follow-up comments about the outcome of their actions, the negative/neutral group positive comments increase by 50% and the outcome of feeling safe almost trebles to 22%. This suggests that JSU has created a culture change in classrooms where the warmth and safety of the classroom embed the messages of the programme.
6.4 Teachers’ perspectives of *Jade Speaks Up*

6.4.1 Teacher’s knowledge of their students’ lives

It was clear that when teachers were to initially assess two children in their classes on CORS and to identify key support people in these children’s lives, that they had significant gaps in their knowledge about them, particularly the more vulnerable ones who were selected for teacher assessment because of their low CORS self-assessment. The JSU programme saw major improvements in teacher knowledge of their children. This resulted in teachers perceiving clear positive changes in attitudes and behaviour of both low and high CORS children, and, most importantly, a big 7-point change in self-assessed CORS wellbeing from the low CORS children. These findings reinforce how child wellbeing improves when teachers know what support systems children have and where the gaps are.

In their pre-test surveys, teachers indicated that the factors in which the classes were judged most vulnerable were in areas where JSU is very relevant – *not being able to talk about feelings, not being able to ask for help, not being supportive of other children and not knowing how to stay safe* – all of which were happening for between a third and half of the class prior to JSU. The first two factors reflect a limited emotional vocabulary which is addressed in Module 1 of the programme and tested in the assessment tasks of 6.3 above. Naming our emotions allows us to slow down and consider them more deliberately before acting, which provides a link between emotional and cognitive processing in the prefrontal cortex (Barbey, Colom, Solomon, Krueger, Forbes & Grafman, 2012). This emotional spaciousness is key to children being supportive of other children and is the factor that most strongly links teacher perceptions of vulnerability and child self-assessments of wellness. The helpful child is the well child.

The challenge of tackling knowing how to stay safe comes with the task of unpacking the lives of the children and some of the horrors therein. As one teacher noted “you don’t need to scratch too deep to uncover or revisit the violence in many student’s homes”. To do this they have to manage school cultures that say that teachers are not social workers, community cultures that characterise and label people as “snitches” if they attempt to report the distress of children, their lack of knowledge and experience in dealing with serious disclosures from children, and their own history of abuse or neglect which may suddenly rear up into full focus. Of concern to teachers was the use of physical punishment as part of the disciplinary practice of some families. Our assessment of children’s management of staying safe is covered in 6.3.2 to 6.3.4 above.

These issues are uppermost in the training workshop that began JSU, and teachers were pleased to see how topics such as how to respond to disclosures of abuse/issues and understanding of family violence were part of wider “collegial discussions” and a collaborative learning approach that was “holistic” and student centred. While they valued the training, given the pressures on teachers, there were concerns that teachers needed more training and that there would not be enough time to deliver the programme.

6.4.2 Teacher’s perceptions of the value of the training

At the completion of the programme teachers were positive about the content of the training but less so about the time available to deliver the programme. These same time pressures that had distorted the schedule delivery of the control and experimental groups in the evaluation, such that it was difficult to use the CAU data, represent a major hurdle to getting new teacher-driven programmes into schools. Only two teachers felt that none of the features of the programme were helpful, but overall features were found by 64% to 95% of teachers to be helpful or very helpful. Teacher engagement is also critical to the effectiveness of the programme and there is a strong correlation between teacher and
student valuing of the programme. Two programme features stand out as being connected to student recommendations, comments from the positive group and some of the value ratings of interest, fun and helpfulness. These are feedback to teachers from the student CORS which is valuable because, like the teacher CORS, it asks teachers to pay attention to specific students, and, external supervision which provides a forum for debriefing around the anger and sadness in some disclosures, collaborative problem solving and reinforcing feedback.

6.4.3. Teachers’ perceptions of change-
In the post-test survey, teachers were more aware of the situations children were dealing with and the students’ ability to keep themselves safe at school, at home and in the community. For the 11 vulnerability factors assessed at pre-test, teachers rated that students were a bit better or a lot better on 54% of their ratings and only worse on 1%. They were better, particularly, in the four factors that were of most concern at pre-test where 70% to 90% of teachers said their children had improved in being able to talk about their feelings, knowing how to keep themselves safe, being supportive of children who are struggling to keep up and being able to ask for help. Other areas such as being often bullied and having frequent anger outbursts also had impressive improvements (59% and 45% respectively) which testify to the changed classroom climate.

This improvement continued into the follow-up assessment, where teachers were asked to rate the vulnerability of their classes in the same way as they had done at pre-test. On all but two factors the classes at follow-up were less vulnerable, and on none were they more vulnerable. Three factors were significant, with 79% of children able to keep themselves safe, 62% able to talk about their feelings and the percent of children regularly disruptive in class halving to 6%. Follow-up also used the same assessment of change as in post-test and again was superior to post-test in all but two factors and with two factors making major and significant improvement (low level of literacy - a fivefold improvement - and frequent anger issues - a twofold improvement). This represents a major achievement for a small programmatic intervention and supports research which demonstrates the positive effect reducing anxiety and depression has on academic performance (Owens, Stevenson, Hadwin & Norgate, 2012).

The concluding comments from teachers returned to the themes above in 6.3.4 of the difficulties of delivering JSU in hostile environments of under-resourced communities or that of a bored but “privileged upbringing (abundant wealth, time with parents, frequent holidays)”. With a little more time, training, collaboration within school and with outside agencies, flexible delivery, integration within the health curriculum and possibly more specialisation within the area of teaching relationship skills, the teachers at post-test and follow-up are mostly very positive about the future for JSU, using epithets such as “excellent”, “very effective”, “very successful”, “superb”, “gold” and “amazing”.

6.5 The limitations of the programme
In this section we discuss some limitations of the programme in its current form within the context of schools operating in a diverse range of New Zealand communities. Because this programme contains messages promoting attitudinal and behavioural changes which may seem to threaten traditional beliefs, attitudes or behaviours of the various cultures of New Zealand, it is important that we address these limitations of the programme in a suitable and timely manner.

6.5.1 Does it work with high decile, Pākehā children?
In many areas across the programme the Pākehā children were less responsive and less engaged than students from other cultural backgrounds. Nearly half of Pākehā students come from a high decile school with the youngest study cohort. Their responses were notable for a focus on being the best, not taking
risks, being taught self-defence, having difficulty in describing emotions, not wanting to be told an unpleasant truth, being less likely to have relatives as trusted adults, having a stronger feeling of needing to be looked after when scared and being less likely to support a friend, make a safety plan or talk to the person you’re scared of. These patterns may be because of the younger age of the Pākehā children, a level of boredom, or even a feeling of being safe and not needing the programme. For example, children from an alternative school, a very safe, warm, cooperative teaching environment where the children have a lot of freedom and autonomy, didn’t have a strong sense of their right to be safe, possibly because they were safe. There is also a sense that Pākehā children are more emotionally constrained, frightened and caught within a more individualistic paradigm of survival. In their comments about what would happen if JSU strategies were used, it was two Pākehā children who wanted retributive justice – “I’ll be safe and the person will probably go to jail and no-one will bail him out”.

The extent to which JSU images and stories are Polynesian-centric may make some Pākehā children uncomfortable and require a different approach to engage them. While JSU may not yet be fully addressing the needs of Pākehā students in high decile schools, what the programme is uncovering through the student surveys, is an understanding of the relationship vulnerabilities of Pākehā in a high decile school – a group that may previously have been considered resilient and adaptable.

6.5.2 Working with seriously under-resourced communities
What became obvious within the project was that many schools felt isolated both from the community support structures and the agencies that could support their work with the children’s well-being. This finding has recently been echoed in Beddoe, de Haan and Joy’s 2018 report on the perspectives of Social Workers in Schools - ‘If you could change two things’: Social workers in schools talk about what could improve schools’ responses to child abuse and neglect. Many of the stories in chapters 4 and 5 reflect children coming from poorly resourced, low decile communities, which may seem to have fewer safe people and places.

Most of our schools, in part, fit this description, yet have done excellent work with their students using JSU, but there are circumstances that add difficulties to the task. School managers and teachers both acknowledge the need to improve policies, procedures and training when responding to student distress and have a greater readiness to deal with student issues from home. (See 5.8 for detailed suggestions by teachers for improvements in this area). Team teaching the programme with the support coming from having a second (or third) adult present in the classroom, helps teachers tackle the sensitive issues with more confidence. How will this set of circumstances transpose into schools running the programme in isolated rural settings with less staff and few agencies to call on for support?

In chapter 4 we discussed AREA, its problems of isolation and poverty and the difficulty its children had when home wasn’t a safe space and there appeared to be limited substitutes in the community. This is a predominantly Māori school and many of the disappointing outcomes that relate to AREA also relate to Māori. These include fewer positive outcomes from using JSU strategies, feeling it’s OK to bully or threaten others, being less likely to see schools as a safe space and being less likely to expect a trusted adult to listen to you. These features characterise a group that has a compromised idea of their rights. JSU needs to have strategies that give children in tough communities a stronger sense of their rights, particularly the boys for whom being staunch is a dominating requirement of social interaction. This would focus on strengthening the work around safe people and places, particularly in the school, and making sure in the classroom that children felt that they were being listened to. Building connections with community agencies, finding community champions and adding a well-thought-out community development component to the programme which engages iwi and whānau are also important. AREA’s
girls were very positive about JSU and the school has had very positive outcomes from this year’s (2018) iteration.

6.5.3 Jade Speaks Up with Years 5 and 6
One of the aims of the 2018 roll out has been to increase the number of classes in the Year 5 and 6 cohort to get a better understanding of the suitability of JSU for this group. In 2017 the number of participating Year 5 and 6 students was small, in two schools, one of which was a very small school of only 7 participating students. In the larger school, a mainly high decile Pākehā cohort, thus there were other factors, discussed above, affecting the uptake of the programme, making it difficult to identify the impact that the programme had with this age group. Comparing 8-10-year old children in the programme with 11-year olds and 12-13-year olds maturity shows in certain areas. More older children want reliable and consistent friends and trusted adults, who will keep their word and tell the uncomfortable truths. They have a stronger sense of their right not to be scared and less certainty that they have to be the best at everything. Their ratings and recommendations are more positive. However, on the uptake of JSU strategies the younger children are just as fast as older children and have the same proportion of positive outcomes and in most other respects are no different from the older children.

6.5.4 Teaching Jade Speaks Up in the current environment of lack of space given to the Health Curriculum
In 1999, the Health and Physical Education Curriculum (HPEC) was introduced as one of the essential learning areas of the New Zealand Curriculum. In 2001 Sharon Dewar reviewed its implementation and found that the main impediments to implementation were

“a lack of time for tasks such as planning and writing up units, a lack of sufficient guidance and professional development opportunities, and that some staff and parents did not place a very high importance on the health and physical education curriculum. [For secondary schools] ... the main barrier ... [is] problems associated with fitting the components of the health and physical education curriculum into an already full timetable.“ (pp.82-83).

The 2007 New Zealand Curriculum (Ministry of Health, 2007) states of HPEC that “this learning area makes a significant contribution to the wellbeing of students beyond the classroom, particularly when it is supported by school policies and procedures and by the actions of all the people in the school community” (p.22).

While there was undoubted enthusiasm amongst teachers and management staff to address student wellbeing in the schools that participated in this pilot, it appears that emphasis on the HPEC has changed little since 2001. This is supported by the frequent responses from teachers that there is insufficient time in the school timetable to do justice to JSU let alone the four concepts underpinning the learning of Health and Physical Education – well-being (hauora), health promotion, the socio-ecological perspective and the importance of attitudes and values that promote hauora.

In the research pilot, a challenge experienced in several schools was the time pressures involved in running the programme to a tight research time-frame. There is more material in the programme than the teachers can fit into the traditional ‘health slot’ in their programmes. We addressed this by encouraging teachers to plan cross-curricula delivery of the programme. The programme was developed to address the achievement objectives of health education, providing opportunities for written and oral literacy, drama, social sciences, art and music. Some creative teachers later shared their ways of incorporating the programme into such diverse areas as maths and statistical analysis.
Because it is important to give the teachers clear indications of the time involved in programme delivery we listened to their feedback and subsequently modified the manual so that it could be used in ways that fitted the diversity of practice and timetables within schools. Teachers reported that it was a stretch to run the programme with just one 90-minute session each week over a term. Those teachers who created a second time-slot each week had no trouble completing the whole programme within a term – it became evident that allowing two terms for programme delivery is a more achievable timeframe. Teachers often commented that the programme was beneficial to their students and themselves, but the time pressure on getting the material covered and completing the evaluation measures in scheduled time frames made for considerable stress.

As we consider a wider roll out, it is worth noting that, beyond the research phase, the classroom delivery will become much lighter when the degree of evaluative workload for teachers is pruned back. However, teachers noted that they would still appreciate being supported with enough material evidence from student surveys which highlight progress students make during the programme as well as concerns that they may not have shared with their teacher.

6.5.4 Jade Speaks Up with different models of delivery integrated into the curriculum

Our pilot included two delivery models. The predominant one was that of teachers trained and supported in the delivery of the programme with their classes. Our focus in 2017 was to ensure that we managed the pedagogical and administrative load of this alongside the teachers and management. The second model was one we began using prior to this pilot in late 2016. In this model, we trained a young, multi-cultural team of Catholic youth workers, Logos, to deliver the programme in some of the Auckland Catholic schools. A team of approximately five facilitators would work with the Year 7 students in their classrooms. Five sessions of approximately 2.5 hours over a sequence of 5-6 weeks were provided with the classroom teachers also in the room, primarily as observers and follow-up/ integration providers. Logos continued facilitating the programme in one Catholic School in 2017. Their results as well as feedback from the classroom teachers are included in the analysis and in a separate analysis (Bridgman, Dyer, O’Hagan & McCarthy, 2017).

Both models appear to have delivered similar results, yet there are features of the Logos delivery to be noted: they were young - aged 21-30; they presented a variety of cultures within their team that reflected the cultural mix of the schools; a group of five worked together giving them the capacity to make dynamic small group work happen with their leadership support, and they had an energetic approach to their delivery. “We have ‘youth worked’ it up a bit” they told us, as they included more games and upbeat activities into their facilitation.

Throughout the time that the programme was being delivered in this school we offered supervision to the teachers and managed at least one joint session between the two teachers and Logos. One teacher became eager to take over the facilitation of the programme herself (already well trained and experienced in health education) whereas another teacher had not felt as confident. One of the class teachers decided to attend a JSU teacher training day so that she could more clearly understand the thinking and practice behind the class sessions she had observed.

The model of the Logos youth-worker team as facilitators is one that presents a suitable alternative for teachers initially feeling overwhelmed by the load of ‘must dos’ that they are already responsible for when the JSU is introduced into their school. It is also a suitable model for any teachers concerned that the programme will trigger memories of past abuse for them. Beginning teachers could appreciate observing experienced youth workers facilitating the programme before delivering it themselves.
However, this model has the disadvantage of side-lining the teachers and not including them in the deeper trust that comes when adults and children build the opportunities together to explore more personal issues.

There are other aspects that require further investigation such as when in the school year should the programme be delivered, and for how long. This is to address the stress experienced by teachers over the amount of teaching and evaluation tasks they have had to compress into one term, particularly the first term. Term 1 contains many extras for classes, with school camps, relationship building and settling in, particularly in intermediate schools, and is the time when students are establishing their sense of self in a new class or new school. The JSU programme encouraged sharing the vulnerability of students too early in the school year. Feedback from schools was that a slow introduction of first module, covering establishing relationships, class agreements and expanding emotional literacy, would be ideally placed in term 1, followed by the remaining five modules and the deeper discussions in terms 2 and 3.

Looking forward, beyond the intensive research phase, there is a need for teachers to adapt the delivery of the programme to their schedules and the learning levels of the students. A popular recommendation from the teachers for a suitable schedule looks something like:

Term 1: Module one: Feelings and friendship

Terms 2&3: Modules two to six: Trust, Keeping ourselves safe, Personal safety plan, Choices to keep myself and others safe, and the final Reflection session.

No matter how engaging and relevant a programme may be, when there are too many obstacles in the way of teacher and student commitment and enjoyment, it will be of limited impact. A necessary consideration in ensuring a future successful expansion of the programme will address how these obstacles are worked around.

6.6 The cost per child of the current delivery of Jade Speaks Up

The costs per child of delivering JSU to the 1300 students over 5-7 weeks in 2017 was $160.48 per child. This includes the cost of research and the infrastructure to run the pilot. Without the extra costs associated with evaluation, such as data gathering and analysis, costs of advisory group meetings and transcription of teacher and management interviews, cost per student reduces to $122.90. When additional costs related to administration, financial services and an administration assistant relating to evaluation, are removed the cost reduces to $102.56/pupil. We can compare this to the cost per child of school education in New Zealand. Private school education costs parents $511.83/week, integrated school education costs parents $161.77/week, and “free” education state schooling costs parents $56.75/week, with the government contribution being $141/week (Patricia Duggan, NZ Herald Jan 20, 2017). On an annual basis the cost of state education is over $10,000 per child, with the government contribution being $7232.

As point of comparison, Rape Prevention Education spent around $133/child in reaching 4682 children with their two flagship programmes BodySafe and Mates & Dates (Rape Prevention Education, 2017). BodySafe (Dickinson, Carroll, Kaiwai Gregory, 2011) is delivered by external facilitators in three one-hour blocks, while Mates & Dates (Duncan and Kingi, 2017) is delivered in five one-hour blocks. While the JSU programme costs appear within a similar range, they include the training and support of classroom teachers who are delivering the programme over an extended time-frame to suit their particular class. Costs will drop as teachers go on to deliver the programme to other classes in future years requiring only shorter refresher trainings and lessened supervision to ensure fidelity of the programme is maintained. In other words, JSU appears to be a very inexpensive programme to run.
6.7 Comparison of the effectiveness of other programmes compared with *Jade Speaks Up*

### 6.7.1 Keeping Ourselves Safe

For many schools the New Zealand Police programme, *Keeping Ourselves Safe (KOS, 2017)*, is very valuable, particularly in dealing with the issue of sexual abuse. The sessions are delivered by local police educators working alongside the teachers and have a long and worthy tradition of supporting teachers to address some of the community issues around violence. *KOS* is an important tool in relationship-building between the police and students in our schools.

Encouraging feedback from the *JSU* pilot was that in some schools which completed *JSU* and then ran *KOS*, police facilitators commented that they were impressed with how the children engaged more in their session. Teachers believed this was a result of having run the *JSU* programme prior to *KOS*. In the area of child wellbeing, where children deserve all the help they can get, programmes such as *JSU* and *KOS* can effectively dovetail.

### 6.7.2 My Friends Resilience

As noted in chapter 1, the *My Friends Resilience (MFR, Barratt, 2012a)* youth programme is unlikely to continue as a MoE supported programme. MFR has some similarity to *JSU*, apart from being targeted at secondary school students (although there is also a version for younger children). Like *JSU*, *MFR youth* is compatible with the NZ Health Curriculum, despite being developed and owned by an Australian group. Teachers were trained to deliver the programme and were supported by Ministry of Education facilitators to keep it on track. A key issue for the programme was that the programme activities needed considerable adaptation to meet the needs of New Zealand students, especially for boys. For the success of early intervention programmes like *MFR* parent engagement is seen as a desirable and important factor (Barrett, 2012b), but unfortunately few opportunities emerged for this. *MFR* with its strong background in evaluation is the only programme that may have been a credible alternative to *JSU*. Even the best of relational programmes does not travel well and can be an awkward guest in other countries. New Zealand children deserve relational programmes that speak to them in their own voice/s.
7 Recommendations and Conclusion

7.1 Introduction
There are several areas of recommendations arising from the research of the 2017 pilot and refined during the project work of 2018.

These are grouped into:
1. Operational recommendations
2. Content of programme
3. Areas to further develop
4. Wider roll-out strategies

7.2 Training and supervisory support for teachers: ensuring that the value of the training and supervision component of the programme is maintained.
Feedback from and supervisory support for teachers was vital, strengthening the engagement with the contents of the programme, effectively managing disclosures and improving the well-being of students.

Our recommendations are:
- Ensure that senior management is included in the training, for at least the first half-day. Involving management added value to the training days, with their comments and participation coming alongside the teachers, assisting the school in making systemic commitment to the programme as leadership understands what the programme entails, and models school management engagement.
- Require that new participating schools prepare for JSU by including Professional Learning Development (PLD) for all teachers on the school’s procedures for implementing policy and procedures of responding to disclosures from or about vulnerable students. Local branches of Oranga Tamariki may play a role in supporting schools with this PLD, also strengthening relationships between school and support agencies.
- Include into the JSU 2019 teachers’ manual a suitable template of practical procedures for teachers re disclosures.
- Continue teacher supervision in the form of two Skype supervision sessions for new teams of teachers and one Skype session for teachers experienced in teaching JSU. When a school is in its second round of programme roll-out, supervision needs are lessened as there are more programme-experienced teachers to mentor the newer staff.
- Create a sustainable and robust process to ensure that a wide pool of trained people can support roll out in regions and expand mentoring for teachers in participating schools.

7.3 Relievers and new staff support
The issue of relievers or new staff members in classes introduced into an ongoing JSU delivery needs further attention. In one class whose teacher was away for an extended time a significant drop in enthusiasm occurred since the reliever, while doing a good job, had not been trained in delivery of the material.

Our recommendations are:
- Include schools’ relieving teachers in PLD about responding to vulnerable children.
- Resource the development of online webinars to increase relievers’ and new staff members’ confidence and competency in delivering the programme.
7.4 Evaluation processes beyond the pilot

In 2018 we have streamlined the evaluation process to shorten student surveys. In 2017 teachers named the positive value of feedback from the CORS results. However, with a greater focus in 2018 on younger students, more adaptations may be needed to ensure these students and ESOL students can effectively respond to the evaluations.

Our recommendations are:

- Ensure in any roll-out of JSU, evaluations are accessible to the cultures of each school community.
- Resource the JSU programme to create an online webinar explaining JSU’s research component.
- Explore the use of the CORS and the 4-item CES-DC tests in longitudinal studies currently undertaken on New Zealand children’s well-being.
- Provide training for teachers to be able to independently use CORS to assist in identifying vulnerable students.

7.5 Content of the programme

7.5.1 Integrating the programme into the curriculum

In the 2018 manual we have placed more emphasis on the cross-curriculum nature of the programme. Each module has guides to allow the work to be integrated into curriculum delivery planning.

Our recommendations are:

- Ensure that the specific links and achievement objectives for the Health Curriculum are clearly identified in the 2019 manual.
- Explore ways in which the manual can increase the possibilities for more extended use of the programme by providing extensions of essential activities and optional activities that will be useful:
  - in classes which have already done the programme in a previous year
  - in deepening new classes’ understanding of and engagement with a module
  - in adapting material for students’ differing age/abilities/experiences.

7.5.2 Adapting Jade Speaks Up to align with cultures of the school

We heard teacher comments such as “this programme aligns to my Māori and Pacific values, so I feel at home with this work”. Informally it was noted that, for Māori and Pacific Island students, having teachers of the same culture helped, particularly in under resourced social and economic environments where aspects of the programme promoted a different approach from the students’ family discipline practices.

Our recommendations are:

- Expand the cultural stories to ensure inclusion of more students.
- Adapt the emotional vocabulary exercises to incorporate more cultures and languages.
- Seek collaborators to translate, adapt and implement the JSU programme in a Te Reo Māori framework for bilingual classes and Kura Kaupapa.
- Make Modules One and Two, with their emphasis on emotional literacy and trust, into a stand-alone resource for any teacher’s use at the beginning of the school year, possibly helping teachers of Years 5-8 students.
- Expand exploration of “Breathe, Think and Do” into mindfulness or similar exercises to support students’ capacity for calming themselves.
- Continue updating suitable current clips from YouTube and other sources to help embed messages of the programme across the curricula.
● Use 2018 and 2019 pilots to further investigate the most appropriate age group and school context, e.g. rural/urban, primary/intermediate, high/low decile schools, for classroom delivery of the programme.

7.6 Areas to further develop

7.6.1 Teacher PLD in skills needed to ensure wellbeing of students
Teachers need to develop effective skills in: listening to students; implementing regular check-ups on all students; discovering basic details of the student’s life (such as friends, family and people they can trust), and what to do when challenges are disclosed. Training needs to be culturally appropriate, in-depth and related to educational pedagogies that emphasise the critical value of relationship education. In high needs communities, we need to recognise the additional burdens that teachers carry and to have more of a community development approach and stronger connections with Oranga Tamariki and other community support agencies.

Our recommendations are:
● Include dealing with disclosures, and culturally responsive and effective relational pedagogy, into basic teacher training and on-going PLD.
● Teachers need support for themselves (not only to enhance student wellbeing) but for coping with disclosures, supporting themselves etc. This this kind of work cannot happen effectively without ongoing PLD for teachers.
● Establish external supervision as part of pastoral care of all teachers, particularly for beginning teachers, new migrant teachers and teachers in high needs communities.
● Incorporate health services, including Social Workers in Schools, nurses and counsellors, into every school to support teachers in the pastoral care of students.
● Build a much closer relationship between schools and Oranga Tamariki and other community support agencies.

7.6.2 Parent engagement
Key messages to parents were integrated into take-home resources such as bookmarks and safety plans. However, more can be done to engage parents in dialogue with the programme.

Our recommendations are:
● Investigate the creation of more effective resources for reaching families/whanau through parent meetings, insertion of parenting tips/ positive discipline principles into school newsletters.
● Increase visibility of agencies that can support parents, school and community.
● Make resources for families more accessible for the range of cultures and literacy levels – clear, visually attractive and brief.

7.7 Further roll-out

7.7.1 Engagement with new and repeating schools
In the implementation of JSU, schools need to plan beyond the first year. For example, intermediate schools may deliver JSU to the whole school every second year. Full primaries may be introducing JSU every year to their Year 5 classes and want a refresher for Year 7 classes. The follow-up data suggests that if all classes in the initial cohort complete the programme at the same time, there is a shift in school culture which helps bring new children on board. Principals and staff will need plenty of time to consider the introduction of JSU to their schools and their curriculum planning stage is usually done in
term 3 of the preceding year. This has significant implications for funding, requiring certainty of resourcing for the following year to be confirmed by June/July.

Our recommendations are:

- Scheduling any approach to school engagement in JSU at least eight months before the February/March introduction or renewal of the programme.
- Schools contract to JSU with a plan that ensures a comprehensive coverage of Year 5-8 children, starting with a whole of cohort coverage and follow-up with delivery of JSU to new children and refreshers to parts of the cohort.
- Training trainers to conduct teacher training and offer supervision to the teachers is seen as high importance for wider roll out. Models for creating structure, support and endorsement of these trainers are to be created to ensure fidelity of delivery and aligned outcomes for the programme.

7.7.2 Building community support around Jade Speaks Up delivery

The issue of enlisting schools’ participation is becoming easier as more material supporting the value of the programme emerges. JSU is unique in supporting this Year 5-8 group with problems of family harm, and simultaneously it is also effective in addressing well-being concerns exposed by our research. Some PB4L personnel and some teachers commented that promoting the programme to schools as a course on respectful relationships and wellbeing could be more effective than promoting the violence prevention approach, as this implies that schools who use JSU are only ones where violence is high.

Our recommendations are:

- Building stronger networks with other service providers and programmes - including PB4L School Wide and the PB4L clip-ons, Health Promoting Schools, the independent programmes (Keeping Ourselves Safe, Health Promoting Schools, Peace Foundation’s Cool Schools), and the Social Workers in Schools and the Resource Teachers Learning Behaviour networks. Such connections will assist cross referrals and can align to working with targeted schools and communities where family harm issues are identified.
- Exploring engagement with Communities of Learning school clusters to nurture localised future sustainability.
- Formalising a community development approach involving multiple community agencies to tackle the major disruptive social concerns affecting school communities. JSU schools made regular references to increased anxiety among students, associations with gangs and drugs and issues of poverty. Strengthening links between Health, Social Services and Education is more important than ever before.
- Opening a discussion with Ministry of Justice around their work with young offenders.

7.7.3 Further investigation and promotion of Jade Speaks Up programme

- Seeking opportunities to share programme findings, as well as publishing them, to promote JSU’s availability through conferences and seminars.
- Investigating the impact of the programme further in relation to decile level. E.g. the Dunedin cohort in 2018 comprises all lower decile schools, more Years 5-6, with much more Pākehā component.

7.7.4 Ensuring best value from all programmes in addressing student wellbeing

While no one programme will be effective for all students in all settings, more ‘joined up’ thinking will be useful when addressing children’s wellbeing.

Our recommendations are:
• Identifying how JSU fits into the latest draft of the New Zealand Health Curriculum. One approach is for Ministry of Education or other national body to create a directory of suitable programmes covering the student’s wellbeing journey from school entry to exit.
• Becoming a PB4L ‘clip-on’ programme with a funding model similar to Restorative Practice, including ongoing evaluation and development support to encourage the trialling of New Zealand designed programmes. Not all international programmes work well in our community.

7.8 Conclusion
When figures indicating the state of student wellbeing in New Zealand show that we have the second highest percentage of school children who are frequently bullied, double the OECD average, and age-standardised rates of admissions to a mental health service for 10-14-year olds rising 63% between 2010 to 2016, faster than any other age group, we have a problem that requires urgent, immediate resolution.

We cannot look to the future with any confidence of a healthy and generative community if we allow this state to continue.

The progress made by children in JSU, the only currently available programme for Years 7 and 8 that has been subject to robust evaluation in this country, demands our attention and our actions. JSU is the only programme available for these intermediate students that is showing signs of changing the direction of decline in the mental health of our children.

We believe that Ministry of Education’s PB4L School Wide programme and Health and Physical Education curriculum provide appropriate and practical frameworks for a roll-out of JSU that would ensure its relevance and sustainability within the education system. Without such security of being embedded in school structures and the curriculum, JSU runs the risk that it will flare for a while, then burn out, to be relegated to the dusty shelves along with all the other programmes that have, in their time, been ‘flavour of the month’.

Whether the ultimate funding support comes from one ministry or multi-ministries, the programme needs to be well supported by appropriate professional development learning for teachers, with robust mental wellbeing back up, and ongoing monitoring and refinement to ensure that the fidelity of the material, its delivery and its quality of outcomes are maintained.

Our children desperately need such support. Today more than ever. We offer the results of our research as evidence that the Jade Speaks Up programme provides a suitable and robust curriculum and delivery to construct the scaffolding for young people to confidently and resiliently face their futures.
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Appendix 1: Questionnaires
Jade Speaks Up child pre-test

1. What is your name?
2. What school year are you in?
3. How old are you?
4. What classroom are you in?
5. Are you a girl or boy?
6. Which of these groups do you belong to? (You can tick more than one box or write it in below)
   - Black
   - Latin American
   - African American
   - Asian
   - Other

7. Match the seven pictures to the emotions they are closest to. Angry, Happy, Disgusted, Surprised, Frightened, Loving, Sad.

![Images of seven faces with different emotions]

8. Below is a list of the ways you might have felt or acted. Please tick how much you have felt this way DURING THE PAST WEEK. (Mark: not at all, a little bit, some, a lot)
   - a) Was bothered by things that usually don’t bother me
   - b) I did not feel like eating, I wasn’t very hungry
   - c) I wasn’t able to feel happy, even when my family or friends tried to help me feel better
   - d) I felt like I was just as good as other kids
   - e) I felt like I couldn’t pay attention to what I was doing

8b. Please tick how much you have felt this way DURING THE PAST WEEK.
   - (Mark: not at all, a little bit, some, a lot)
   - a) I felt down and unhappy
   - b) I felt like I was too tired to do things
   - c) I felt like something good was going to happen
   - d) I felt like things I did before didn’t work out right
   - e) I felt scared

8c. Please tick how much you have felt this way DURING THE PAST WEEK.
   - (Mark: not at all, a little bit, some, a lot)
   - a) I didn’t sleep as well as I usually sleep
   - b) I was happy
   - c) I was more quiet than usual
   - d) I felt lonely like I didn’t have any friends
   - e) I felt like kids I know were not friendly or that they didn’t want to be with me
8d. Please tick how much you have felt this way DURING THE PAST WEEK.
  (Mark: not at all, a little bit, some, a lot)
  a) I had a good time
  b) I felt like crying
  c) I felt sad
  d) I felt people didn’t like me
  e) It was hard to get started doing things

9. Name up to 4 friends who you could trust to ask for help if you needed it?
10. Name up to 4 family members you could trust to ask for help if you needed it? (Please say they are
    your mum, dad, aunt or other relation to you.)
11. Name up to 4 adults (not family members) you could trust to ask for help if you needed it? (Please
    say what role they have such as teacher, coach, friend’s parents)
12. Do you know the phone numbers of the friends or adults (not family members) that you can trust if
    you need help? None of them/some of them/all of them.
13. Do you know somewhere you can go that is safe? Where is this?
14. What things are true about your best friend/s?
    (Mark: mostly not true, not sure/don’t know, mostly true)
    a) They are reliable and consistent
    b) They are popular with others
    c) They care how you feel
    d) They are good listeners
    e) They can’t keep a secret
    f) They look attractive
    g) They get help for you if you are scared
    h) They say something truthful about you that might be a bit uncomfortable to hear
    i) They don’t do what they say they would
15. What things are true about people you can really trust?
    (Mark: mostly not true, not sure/don’t know, mostly true)
    a) They look attractive
    b) They say something truthful about you that might be a bit uncomfortable to hear
    c) They are good listeners
    d) They enjoy your jokes
    e) They don’t do what they say they would
    f) They are reliable and consistent
    g) They are popular with others
    h) They care how you feel
    i) They get help for you if you are scared
    j) They can’t keep a secret
16. How can you tell if someone is angry?
17. How can you tell if someone is sad?
18. How can you tell if someone is frightened?
19. How can you tell if someone is happy?
20. Match the five pictures to the stories they are closest to:

![Five pictures with labels](image)

a) They have just had some good news
b) Something really sad has happened
c) They are annoyed and fed up
d) They want to upset or bully you
e) They have done something stupid

21. What are some ways that you can help yourself feel OK, when you’re feeling down or scared?

(Mark: yes/no)

a) Talk to someone you trust
b) Stop and breathe slowly
c) Get ‘out of it’ on drugs or alcohol
d) Play a game on your phone/computer
e) Pick a fight or start an argument with someone
f) Say kind things to yourself

22. What are some of the things ‘I have a right to be safe’ could mean for you?

(Mark: yes/no/don’t know)

a) It’s not OK to bully or threaten others
b) No-one should ever make me feel scared
c) All kids should be safe all the time and never do anything risky
d) All children should be taught self-defence
e) People should look after me when I am scared
f) I need to be the best at everything

23. Rate how you think people would feel if these things happened to them.

(not upset/could be upset/upset/very upset/extremely upset)

a) Being teased for how you look
b) Being put down or shamed
c) Being beaten in a game or competition
d) Someone being unkind to you
e) Being threatened with text messages
f) Having a spiteful joke made about them
g) Someone making you cry
h) Being left out of games or activities
i) Being criticised for what you do
j) Being punched for what you do
k) Having mean lies told about you
24. How are you doing? How are things going in your life. Please click on one of the circles to let us know. The closer the smiley face, the better things are. The closer the frowny face, things are not so good.

24a Click a circle

Me - how am I doing?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

24b Click a circle

Family - how are things in my family?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

24c Click a circle

School - how am I doing at school?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

24d Click a circle

Everything - how is everything going?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
1. What is your name?
2. What school year are you in?
3. How old are you?
4. What classroom are you in?
5. Are you a girl or boy?
6. Which of these groups do you belong to? (You can tick more than one box or write it in below)
7. Match the seven pictures to the emotions they are closest to. Angry, Happy, Disgusted, Surprised, Frightened, Loving, Sad.

![Image of seven faces]

8a. Below is a list of the ways you might have felt or acted. Please tick how much you have felt this way DURING THE PAST WEEK. (Mark: not at all, a little bit, some, a lot)
   a) Was bothered by things that usually don’t bother me
   b) I did not feel like eating, I wasn’t very hungry
   c) I wasn’t able to feel happy, even when my family or friends tried to help me feel better)
   d) I felt like I was just as good as other kids
   e) I felt like I couldn’t pay attention to what I was doing

8b. Please tick how much you have felt this way DURING THE PAST WEEK.
   (Mark: not at all, a little bit, some, a lot)
   a) I felt down and unhappy
   b) I felt like I was too tired to do things
   c) I felt like something good was going to happen
   d) I felt like things I did before didn’t work out right
   e) I felt scared

8c. Please tick how much you have felt this way DURING THE PAST WEEK.
   (Mark: not at all, a little bit, some, a lot)
   a) I didn’t sleep as well as I usually sleep
   b) I was happy
   c) I was more quiet than usual
   d) I felt lonely like I didn’t have any friends
   e) I felt like kids I know were not friendly or that they didn’t want to be with me
8d. Please tick how much you have felt this way DURING THE PAST WEEK.
(Mark: not at all, a little bit, some, a lot)
   a) I had a good time
   b) I felt like crying
   c) I felt sad
   d) I felt people didn’t like me
   e) It was hard to get started doing things

9. Name up to 4 friends who you could trust to ask for help if you needed it?
10. Name up to 4 family members you could trust to ask for help if you needed it? (Please say they are your mum, dad, aunt or other relation to you.)
11. Name up to 4 adults (not family members) you could trust to ask for help if you needed it? (Please say what role they have such as teacher, coach, friend’s parents)
12. Do you know the phone numbers of the friends or adults (not family members) that you can trust if you need help? None of them/some of them/all of them.
13. Do you know somewhere you can go that is safe? Where is this?
14. What things are true about your best friend/s?
   (Mark: mostly not true, not sure/don’t know, mostly true)
      a) They are reliable and consistent
      b) They are popular with others
      c) They care how you feel
      d) They are good listeners
      e) They can’t keep a secret
      f) They look attractive
      g) They get help for you if you are scared
      h) They say something truthful about you that might be a bit uncomfortable to hear
      i) They don’t do what they say they would

15. What things are true about people you can really trust?
   (Mark: mostly not true, not sure/don’t know, mostly true)
      a) They look attractive
      b) They say something truthful about you that might be a bit uncomfortable to hear
      c) They are good listeners
      d) They enjoy your jokes
      e) They don’t do what they say they would
      f) They are reliable and consistent
      g) They are popular with others
      h) They care how you feel
      i) They get help for you if you are scared
      j) They can’t keep a secret

16. How can you tell if someone is angry?
17. How can you tell if someone is sad?
18. How can you tell if someone is frightened?
19. How can you tell if someone is happy?
20. Match the five pictures to the stories they are closest to:

1. They have just had good news
2. Something really sad has happened
3. They are annoyed and fed up
4. They want to upset or bully you
5. They have done something stupid

a) They have just had some good news
b) Something really sad has happened
c) They are annoyed and fed up
d) They want to upset or bully you
e) They have done something stupid

21. What are some ways that you can help yourself feel OK, when you’re feeling down or scared?
(Mark: yes/no)

a) Talk to someone you trust
b) Stop and breathe slowly
c) Get ‘out of it’ on drugs or alcohol
d) Play a game on your phone/computer
e) Pick a fight or start an argument with someone
f) Say kind things to yourself

22. What are some of the things ‘I have a right to be safe’ could mean for you?
(Mark: yes/no/don’t know)

a) It’s not OK to bully or threaten others
b) No-one should ever make me feel scared
c) All kids should be safe all the time and never do anything risky
d) All children should be taught self-defence
e) People should look after me when I am scared
f) I need to be the best at everything

23. Rate how you think people would feel if these things happened to them.
(not upset/could be upset/upset/very upset/extremely upset)

a) Being teased for how you look
b) Being put down or shamed
c) Being beaten in a game or competition
d) Someone being unkind to you
e) Being threatened with text messages
f) Having a spiteful joke made about them
g) Someone making you cry
h) Being left out of games or activities
i) Being criticised for what you do
j) Being punched for what you do
k) Having mean lies told about you
24. How are you doing? How are things going in your life. Please click on one of the circles to let us know. The closer the smiley face, the better things are. The closer the frowny face, things are not so good.

24a Click a circle

![Me - how am I doing?](circle)

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

24b Click a circle

![Family - how are things in my family?](circle)

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

24c Click a circle

![School - how am I doing at school?](circle)

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

24d Click a circle

![Everything - how is everything going?](circle)

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

25. Since doing the Jade Speaks Up programme how often have you used any of these actions? (not at all/not sure/a little bit/some/a lot)

   a) Made good choices about who your friends are
   b) Asked for help from a friend
   c) Asked for help from an adult you trust
   d) Told someone about your feelings using ‘I feel’
   e) Talked with a friend about your worries
   f) Supported a friend who has a problem
   g) Kept calm in a time when you could have been angry
   h) Made a safety plan and remembered the messages
   i) Kept yourself safe in a frightening situation
26. If you were scared of someone what would you do?  
(Mark: not at all/not sure/a little bit/some/a lot)  
   a) Walk away when they were there  
   b) Ask for a friend to help sort things out  
   c) Go to a safe place  
   d) Call for help  
   e) Talk to an adult about what happened when you could  
   f) Just breathe and keep calm  
   g) Talk to the person you are scared of  

27. What do you think would happen next?  

28. While you have been doing the Jade Speaks Up programme.  
(Mark: not at all/not sure/a little bit/some/a lot)  
   a) How interesting was it?  
   b) How much fun was it?  
   c) How helpful was it?  

29. Tell us what was not so good about Jade Speaks Up  

30. Tell us what was helpful, interesting or fun about Jade Speaks Up  

31. Would you recommend this course to a friend? (yes/maybe/no)
Jade Speaks Up child follow-up test

1. What is your name?
2. What school year are you in?
3. How old are you?
4. What classroom are you in?
5. Are you a girl or boy?
6. Which of these groups do you belong to? (You can tick more than one box or write it in below)
7a. Below is a list of the ways you might have felt or acted. Please tick how much you have felt this way DURING THE PAST WEEK. (Mark: not at all, a little bit, some, a lot)
   a) Was bothered by things that usually don’t bother me
   b) I did not feel like eating, I wasn’t very hungry
   c) I wasn’t able to feel happy, even when my family or friends tried to help me feel better)
   d) I felt like I was just as good as other kids
   e) I felt like I couldn’t pay attention to what I was doing
7b. Please tick how much you have felt this way DURING THE PAST WEEK. (Mark: not at all, a little bit, some, a lot)
   f) I felt down and unhappy
   g) I felt like I was too tired to do things
   h) I felt like something good was going to happen
   i) I felt like things I did before didn’t work out right
   j) I felt scared
7c. Please tick how much you have felt this way DURING THE PAST WEEK. (Mark: not at all, a little bit, some, a lot)
   f) I didn’t sleep as well as I usually sleep
   g) I was happy
   h) I was more quiet than usual
   i) I felt lonely like I didn’t have any friends
   j) I felt like kids I know were not friendly or that they didn’t want to be with me
7d. Please tick how much you have felt this way DURING THE PAST WEEK. (Mark: not at all, a little bit, some, a lot)
   f) I had a good time
   g) I felt like crying
   h) I felt sad
   i) I felt people didn’t like me
   j) It was hard to get started doing things
8. Name up to 4 friends who you could trust to ask for help if you needed it?
9. Name up to 4 family members you could trust to ask for help if you needed it? (Please say they are your mum, dad, aunt or other relation to you.)
10. Name up to 4 adults (not family members) you could trust to ask for help if you needed it? (Please say what role they have such as teacher, coach, friend’s parents)
11. Do you know the phone numbers of the friends or adults (not family members) that you can trust if you need help? None of them/some of them/all of them.
12. Do you know somewhere you can go that is safe? Where is this?
13. How are you doing? How are things going in your life. Please click on one of the circles to let us know. The closer the smiley face, the better things are. The closer the frowny face, things are not so good.

13a Click a circle

Me - how am I doing?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

13b Click a circle

Family - how are things in my family?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

13c Click a circle

School - how am I doing at school?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

13d Click a circle

Everything - how is everything going?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

14. If you were scared of someone what would you do? (Mark: not at all/not sure/a little bit/some/a lot)

   a) Walk away when they were there
   b) Ask for a friend to help sort things out
   c) Go to a safe place
   d) Call for help
   e) Talk to an adult about what happened when you could
   f) Just breathe and keep calm
   g) Talk to the person you are scared of

15. What do you think would happen next?
Jade Speaks Up child post-test class as usual

1. What is your name?
2. What school year are you in?
3. How old are you?
4. What classroom are you in?
5. Are you a girl or boy?
6. Which of these groups do you belong to? (You can tick more than one box or write it in below)
7. Match the seven pictures to the emotions they are closest to. Angry, Happy, Disgusted, Surprised, Frightened, Loving, Sad.

![Picture of emotions]

8a. Below is a list of the ways you might have felt or acted. Please tick how much you have felt this way DURING THE PAST WEEK. (Mark: not at all, a little bit, some, a lot)
   a) Was bothered by things that usually don’t bother me
   b) I did not feel like eating, I wasn’t very hungry
   c) I wasn’t able to feel happy, even when my family or friends tried to help me feel better)
   d) I felt like I was just as good as other kids
   e) I felt like I couldn’t pay attention to what I was doing

8b. Please tick how much you have felt this way DURING THE PAST WEEK. (Mark: not at all, a little bit, some, a lot)
   a) I felt down and unhappy
   b) I felt like I was too tired to do things
   c) I felt like something good was going to happen
   d) I felt like things I did before didn’t work out right
   e) I felt scared

8c. Please tick how much you have felt this way DURING THE PAST WEEK. (Mark: not at all, a little bit, some, a lot)
   a) I didn’t sleep as well as I usually sleep
   b) I was happy
   c) I was more quiet than usual
   d) I felt lonely like I didn’t have any friends
   e) I felt like kids I know were not friendly or that they didn’t want to be with me
8d. Please tick how much you have felt this way DURING THE PAST WEEK.
   (Mark: not at all, a little bit, some, a lot)
   a) I had a good time
   b) I felt like crying
   c) I felt sad
   d) I felt people didn’t like me
   e) It was hard to get started doing things

9. Name up to 4 friends who you could trust to ask for help if you needed it?

10. Name up to 4 family members you could trust to ask for help if you needed it? (Please say they are your mum, dad, aunt or other relation to you.)

11. Name up to 4 adults (not family members) you could trust to ask for help if you needed it? (Please say what role they have such as teacher, coach, friend’s parents)

12. Do you know the phone numbers of the friends or adults (not family members) that you can trust if you need help? None of them/some of them/all of them.

13. Do you know somewhere you can go that is safe? Where is this?

14. What things are true about your best friend/s?
   (Mark: mostly not true, not sure/don’t know, mostly true)
   a) They are reliable and consistent
   b) They are popular with others
   c) They care how you feel
   d) They are good listeners
   e) They can’t keep a secret
   f) They look attractive
   g) They get help for you if you are scared
   h) They say something truthful about you that might be a bit uncomfortable to hear
   i) They don’t do what they say they would

15. What things are true about people you can really trust?
   (Mark: mostly not true, not sure/don’t know, mostly true)
   a) They look attractive
   b) They say something truthful about you that might be a bit uncomfortable to hear
   c) They are good listeners
   d) They enjoy your jokes
   e) They don’t do what they say they would
   f) They are reliable and consistent
   g) They are popular with others
   h) They care how you feel
   i) They get help for you if you are scared
   j) They can’t keep a secret

16. How can you tell if someone is angry?

17. How can you tell if someone is sad?

18. How can you tell if someone is frightened?

19. How can you tell if someone is happy?
20. Match the five pictures to the stories they are closest to:

1. They have just had good news
2. Something really sad has happened
3. They are annoyed and fed up
4. They want to upset or bully you
5. They have done something stupid

a) They have just had some good news
b) Something really sad has happened
c) They are annoyed and fed up
d) They want to upset or bully you
e) They have done something stupid

21. What are some ways that you can help yourself feel OK, when you’re feeling down or scared? (Mark: yes/no)
   a) Talk to someone you trust
   b) Stop and breathe slowly
   c) Get ‘out of it’ on drugs or alcohol
   d) Play a game on your phone/computer
   e) Pick a fight or start an argument with someone
   f) Say kind things to yourself

22. What are some of the things ‘I have a right to be safe’ could mean for you? (Mark: yes/no/don’t know)
   a) It’s not OK to bully or threaten others
   b) No-one should ever make me feel scared
   c) All kids should be safe all the time and never do anything risky
   d) All children should be taught self-defence
   e) People should look after me when I am scared
   f) I need to be the best at everything

23. Rate how you think people would feel if these things happened to them. (not upset/could be upset/upset/very upset/extremely upset)
   a) Being teased for how you look
   b) Being put down or shamed
   c) Being beaten in a game or competition
   d) Someone being unkind to you
   e) Being threatened with text messages
   f) Having a spiteful joke made about them
   g) Someone making you cry
   h) Being left out of games or activities
   i) Being criticised for what you do
   j) Being punched for what you do
   k) Having mean lies told about you
24. How are you doing? How are things going in your life. Please click on one of the circles to let us know. The closer the smiley face, the better things are. The closer the frowny face, things are not so good.

24a Click a circle

Me - how am I doing?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○

24b Click a circle

Family - how are things in my family?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○

24c Click a circle

School - how am I doing at school?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○

24d Click a circle

Everything - how is everything going?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○

25. Over the past two months how often have you used any of these actions?
   (not at all/not sure/a little bit/some/a lot)

   a) Made good choices about who your friends are
   b) Asked for help from a friend
   c) Asked for help from an adult you trust
   d) Told someone about your feelings using ‘I feel’
   e) Talked with a friend about your worries
   f) Supported a friend who has a problem
   g) Kept calm in a time when you could have been angry
   h) Made a safety plan and remembered the messages
   i) Kept yourself safe in a frightening situation
26. If you were scared of someone what would you do?  
(Mark: not at all/not sure/a little bit/some/a lot) 
   a) Walk away when they were there  
   b) Ask for a friend to help sort things out  
   c) Go to a safe place  
   d) Call for help  
   e) Talk to an adult about what happened when you could  
   f) Just breathe and keep calm  
   g) Talk to the person you are scared of  

27. What do you think would happen next?
Jade Speaks Up teacher pre-programme response form

1. Name
2. School and Classroom
3. What programmes this year and last year have students in your class used or attended that build student confidence around keeping safe?
   - Keeping ourselves safe
   - Cool schools
   - DARE/Life education
   - Other (please name)
4. Tell us about your class. How many children
   [minimal (0-5%)/some (6-25%)/around half (26-75%)/many-most (76-95%)/nearly all-all (96-100%)]
   a) Have frequent anger issues?
   b) Are supportive of children who are struggling to keep up?
   c) Have indicated non-school issues of concern?
   d) Know how to keep themselves safe?
   e) Are regularly disruptive in class?
   f) Are often bullied?
   g) Are often sick?
   h) Have supportive parents/caregivers?
   i) Able to ask for help have a low level of literacy for their age?
   k) Are able to talk about their feelings?
5. What other things apart from the above are special features of your class?
6. How helpful were the following features of the Jade Speaks Up training session?
   (not at all/not sure/slightly helpful/helpful/very helpful)
   a) How to respond to disclosures of abuse/issues
   b) Understanding of family violence
   c) Clarity about how the JSU programme is delivered
   d) Clarity about involvement with evaluation
   e) The training session overall
7. Please comment on the things you found helpful/not helpful about the training session.
8. You have been assigned two students (student 1 and student 2) to monitor closely. Looking back over the last week, including today, please give your observation of how these two students have been by rating how well they have been doing in the following areas of life, where marks to the left represent low levels and marks to the right indicate high level.

8a. Individually - personal well-being
   1  2  3  4  5  6  7  8  9  10
   low ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ high

8b. Interpersonally - family, close relationships
   1  2  3  4  5  6  7  8  9  10
   low ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ high

8c. Socially - school, friendships
   1  2  3  4  5  6  7  8  9  10
   low ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ high

8d. Overall - general sense of well-being
   1  2  3  4  5  6  7  8  9  10
   low ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ high

8e. Does student 1 have:
   (no/not sure/one person/two people/more than two people)
   a) Family members who they can trust to ask for help if needed it? (e.g. dad, aunt or other relations)
   b) Friends who they can trust to ask for help if needed it?
   c) Adults (not family members) they can trust to ask for help if you needed it? (e.g. teacher, coach, friend’s parents?)

8f. Does student 1 know somewhere they can go that is safe? Where is this?
9. Student 2

9a. Individually - personal well-being

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
low ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ high

9b. Interpersonally - family, close relationships

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
low ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ high

9c. Socially - school, friendships

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
low ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ high

9d. Overall - general sense of well-being

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
low ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ high

9e. Does student 2 have:
(no/not sure/one person/two people/more than two people)

a) Family members who they can trust to ask for help if needed it? (e.g. dad, aunt or other relations)

b) Friends who they can trust to ask for help if needed it?

c) Adults (not family members) they can trust to ask for help if you needed it? (e.g. teacher, coach, friend’s parents?)

9f. Does student 2 know somewhere they can go that is safe? Where is this?
Jade Speaks Up teacher post-programme response form

1. Name
2. School and Classroom
3. What things are special features of your class?
4. How helpful were the following features of the Jade Speaks Up programme? (not at all/not sure/slightly helpful/helpful/very helpful)
   a) The training sessions
   b) The weekly classroom teaching session
   c) The feedback form the CORS assessment
   d) The Jade Speaks Up video
   e) The module on keeping myself safe
   f) The module on safely planning for home and school
   g) The module on choices to keep myself and others safe
   h) The session on review and evaluation
   i) External support person researcher/trainer support
   j) Student journals
   k) Extension activities
   l) Hand out materials e.g. bookmark, safety plan, stickers
5. Please comment on the things that you found helpful/not helpful (in above question) about the Jade Speaks Up programme.
6. What things have changed over the period of the Jade Speaks Up programme. What change overall has there been with regard to children. (much worse/a bit worse/about the same/a bit better/much better)
   a) Having frequent anger issues?
   b) Being often sick?
   c) Being often bullied?
   d) Having supportive parents/caregivers?
   e) Being supportive of children who are struggling to keep up?
   f) Being able to talk about their feelings?
   g) Being able to ask for help?
   h) Having a low level of literacy for their age?
   i) Knowing how to keep themselves safe?
   j) Being regularly disruptive in class?
   k) Having indicated non-school issues of concern?
7. What changes have you noticed in your class as a whole over the period of Jade Speaks Up programme, that might be due to the programme?
8. You have been assigned two students (student 1 and student 2) to monitor closely. Looking back over the last week, including today, please give your observation of how these two students have been by rating how well they have been doing in the following areas of life, where marks to the left represent low levels and marks to the right indicate high level.
8a. Individually - personal well-being
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
   low ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ high

8b. Interpersonally - family, close relationships
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
   low ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ high

8c. Socially - school, friendships
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
   low ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ high

8d. Overall - general sense of well-being
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
   low ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ high

8e. Does student 1 have:
   (no/not sure/one person/two people/more than two people)
   a) Family members who they can trust to ask for help if needed it? (e.g. dad, aunt or other relations)
   b) Friends who they can trust to ask for help if needed it?
   c) Adults (not family members) they can trust to ask for help if you needed it? (e.g. teacher, coach, friend’s parents?)

8f. Does student 1 know somewhere they can go that is safe? Where is this?

8g. What is your impression of the change (if any) in student 1’s ability to keep themselves safe?

8h. Any other comment or observation about change that has occurred for student 1.
9. Student 2

9a Individually - personal well-being

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

low ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ high

9b. Interpersonally - family, close relationships

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

low ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ high

9c. Socially - school, friendships

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

low ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ high

9d. Overall - general sense of well-being

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

low ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ high

9e. Does student 2 have:
(no/not sure/one person/two people/more than two people)

a) Family members who they can trust to ask for help if needed it? (e.g. dad, aunt or other relations)
b) Friends who they can trust to ask for help if needed it?
c) Adults (not family members) they can trust to ask for help if you needed it? (e.g. teacher, coach, friend’s parents?)

9f. Does student 2 know somewhere they can go that is safe? Where is this?

9g. What is your impression of the change (if any) in student 2's ability to keep themselves safe?

9h. Any other comment or observation about change that has occurred for student 2?

10. Overall, how practical was the programme to implement?
(not practical/quite difficult/practical with extra resources/practical with existing resources/no problem)

11. Overall, what is your view of the value of Jade Speaks Up Programme?
(no value, some/ value for a small number of children/some value for a minority of children/considerable value for a minority of children/some value for a majority of children/considerable value for a majority of children)

12. Please comment on your reasons for your ratings in the last two questions and suggestion for changes to improve the delivery of the programme.
Jade Speaks Up teacher follow-up programme response form

1. Name
2. School and Classroom
3. Tell us about your class. Over the last month how many children:
   [minimal (0-5%)/some (6-25%)/around half (26-75%)/many-most (76-95%)/nearly all-all (96-100%)]
   a) Able to ask for help?
   b) Have a low level of literacy?
   c) Are able to talk about their feelings?
   d) Are supportive of children who are struggling to keep up?
   e) Are often sick?
   f) Are often bullied?
   g) Are regularly disruptive in class?
   h) Know how to keep themselves safe?
   i) Have frequent anger issues?
   j) Have indicated non-school issues of concern?
   k) Have supportive parents/caregivers?

5. What things have changed over the last six months? What change overall has there been with regard to children.
   (much worse/a bit worse/about the same/a bit better/much better)
   a) Having frequent anger issues?
   b) Being often sick?
   c) Being often bullied?
   d) Having supportive parents/caregivers?
   e) Being supportive of children who are struggling to keep up?
   f) Being able to talk about their feelings?
   g) Being able to ask for help?
   h) Having a low level of literacy for their age?
   i) Knowing how to keep themselves safe?
   j) Being regularly disruptive in class?
   k) Having indicated non-school issues of concern?

6. What changes have you noticed in your class as a whole over the last six months that might be due to the Jade Speaks Up programme?

7. Overall, what is your view of the value of Jade Speaks Up Programme?
   (no value, some/ value for a small number of children/some value for a minority of children/considerable value for a minority of children/some value for a majority of children/considerable value for a majority of children)

8. Please comment on your reasons for your ratings in the last two questions and suggestion for changes to improve the delivery of the programme.
Jade Speaks Up Interview Questions

First supervision outline:
- Narrative and what’s working well
- Challenges
- Solutions
- Looking forward
- Research discussion

Second supervision outline:
- Where are you and your students now?
- Popular parts of programme
- Observation Students
- Overall teachers comment
- Modifications

Outline of questions for teachers post programme interviews May 2017

1. **What was like running the JSU programme?**
   (prompts: the training, setting it up, first day, doing the CORS assessment, feedback from the CORS, supervision sessions, the two children selected for close attention, the last session, connection with children in your class)
   - Did the JSU training and supervision help you in your delivery of the programme? How? Eg debriefing with other teachers?
   - Were there any skills or tools that you have picked up through JSU that you have found useful in engaging your students?
   - How helpful was it for you to see the CORS data on your students?
   - In what ways were you able to use this information? What were your beliefs about the wellbeing of the students in your class prior to doing the JSU programme? What are your beliefs about the wellbeing of the students as a result of seeing the CORS data?
   - Has your participation in JSU contributed to the way you are relating with the children in your classroom since? If yes, how?
   - Has your participation in JSU contributed to the ways the students are relating to you? Each other? If yes, how?

2. **How did the children in your class respond to JSU programme?**
   (Prompts: doing the questionnaires at beginning and the end, doing the CORS assessments, doing the JSU activities, using the JSU skills outside the JSU sessions or outside the classroom, disclosures around unsafe situations, specific instances of change connected to the programme, general well-being of the class)
   - Overall how would you rate the student’s engagement with the programme out of 10. Tell us more... what did you see or hear that demonstrated their engagement
   - What did you see or hear that demonstrated lack of engagement?
   - Has your participation in JSU contributed to the ways the students are relating to you? Each other? If yes, how?
3. **What were the major challenges in implementing the JSU programme?**
   (Prompts: training, uncooperative children, communication issues, timing, timetables and having to make modifications (which were?), sickness/relievers, coping with disclosures)?
   - What can you remember from your initial teacher training or any PLD since that prepared you to deal with FV, disclosures, vulnerable children
   - What changes if any did you make to the programme as you taught it?
   - How many and of what type of disclosures and what happened as a result. Has the level of disclosures changed as a result of JSU?

4. **What, if anything, would help the programme run better?**
   (Prompts: training around FV and vulnerable children,
   - timing, synchrony with other part of the curriculum,
   - wider recognition of the importance of contribution of JSU content to children’s learning in general, more resources (which are?)
   - Was anything not helpful about the JSU training and supervision? Was there anything else that would have been helpful for you to know?
   - Has your participation in the JSU programme contributed to ways you teach other parts of the school curriculum? If yes, how?

   What changes would you suggest to the programme or its training for future roll-out?

**6 Month Follow up teacher interview questionnaire**

**Impacts on class culture in the last 6 months:**
- E.g. Student empathy, problem solving, resiliency, use of emotional vocabulary, willingness to talk about personal issues with an adult
  - Do they think that the older children are more vulnerable, and if so why?
  - What is the impact of the JSU animation and the video stories on the children?
  - What stories resonated and what ones didn’t?

**Impact on teaching pedagogy in the last 6 months** - changes to your teaching style and relationship - relating with students - as individuals? As a class? Interacting with other students from other classes?

**Evidence of student application of strategies**
- Disclosures since the end of the programme:
  - How many and of what type?
  - Has the level of disclosures changed as a result of JSU.
  - What feedback from Management/ outside agencies did you receive since the disclosure?
  - To what extent did the CORS feedback, prompt a discussion with a child, did the child recognise the connection between doing CORS and the conversation?

**In retrospect are there any changes you would make to JSU programme**
- Training day - was one day enough? Would a second day half way through be possible and valuable?
- Manual content - 5 modules, relevance to your students. Missing topics?
- Extension activities - which of these were significant and led to deeper conversations or higher order thinking? Can you give examples of the conversations or comments/ further questions the students came up with?
- Curriculum alignment or links made to other curricula threads where could /would you take the students in their learning after completing JSU?
- Classroom facilitation - comment on opportunities for working in small groups vs full class. Team teaching. Fitting with school timetables. Relievers/teacher aides.

**Supervision sessions and collegial support:**
- How could the Supervision Sessions (Skype) be made most relevant and useful for you as teachers?
- What other support was offered to you within your school eg staff meetings specifically around at risk children, peer support/ suggestions on programme

**Impact of JSU on you personally both positive and negative?**
- Feelings of overwhelm, sleeplessness, feeling a need for more support, or knowing this has made a change to your relationship with students - how?
- Seeing or hearing a change in collegial support or conversations?
- Increased trust environment in classroom?

- **Any changes you would make in respect to the research?**
  parental consent/ opt out
  Informing teachers initially
  Gaining Student consent
  Frequency and length of questionnaires
  Use of CORS

Schools interest in 2018 roll out
Other schools you are aware of who might be interested in JSU
Consent Form - Children

How effective is the Jade Speaks Up school’s programme in helping keep children safe?

I have had the research project explained to me and I have read and understand the information sheet that has been given to me.

I understand that I don’t have to be part of this research if I don’t want to.

I understand that if I give consent I can withdraw from the research at any time and that I do not need to give a reason for my decision. I understand that any data collected before consent is withdrawn may be used in the study.

I understand that everything I say is confidential to the researchers and that nothing in the reports will identify me or my family. A final report will be written, which will totally protect my anonymity and that of my parents.

I understand that I can will be able to access summary or the full report through the Violence Free Communities Jade Speaks Up website.

I am aware that I may contact the Research Leader, Dr Geoff Bridgman, at Unitec, (09) 815-4321 ext 5071 if I have any queries about the project or send an email to jadespeaksup@violencefreecommunities.org.

I have had time to consider everything and I give my consent to be a part of this.

Participant’s Name………………………………………………………………………….

Signature: ……………………………………… Date: …………………………

Project Researcher: ………………………… Date: ……………………………

This study has been approved by the Accident Compensation Corporation Ethics Committee from 10/10/2016 to 31/12/2017. If you have any complaints or reservations about the ethical conduct of this research, you may contact the Committee through the ACC Ethics Committee Secretary Dr Neonila Panko (Tel (04) 816 6743). Any issues you raise will be treated in confidence and investigated fully, and you will be informed of the outcome.
Consent Form – Teachers

How effective is the Jade Speaks Up school’s programme in helping keep children safe?

I have had the research project explained to me and I have read and understand the information sheet that has been given to me.

I understand that I don’t have to be part of this research if I don’t want to.

I understand that if I give consent I can withdraw from the research at any time and that I do not need to give a reason for my decision. I understand that any data collected before consent is withdrawn may be used in the study.

I understand that everything I say or write is confidential to the researchers and that nothing in the reports will identify me or people connected to me. A final report will be written, which will totally protect my anonymity and that of students and their parents or guardians.

I understand that only reason for breaking confidentiality is under the Vulnerable Children’s Act (2014) where the researchers have to release information to school authorities because a significant act of violence or potential violence has been reported to them. I understand that none of the questions in the research ask children to report on this, so it is very unlikely that that the Vulnerable Children’s Act will be invoked.

I understand that I can will be able to access summary or the full report through the Violence Free Communities Jade Speaks Up website.

I understand that I can contact the Research Leader, Dr Geoff Bridgman, at Unitec, (09) 815-4321 ext 5071 if I have any queries about the project or send an email to jadespeaksup@violencefreecommunities.org

I have had time to consider everything and I give my consent to be a part of this.

Teacher’s Name: .................................................................

School: ........................................  class: ..............................

Teacher’s Signature: ..............................  Date: ..............................

Project Researcher: ..............................  Date: ..............................

This study has been approved by the Accident Compensation Corporation Ethics Committee from 10/10/2016 to 31/12/2017. If you have any complaints or reservations about the ethical conduct of this research, you may contact the Committee through the ACC Ethics Committee Secretary Dr Neonila Panko (Tel (04) 816 6743). Any issues you raise will be treated in confidence and investigated fully, and you will be informed of the outcome.
Memorandum of Understanding

Violence Free Communities

PO Box 21920
Henderson
Waitakere 0650
Ph 8374849
www.violencefreecommunities.org

Letter of agreement between and Violence Free Communities regarding the introduction and evaluation of “Jade Speaks Up”.

1) “Jade Speaks Up” Schools Programme

Background:
“Jade Speaks Up (JSU) is a 5 week programme designed for students in Years 7-8 to teach transferable pro-social skills and attitudes to young people about responding to the violence and potential violence in their worlds.

With support from ACC, the JSU programme is in its pilot stage and subsequent to the results of the evaluations, is anticipated to be rolled out nationally in 2018.

Project Outline
Aims. The aim of the project is to evaluate change in emotional literacy, safety skills, global distress and access to protection resources resulting from the introduction of the JSU programme

Methods and Design:
Participants: For the full project we aim recruit 1066 10-12-year-old children attending years 6-8 classes in New Zealand schools (40 classrooms and teachers). These children will be drawn from at least four schools in the Northern half of the North Island including at least one rural/small town school. Ideally only schools already engaged with the Ministry of Education’s Positive Behaviour for Learning (PB4L) will be approached. School selection will also be determined (using 2015 Education Counts data), where there are options, by the degree to which the sample matches the demographic of New Zealand 10-12 year olds in age, gender and culture.

Participants will be divided in each school into two equal class groups, one class as usual (the control group) and one receiving the JSU programme (the experimental group). Selection of who would be in each group would be the responsibility of the school. We expect an attrition rate of 25%, between selection and post-test leaving some 400 children in both groups. If the JSU programme group is successful at post-test, the programme would then be offered to the control group (class as usual) participants.

Method. The full project uses pre- and post- programme and follow-up (6-months later) student and teacher questionnaires and qualitative data drawn from training and support conversations with
teachers. The questionnaires (tick box and open-ended questions) are designed to assess the change in students exposed to the Jade Speaks Up programme.

The student questionnaires (pre-, post- and follow-up) will be conducted as an online questionnaire, and have the components shown in Table 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 1: Questionnaire components</th>
<th>JSU programme</th>
<th>Class as usual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>pre-test</td>
<td>post-test</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demographic questions: school, decile, class, age, gender, culture.</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional literacy questions: two picture based and a four short answer questions.</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protection resources: five short answer questions.</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety skills questions: five tick box questions</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measures of global distress: the 20-item Center for Epidemiologic Studies’ Depression Scale for Children (CES-DC; Weissman, Orvaschel, &amp; Padian, 1980) and the Child Outcomes Rating Scale (Duncan, Sparks et al, 2006).</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcome scenario</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rating and comment questions on the overall value of JSU</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Teacher questionnaires. Only the 20 JSU programme teachers (possibly augmented by support staff - programme facilitators) will be part of the research. On the basis of the pre-test 40 JSU programme children will be randomly chosen (2 children per class) for closer attention from the teacher. We seek, through a questionnaire, a teacher’s view of the progress these two children have made. The pre-programme teacher questionnaire assesses the following using a mix of tick box and comment questions:

- Pre-existing conditions that might affect the value and uptake of the programme such as previous keeping ourselves safe programmes and the atmosphere of the class.
- Perceived value of the training
- Knowledge of protective resources and teacher CORS wellbeing assessment for two selected students.

The post-programme teacher questionnaire assesses the following using a mix of tick box and comment questions:

- Perceived value of the training and implementation of the programme
- Knowledge of protective resources and teacher CORS wellbeing assessment for two selected students - repeat of pre-test, plus descriptions of change that may have occurred.

The follow-up questionnaire to teachers will be a reduced form of the post-test covering

- Classroom conditions (repeat of the pre-test) that may have changed as a function of Jade Speaks Up
- Global assessment of programme effectiveness.

In addition, the researchers will have conversations with teachers and programme facilitators (email, skype, face-to-face) at the training, two and four weeks into the programme and at the end of the programme. These conversations are aimed at answering the “how’s it going” question, as well as identifying any issues of concern for children. However, this contact won’t be structured as narrative
interve

This project outline and the Information sheet for Teachers, Programme Facilitators and School Administrators (attached), provide the background information necessary for this agreement.

2) Time-line
- All teachers involved with the first run through of the pilot (Not the Class as Usual group) and relevant support staff (e.g., Guidance, health, SENCOs, SWIS and Deans) will participate in a one-day PLD orientation to the programme to be held in Term One, 2017. This is being held with participating schools on both 21st or 23rd February in Henderson, 9:30-4:00.
- ... classes will commence JSU from Week 6, Term One, 2017 and conduct the programme with their students over the following five weeks.
- The school agrees to supporting all participating students and teachers to complete the evaluation processes identified in the project outline above and the time-line detailed in Process of engagement with schools re JSU Pilot.
- ... classes in Year .......(approximately ......students) will be involved in the overall Jade Speaks Up Programme. .......composite classes (approximately ...... students) will be involved in working through the programme in Term One, with a similar control group (Class as Usual) for first iteration. The second iteration will commence at the beginning of Term Two in 2017.
- The training team will meet either in person or via skype with the participating teachers and programme facilitators two times during the programme roll out for supervision and debriefing as per the information sheet for teachers, programme facilitators and school administrators.
- For key dates and times for the programme roll out refer to separate page Process of engagement with schools re JSU Pilot.
- The same sequence of PLD and conducting the programme over 5 weeks will be repeated for the Class as Usual group at either the beginning of term 2 (May).

3) Publication
In consultation with ........................., Violence Free Communities retains the right to the use and publication data generated by this research.

4. Costs:
Are covered for this iteration by Violence Free Communities’ contract with ACC. If additional sessions are required with parents or staff, which are outside the ACC contract, a fee will be negotiated with the school. VFC will contribute $100 release costs for each teacher involved in the PLD course.

5. Tasks:
Teachers, programme facilitators and school administrators:
These are set out above and in the Information sheet for Teachers, Programme Facilitators and School Administrators. At the beginning of Term One 2017 an information letter will be sent home to the parents of children who will be partaking in JSU. This will include:
- Information about JSU (this must include the parents / guardian information sheets provided by the project).
A parent consent/opt out form for their child to be involved in the evaluation research. Both these above will also be promoted through school’s social media channels with opportunities for parents to opt out online or by telephone.

If requested, an additional session led by Violence Free Communities on “Meet The Parents” evening could be arranged and also If requested by the Board, Violence Free Communities will attend the BOT meeting.

Children

- As set out above, evaluation will involve an online pre- and post-programme online questionnaires for both the JSU group and the class as usual group as well as 6 months follow-up online questionnaire for the JSU group.
- All children involved in the programme evaluation will sign the children’s consent forms. Participation in the programme itself is not subject to consent.

6. Contacts for the project
In the first instance contact Project Manager, Elaine Dyer 4168774 or by email to jadespeaksup@violencefreecommunities.org. Also you can contact Research Leader, Geoff Bridgman gbridgman@unitec.ac.nz 8154321 extn 7464.

Signed

_________________________________________Date: ____________________

_________________________ Principal

_________________________________________Date: ____________________

Project Manager, Jade Speaks Up, Violence Free Communities
Information for children

Evaluation of the Jade Speaks Up school’s programme in helping to keep children safe

Tena Koe, Talofa Lava, Malo e Lelei, Fakalofa Lahi Aatu, Kia Orana, Namaste, Ni hao, Hello!

A new programme has come to your school!

Your class is going to do a 6-week programme called "Jade Speaks Up”. This about helping kids in New Zealand be even safer! We want to know what you think about this programme.

What sorts of things will I be learning?

You will learn more about how to keep yourself safe at school, in the community and at home. You will create a personal safety plan. There are some great things to do, watch, listen to and work together on. There is a short film to watch, and we have book marks and stickers for you to keep.

What do I have to do?

You will fill in three easy questionnaires on a computer.
✓ one before you start on the programme
✓ one at the end of the programme
✓ one 6-months later.
✓ twice during the course, you will also fill out a quick scale to check out how you are going.

What difference will this programme make?

We know that if you feel safe many worries are pretty much gone. When you are feeling good about yourself and good about other people, most kids are happier and more ready to build friendships, learn better and enjoy being at school.

Your class is one of the first classes in New Zealand to assess this programme. The answers you provide in the questionnaires will help us decide what to do next.

Who will know about this?

When we finish the study we will write up what was learned. This will be shared with the school, the parents and other schools. No names will be in the reports. There will be nothing that could identify you or your family. Only the researchers will know you have written.
Do I have to do the questionnaires?

No. You don’t have to do the questionnaires if you don’t want to. You can also stop doing the questionnaires, even if you had already agreed to do them.

Further information

You can find out more about this programme by looking at:

✓ Our face-book page (https://www.facebook.com/Jade-Speaks-Up-697406863651179/)

✓ The Violence Free Communities website (http://www.violencefreecommunities.org/jade-speaks-up/).

✓ The special website just for Jade Speaks Up http://www.jadespeaksup.co.nz

✓ The film about the evaluation and programme https://youtu.be/ZSGsUmGxLYg

You can contact me, Elaine Dyer, at jadespeaksup@violencefreecommunities.org for more information about the project.

If you have concerns about our evaluation project contact the research leader: Dr Geoff Bridgman, by telephone 09 815 4321 ext. #7464 or by email at gbridgman@unitec.ac.nz

Thank you!

This study has been approved by the Accident Compensation Corporation Ethics Committee from 10/10/2016 to 31/12/2017. If you have any complaints or reservations about the ethical conduct of this research, you may contact the Committee through the ACC Ethics Committee Secretary Dr Neonila Panko (Tel (04) 816 6743). Any issues you raise will be treated in confidence and investigated fully, and you will be informed of the outcome.
Information for parents and guardians

“Jade Speaks Up” is an educational programme about domestic violence and helping our students deal with dangerous situations confidently.

The programme will be delivered by class teachers during class time in Term 1 and 2.

Your child’s class will be part of one module per week for five weeks. The students will be surveyed four times during this time.

All the survey data will be held confidentially by UNITEC Auckland and none of the information given will identify anyone personally.

For more information read the detailed information to parents that is attached to this email/leaflet

You can also go to www.jadespeaksup.co.nz or look at their programme trailer on https://youtube/SG3Eul7txvY or the clip regarding the evaluation on https://youtu.be/ZSGsUmGxLYg

If you do not wish your child to participate, please return this email or letter with “non-participant” in the title line. If you do not reply by 15th March, we assume you consent to your child participating in the research.

You can also phone the school at ……………or send a text to ……………….. giving your child’s name and class.

If you have the leaflet form of the information you can return the form below to the school.

Refusal of Consent Form – Parent Jade Speaks Up

| How effective is the Jade Speaks Up school’s programme in helping keep children safe? |
| I have had the research project explained to me and I have read and understand the information sheet given to me. |
| I do not give my consent for my child to be a part of this evaluation | ☐ |
| Participant (Child’s) Name: ………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………… |
| Child’s class: ……………………………………………………………….. |
| Parent’s Signature: ……………………… Date: ………………………… |
Evaluation of effectiveness of the Jade Speaks Up school’s programme in helping to keep children safe

Tena Koe, Talofa Lava, Malo e Lelei, Fakalofa Lahi Aatu, Kia Orana, Namaste, Ni hao, Hello!

Violence Free Communities is a non-profit organisation working to make safer communities. During Term One and Two of 2017 we have partnered with your child’s school for the final development phase of an exciting new ACC funded programme called Jade Speaks Up. Our focus is on children aged between 9 and 12 years of age. The lessons will be taught by your child’s regular teacher using material that has been carefully developed in West Auckland schools over the past ten years by a team led by Elaine Dyer, former CEO of Violence Free Communities and the coordinator of this project.

The focus of this programme is building self-esteem, feeling confident and empathic towards others, making personal safety plans, and further developing communication skills to strengthen children’s ability to keep themselves safe. The programme also helps students develop personal tools to apply in times of difficulty.

The programme aligns with the English, Health, Physical Education, Technology and Social Studies curricula. It will enable teachers to fulfil many of the learning goals required by the Ministry of Education in these areas. ACC has funded this pilot project to run several schools at the beginning of 2017 with the intention of making it nationally available the following year if it is successful.

Two groups – the Jade Speaks Up group and the Class as Usual group

To get the best view on whether a programme is working we need to compare what happens to the children who get the programme compared with children who are just having their class as usual. Your child may be class where it is Class as Usual for the first semester. However, if we get positive results from the Jade Speaks Up group then we’ll introduce that programme in the next semester for the Class as Usual children.

What it will mean for your child

As part of the classroom curriculum the Jade Speaks Up programme will be introduced over six weeks in either early Term One or Term Two. Both the Jade Speaks Up and Class as Usual Children will be asked to complete questionnaires before and after the programme about how they are, what they know about keeping themselves safe, and what resources they have for keeping safe.

Jade Speaks Up children will also be asked what they think about the programme. They will be asked to do a follow-up questionnaire 6 months later to see to what learning has been retained and whether their well-being improved as a result. The questionnaires will be on-line. Children will answer them at school, taking about 15 minutes to complete the questionnaires.

In addition, Jade Speaks Up children will be asked, in weeks two and four, to complete a 30 second “how are you” questionnaire where children put mark on four lines anchored by happy and sad faces. This is to ensure that teachers are getting feedback from the children and can support children who might be struggling.
Confidentiality:
All information collected from your child will be stored on a password protected file without their name and the only people who have access to the identity of your child are the researchers. All identifying data will be removed from storage within 5 years. All data will be aggregated and analysed anonymously to show whether or not the programme works. Nothing in the reports will identify you or your family. A final report will be written, which will totally protect your anonymity and that of your child or children. The only exception to this is under the Vulnerable Children’s Act (2014) where we have to release information to school authorities because a significant act of violence or potential violence has been reported to us. None of our questions ask children to report on this, so it is very unlikely that that the Vulnerable Children’s Act will be invoked.

What will we do with this
We will be presenting draft reports to the school and parents and guardians. These will focus on the successes achieved and on any changes that programme developers need to explore to improve the outcome for children. The final report will be available to all parents and guardians in December 2017.

Consent
If you are happy for your child to participate in this research you do not have to do anything.

If you wish to refuse consent for your child to participate you can contact your child’s school and tell them that you do not consent (give their name and class) by
- phone .................................
- email.................................
- text ,.................................

You can withdraw consent at any time right up to the 6-months follow-up questionnaire simply by emailing us at jadespeaksup@violencefreecommunities.org or send a text to 0210032115906 . Any data collected before consent is withdrawn may be used in the study.

Please note that the consent is for your child to be included in the evaluation research for both the Class as Usual and the Jade Speaks Up groups if the programme is successful. You are not asked to consent for the class sessions where the Jade Speaks Up programme is being used as the means of teaching some of the social and emotional components of the standard Health Curriculum.

Your child’s consent
Even if you consent, your child may choose not to be part of the evaluation, while still being part of the programme. Your child will be shown a child friendly video, showing some of the elements of the Jade Speaks Up programme. The video also explains what we hope to achieve with it, making it clear that your child does not have to do the questionnaires and can opt out or in for doing the questionnaires at any time during the evaluation. If you refuse consent your child’s data cannot be collected for the evaluation.

Further information
You can find out more about this programme by looking at our face-book page (https://www.facebook.com/Jade-Speaks-Up-697406863651179/ ) or at the Violence Free Communities website (http://www.violencefreecommunities.org/jade-speaks-up/). There is also a special website just for Jade Speaks Up http://www.jadespeaksup.co.nz
You can contact me, Elaine Dyer, at jadespeaksup@violencefreecommunities.org for more information about the project.

If you have concerns about our evaluation project contact the research leader: Dr Geoff Bridgman, by telephone 09 815 4321 ext. 5071 or by email at gbridgman@unitec.ac.nz

Thank you!

This study has been approved by the Accident Compensation Corporation Ethics Committee from 10/10/2016 to 31/12/2017. If you have any complaints or reservations about the ethical conduct of this research, you may contact the Committee through the ACC Ethics Committee Secretary Dr Neonila Panko (Tel (04) 816 6743). Any issues you raise will be treated in confidence and investigated fully, and you will be informed of the outcome.
Information sheet for Teachers and School Administrators

Evaluation of effectiveness of the Jade Speaks Up school’s programme in helping to keep children safe

Jade Speaks Up is a learning programme designed to develop the personal resiliency of students. Based on overseas research and our feedback from early adopters, this can be transformative in schools. When your school undertakes the Jade Speaks Up programme, each teacher is effectively contracting to be part of a school wide initiative to support respectful relationships in the culture of the school.

The lessons in the programme are to be taught by regular teachers. The teaching plans and resources have been carefully refined in Auckland schools over the past ten years by a team led by Elaine Dyer, former CEO of Violence Free Communities and the coordinator of this project. The focus of this programme is building self-esteem, feeling confident and empathic towards others. Additional activities of making personal safety plans, and further developing communication skills strengthen children’s ability to keep themselves safe. The programme helps students develop personal strategies to apply in times of difficulty.

The programme aligns to the English, Health, Physical Education, Technology and Social Studies curricula. It will enable teachers to fulfil many of the learning goals required by the Ministry of Education in these areas.

We are piloting this project in several schools at the beginning of 2017 with the intention of making it nationally available in 2018. Significant interest has been expressed by ACC, Ministry of Social Development, Ministry of Education, and other education and community agencies.

Children will be asked to complete questionnaires before and after the programme about how they are, what they know about keeping themselves safe, what resources they have for keeping safe and what they think about the programme. There will also be a follow-up questionnaire 6 months later to see to what extent their learning has been retained and whether their well-being improved as a result. The questionnaires will be on-line with the children answering them at school and take about 20 minutes to complete.

In addition, in weeks two and four, children complete a two minute “how are you” questionnaire where children put a mark on four lines anchored by happy and sad faces. This ensures that teachers are getting feedback from the children and can support children who might be struggling.

A big thanks for giving consideration to agree to participate in the Jade Speaks Up programme. The following points are important for the success of the programme. It will help if you can take the time to read these at the outset as we negotiate a collaborative relationship with you.

What it means for the school. The school will:
- Have in place a clear policy on the handling of disclosures
- Allocate a day prior to implementation of programme for teacher training. This could be towards the end of the prior year, or a call-back day before the commencement of Term One.
• Allocate two feedback-feed-forward support sessions of 1.5 hours during the implementation of the programme for all teachers involved in the programme. After school once a fortnight works well and could be included in the syndicate meetings you may have at this time.

• If requested, give the research team access to any system of tracking the impact on behaviours relevant to the programme e.g. numerical record of types of behaviour and the number of incidents needing disciplinary intervention by staff. If your school is a PB4L school, we may be able to utilise the tracking system of incidents and actions already in place.

• Agree to student and teacher participation in the pre-, post- and follow-up programme evaluation questionnaires and evaluation processes as negotiated with independent evaluators and Violence Free Communities.

• Be aware that permission is given only to schools who have contracted with us for the programme to copy the master materials for use in the classrooms. Please recommend to other interested schools that they approach us directly. A piece-meal approach to any change process means that it becomes very difficult to track outcomes reliably.

• Promote the work of the programme and the evaluation to parents, eg include an overview of it into Parent/Teacher evenings, include it in your school newsletters. You can refer them to our webpage www.jadespeaksup.co.nz, they can email us at jadespeaksup@violencefreecommunities.org or look at / join our facebook page (https://www.facebook.com/Jade-Speaks-Up-697406863651179/).

• Send home information to the parents and receive any consent or opt out request forms which the children bring back to school.

**What it means for teachers. Selected teachers will:**

• Implement the programme as it is outlined in the manual and addressed in the training. The sequence of sessions has been designed to skilfully build safe and trusting relationships within the class setting. Each exercise is a necessary building block in consolidating the skills and enabling attitudes of students to change. Please ensure you cover ALL of the core exercises.

• Apply the exercises as directed, and feel free to use suggested optional expansion activities when the class is ready for it... also, invent extras and share these with your colleagues and us in the two feedback/feed-forward session

**Participation in the evaluation of the programme for our research is important to support wider roll out of the material.**

**The Research Process** - on behalf of your students involves:

• Sending a parent information letter home with an opt out clause for students from the research (all students in your class will undertake the programme under your health curricula).

• Complete the pre-programme questionnaire yourselves.
• Get all students to complete the on-line pre-programme questionnaire (you may need to be on hand to answer any questions).

• Following the online pre-programme questionnaire you will be allocated two students selected by the researchers to observe closely during the programme. Please unobtrusively take particular note of them and their participation and changes in behaviour over the course of the programme.

• During delivery of Jade Speaks Up, conduct a CORS assessment with your class early in weeks 2 and 4. This pencil and paper graded chart will only take students 3-5 minutes to complete.

• Processing the CORS results can take almost a week. Assessments will need to be completed the morning after delivery of sessions 2 and 4. These forms are to be couriered to the research team on the day they are completed. Results will be conveyed to you and discussed in the feedback/forward sessions which ideally occur the day before sessions 3 and 5.

• Two weeks after you have finished delivery of the programme, the students will complete an online post programme evaluation to give us a comparative read-out on changes that might have been made.

• In this same week, we ask you to complete the online teacher’s post programme evaluation also.

• Your students will also participate in a 6 month review online questionnaire to sample longer term effects of this work.

• If your class is selected as a class as usual (control group) class, apart from the pre and post programme evaluations there is no further work for you to do this term. However we will offer your class the opportunity to participate in the course should the results of the other classes show significant positives.

**Additional important points: -**

- Be clear on how you will respond to disclosures and who in the school to refer to if a student discloses.
- Increase your awareness and the awareness of your students of the community agencies who can support you and your students.
- Contact us if you need any extra support... we are on the same team as you in nurturing a culture of peace within communities.

**Confidentiality:**
All information collected from children or teachers will be stored on a password protected file without names and the only people who have access to the identity of participants are the researchers. All links to identifying data will be removed after 5 years. All data will be aggregated and analysed anonymously to show whether or not the programme works.
Nothing in the reports will identify any participant or their family or friends. A final report will be written, which will totally protect your anonymity and that of your child or children. The only exception to this is under the Vulnerable Children’s Act (2014) where we have to release information to school authorities because a significant act of violence or potential violence has been reported to us. None of our questions ask children to report on this, so it is very unlikely that that the Vulnerable Children’s Act will be invoked.

**What will we do with this**
We will be presenting draft reports to the school, teachers and parents and guardians. These will focus on the successes achieved and on the changes that programme developers need to explore to improve the outcome for children. The final report will be available to all parents and guardians in December.

**Consent**
If you agree to participate in the research as a teacher, you must sign a consent form. You can withdraw consent at any time right up to the 6-months follow-up questionnaire simply by emailing us at jadespeaksup@violencefreecommunities.org
Any data collected before consent is withdrawn may be used in the study.

**Parental and child consent**
Parents and guardians or a child may refuse consent to be part of the evaluation, but will continue to be part of the programme. Children will be shown a child friendly video, showing some of the elements of the Jade Speaks Up programme, explaining what we hope to achieve with it, but making it clear that they do not have to do the questionnaires and that they can opt out or in for doing the questionnaires at any time during the evaluation. If parents or guardians don’t give consent their child’s data cannot be collected for the evaluation.

**Further information**
At any time you can find out more about this programme and download reports by looking at our facebook page (https://www.facebook.com/Jade-Speaks-Up-697406863651179/) or at the Violence Free Communities website (http://www.violencefreecommunities.org/jade-speaks-up/) or the designated website www.jadespeaksup.co.nz

Please contact me, Elaine Dyer, at jadespeaksup@violencefreecommunities.org  Ph 4168774 if you need more information about the project:

At any time if you have any concerns about our evaluation project you can contact the research leader: Dr Geoff Bridgman, 09 815 4321 ext 7464 or at gbridgman@unitec.ac.nz

**Thank you!**

This study has been approved by the Accident Compensation Corporation Ethics Committee from 10/10/2016 to 31/12/2017. If you have any complaints or reservations about the ethical conduct of this research, you may contact the Committee through the ACC Ethics Committee Secretary Dr Neonila Panko (Tel (04) 816 6743). Any issues you raise will be treated in confidence and investigated fully, and you will be informed of the outcome.
Appendix 4: Ethics approval
9 September 2016

Dr Geoff Bridgman
Violence Free Communities
gbridgman@unitec.ac.nz

Dear Geoff

ACC Ethics Committee application #317 Evaluation of effectiveness of the Jade Speaks up school’s programme

Thank you for your ethics application, which was considered by the ACC Research Ethics Committee at its meeting on 7 September 2016. Thank you also for calling to speak to your research proposal. Committee members considered the application to be well thought through and appreciated all the supporting information you provided regarding your study.

Please note that the Committee is not presently in a position to give any approval for the study until:
• it receives confirmation of internal validation of the programme as well as strategic alignment of the programme by the ACC business owner/Family Violence Portfolio Manager;
• a decision has been made regarding the ACC internal contractual arrangements;
• your organisation has been assessed as meeting the ACC research supplier guidelines.

We understand that these matters can only be addressed once ACC funding is confirmed.

Mindful of that, the ACC Ethics Committee thoroughly considered the application and wishes to provide the following feedback:
• Simplify the consent form and information sheet for children. Please follow this link to the best practice recommendations of the Children's Commissioner Office http://www.occ.org.nz/our-work/
• Delete the sentence “A lot depends on you” from the “Information For Children — Jade Speak Up”
• Given the ‘opt-out’ nature of the consent, the Committee suggests you consider asking the schools to use a greater variety of ways to advise parents of the study, including social media and the schools websites.
• The Committee commends your suggestion to provide parents with a greater variety of ways to opt out of the study by using text, Facebook, schools websites and other social media resources
• Please advise that you will destroy the codes/keys/links to the de-identified data once the need to link participants to their results no longer exists.

No other issues were raised by the Committee in respect of your study. Please do not hesitate to contact me if you have any queries.

Yours sincerely

Neonila Panko
Secretary, ACC Ethics Committee

pp John Kleinsman, Co-Chair
2 November 2016

Dr Geoff Bridgman
Violence Free Communities
gbridgman@unitec.ac.nz

Dear Geoff

ACC Ethics Committee Application #317 Evaluation of effectiveness of the Jade Speaks up school’s programme

Thank you for addressing the matters we raised about the evaluation in our letter to you dated 9th September. The resubmission of the forms and other changes mean that we are now able to approve your ethics application. Please do not hesitate to contact me if you have any queries. We wish you all the best with your research.

Yours sincerely

Melanie Martin
Secretary, ACC Ethics Committee

pp John Kleinsman, Co-Chair
15 December 2016

Dr Geoff Bridgman
Violence Free Communities
gbridgman@unitec.ac.nz

Dear Geoff

ACC Ethics Committee Application #317 Evaluation of effectiveness of the Jade Speaks up school’s programme

Thank you for advising us about the need to extend the year and age of pupils for your sample, due to the combined years 5 and 6 classes.

You do not need to go through a formal extension process, and approval for the project is broadened to now allow inclusion of year 5 students.

Please do not hesitate to contact me if you have any queries. We wish you all the best with your evaluation.

Yours sincerely

Melanie Martin
Secretary, ACC Ethics Committee

pp John Kleinsman, Co-Chair