



vent and stop bullying in schools. First, it is important of course to provide the schools with a program that is effective if used in an adequate way. Second, this program must be communicated, implemented, and maintained at a national level. These two central aspects of large-scale innovations will be particularly considered as three national programs to prevent and stop bullying in Norwegian schools are presented and discussed.

Bullying is defined as long-standing negative behaviour conducted by a group or an individual and directed against a person who is not able to defend himself or herself in the actual situation.

In Norway, it has been estimated that approximately 5% of the pupils in primary and secondary school are being bullied persistently, which is defined as weekly or more often. The percentage is higher than 5% among the youngest pupils and slightly below 5% among the oldest ones. Slightly more boys than girls are victims of bullying. It is also estimated that 5%, or slightly less, bully other pupils weekly or more often. These figures for bullies are quite independent of age in primary and secondary school. For each girl bully there may be approximately three boy bullies. Considerably more pupils are involved in bullying now and then, or more often [Olweus, 1978, 1991, 1993; Roland, 1989, 1998]. Obviously, bullying is a serious problem in Norwegian schools, as in other countries in Europe, North America, and Australia [O'Moore, 1989; O'Moore et al., 1997; Pepler et al., 1993; Rigby, 1996; Roland and Munthe, 1989; Smith, 1997; Tattum, 1993]

It was, however, in Sweden rather than in Norway that bullying was first defined and investigated. A Swedish doctor of medicine, Peter-Paul Heinemann, should be recognised as the pioneer as he published the first book about bullying or "mobbing" as he called it in 1972. Shortly after, Dan Olweus published the first research results from Swedish schools. This report was succeeded by a first book on how to stop bullying, also written by a Swedish researcher, Anatol Pikas. All those books were translated and published in Norway [Heinemann, 1973; Olweus, 1974; Pikas, 1976], and they have been very influential. For research and intervention in our country, it was also important that Dan Olweus was appointed Professor in Psychology at the University of Bergen, Norway. When the Norwegian Ministry of Education initiated the first national program against bullying, Professor Olweus became an influential member of the Ministry's expert group to plan and implement the program.

## **THE 1983 PROGRAM**

In 1983, the Ministry of Education initiated the first nationwide campaign in Norway against bullying in schools. Probably, the Ministry took the initiative to conduct such a program because two young people, independently of each other, committed suicide apparently because of being bullied in a serious way over long periods of time. This first program in Norway has been described and discussed by several researchers [Olweus, 1991, 1993; Roland, 1993; Roland and Munthe, 1997]. Two follow-up studies found that the campaign had a very positive short-term effect [Olweus, 1991, 1993] but a limited long-term effect [Roland, 1993]. The rather weak long-term effect was explained by difficulties in maintaining the activities in most schools [Roland, 1993; Roland and Munthe, 1997].

The program, as such, was effective when used, and the principles and practical approaches should be identified.

All Norwegian primary and secondary schools, in which the age of the pupils were approximately 7–13 and 14–16 years, respectively, received a package of material for the headteachers, teachers, and parents developed by the Ministry's expert group. The central part of this package was an article for headteachers and teachers about bullying. In this, some theoretical and empirical results were reviewed and practical approaches to counteract the problem were suggested [Olweus and Roland, 1983]. A main focus was on what to do when bullying became a problem. In principle, the recommended method of intervention was to address the bullies one by one and then together, demanding that they stop bullying the victim. Parallel to this, the victim should be taken care of and supported. Eventually, the bullies and the victim could be brought together to confirm a constructive solution. Communication with the parents of the bullies and the victim was also addressed. The main preventive approach in the Norwegian campaign of 1983 was for the teacher and the pupils to use some material, e.g., literature, and discuss the problem in class. The preventive perspective of the campaign, then, was rather limited and bullying focused [Olweus and Roland, 1983; Roland, 1998; Roland and Munthe 1997]. Besides the article and some other written material, a videotape for teachers, parents, and pupils illustrating bullying and discussing methods to counteract the problem was produced. This tape was not, however, a part of the package of material sent to the schools. It had to be bought or rented.

The campaign against bullying was heavily featured in local and national mass media in Norway, both during the period of planning the campaign and when it was released in autumn 1983. Such a strong public interest for a school issue was considered quite unique in Norway, and it probably came up partly because this was the first time action against bullying was placed on the political agenda. This strong involvement of the mass media was recognised as important for the effective implementation of the program. More details about the campaign and the package of materials are given by Olweus [1991], Roland [1993], and Roland and Munthe [1997].

To evaluate the effect of the program, baseline data were obtained at a national level in spring 1983, and two follow-up research programs comprising about 40 schools each were conducted. The method of research, a questionnaire to the pupils, and the key questions were the same in the baseline investigation and in the follow-up studies. One of these follow-up studies, in the Bergen region, uncovered a remarkable decrease of about 50% in the rate of bullying 1 and 2 years after the campaign was started. In this project, the researchers visited the schools to give them feedback from follow-up studies, and the researchers discussed further work with the staff [Olweus, 1991, 1993; Roland, 1998; Roland and Munthe, 1997]. The other follow-up investigation was conducted in Rogaland county 3 years after the release of the campaign. In fact, the overall rate of bullying had increased slightly. But at a minority of the schools, which had implemented the methods in a serious way, the rate of bullying had decreased, although not as much as in the Bergen schools [Roland, 1993].

Obviously, the campaign had a strong short-term effect in Bergen. It is of course possible that this also was the case in Rogaland, but an important difference existed between these two regions. In Rogaland, nothing more or less was done to support the schools except the national standard. And this was simply to send each school a package of materials. In Bergen, the schools expected visits from the research team, they got data from the follow-up investigation, and they had the opportunity to discuss further work with the experts. This system of support may explain much of the difference between Rogaland and Bergen.

But of course, it is possible that the short-term effect in Rogaland was better, or even much better, than the estimated long-term effect in this county. There are two pieces of information, however, that strongly indicate that the support system in Bergen made a difference. First, the very good effect in Bergen persisted from follow-up one, approximately 1 year after the release of the campaign, to follow-up two, which was conducted about 2 years after the release [Olweus, 1991, 1993]. If this very good effect also had been present in Rogaland 2 years after the release of the campaign, it is hard to believe that the effect could decrease so strongly during only 1 year, i.e., from year 2 to year 3 when the follow-up in Rogaland was conducted. Second, data obtained by interviews with teachers and headteachers in the Rogaland schools showed that it was only the best organised minority of these schools that implemented the campaign in a serious way [Roland, 1993]. The heads or other senior personnel at the majority of the schools did nothing more than briefly present the package to the teachers, or they did nothing at all. If this had been the case in Bergen, it is not likely that the across-schools effect would have been so good. The support system in Bergen, then, may have mobilised not only very good schools to take action but also to a considerable degree the rest of the schools. Empirical data about such possible effects of the support system in Bergen have not been reported, however. Anyway, a support system was considered important when the second program was set up in Norway.

## **THE 1996 PROGRAM**

The second wave in Norway, initiated by the Ministry of Education and headed by the Centre for Behavioural Research, appeared in 1996. When designing this second national program for Norwegian schools, the two main questions mentioned initially were considered closely. First, the program recommended to the individual school had to be effective if used in an adequate way, and the system of support must be secured.

### **Profile of the Program**

A variety of behavioural disorders and weak motivation for schoolwork among a rather large minority of the pupils is a major problem for schools. Why, then, should headteachers and teachers adopt and maintain a program to counteract one particular kind of these problems—bullying among the pupils? Even in countries in which bullying has been identified as a problem in schools for a rather long time, the staff may regard other problems, e.g., discipline problems in class, as much more important to counteract as such problems directly interrupt teaching [Roland and Munthe, 1997]. Consequently, it was considered whether a broad, not very bullying focused program could prevent bullying as well as other problems and promote pro-social behaviour and motivation for schoolwork. A great advantage of this broad profile of a preventive program is of course the supposed multiple effects, which probably will make such a profile easier to adopt and maintain in ordinary schools than a very bullying focused program [Roland, 1989; 1993; 1998; Roland and Munthe, 1997].

When designing the program, the author was working on a rather large research project, “School Influences on Bullying” [Roland, 1998], and the results from pilot projects were known. These preliminary results, together with a theoretical model developed by the author to systemise the main variables, came to underpin the program designed for the individual schools.

This program, which is described in detail elsewhere [Roland and Munthe, 1997], comprised a much broader preventive perspective than that of 1983 besides methods of intervention. This preventive perspective is not very bullying focused. In the booklet for teachers, they are recommended to adopt a general management approach to improve both social interactions and on task activities in the class, besides cooperation with parents about this. In this booklet [Roland and Vaaland, 1996], some major aspects of classroom management were described and recommended; teacher caring for each pupil, good organising and teaching, and monitoring of pupils behaviour in general, besides interventions toward misbehaviour including bullying. This approach, it was argued, would prevent bullying as well as other kinds of behavioural problems and improve pupils' motivation for learning. These effects of the described approach had previously been documented [Roland, 1995].

In addition, material to the pupils' councils at each school about preventing bullying was developed, and 1-day seminars for pupils were arranged [Roland and Munthe, 1997]. In the pupils' part of the program, the significance of the pupils not involved in bullying was strongly focused, as the attitudes of this majority of the pupils would influence potential bullies.

As can easily be recognised, then, the principle of regarding bullying in a social context is highlighted in the material to both teachers and pupils.

### **The Support System**

Besides this general, preventive approach, another element supposed to secure quality and continuity was added to this second national program in Norway. This was a nationwide network of approximately 350 local professionals who should help schools, including the parents and pupil councils, to implement the program. Also, in difficult cases, they should assist the schools with intervention. These local personnel, organised in seven networks in Norway, were offered 2-day seminars in 1996 and 1997 to be qualified to their roles. There were also local network seminars.

According to a broad hearing arranged by the Ministry of Education, the program and the material were well received by the schools [Ministry of Education, 1998]. However, the hearing uncovered problems of the role of many of the local professionals, and this was also found in a survey among these personnel [Midthassel, 1997]. It was concluded that the majority of those in the network, who were outstanding class teachers, did not have the authority and/or practical opportunity to assist other schools in the district. Those employed in the school psychological service and headteachers, however, were in a much better position to take their roles as local resource personnel. The main conclusion so far, then, is that the broad profile of the program and the material were well received by the schools but the system of local assistance has to be improved. Currently, the local school authorities are responsible for maintaining the program. In the future, we will attempt to integrate this program into a forthcoming much broader approach to improve several aspects of pupil behaviour and learning of academic skills.

### **A LARGE-SCALE INNOVATION**

The Norwegian Parliament has recently decided that a 3-year, very broad program to improve central aspects of the Norwegian school system should be started in autumn 1999 or early 2000. The Centre for Behavioural Research has been given the responsi-

bility for coordinating the planning and implementation of this program. The program will concern bullying, other behavioural problems, and reading and learning difficulties as well.

### **Classroom Level**

The content of the program at the classroom level is even broader than that of 1996, as reading and learning problems are explicitly included. The principle behind this approach is that different aspects of pupils' behaviour and their learning of academic skills are interrelated and related to classroom management and the social structure of the class [Roland, 1998]. The general preventive strategy of the 1996 program will be maintained at classroom level and prevention of learning and reading problems will be included in this approach. Besides this general preventive approach, different methods of problem solving, designed for the problem in question, will be part of the content. Then, a broad preventive profile mainly based on principles of classroom management, combined with some methods of problem solving, will be the approach at the classroom level.

### **School Level**

School-level variables, such as the quality of leadership on the part of the headteacher, professional cooperation within staff, and consensus about professional matters, have been recognised by several researchers as important to pupils' behaviour and pupils' learning of subjects [Roland, 1998; Rosenholtz, 1991; Rutter et al., 1979]. One reason for this may be that the headteacher-staff interactions are related to classroom management [Roland, 1998].

Therefore, these school-level variables, together with classroom-level variables, are central to the new, comprehensive program.

### **School-Based Evaluation**

There has been no tradition in Norway of systematic evaluation of schools, and there is a rather heated debate about this issue these days. External evaluation is one alternative, and this is very controversial in Norway. The other one is school-based evaluation, which means that schools should evaluate themselves in a systematic way. This could of course be combined with external evaluation.

The Ministry wants school-based evaluation to be an integrated part of the national program to improve the Norwegian school system at the local level, school level, and classroom level, and the Centre for Behavioural Research has supported this. External evaluation will not be part of the program, but the Ministry will probably consider different models for this as an additional approach. As part of the program, a research-based model for school-based evaluation will be developed. Very likely, different aspects of pupils' learning outcome and behaviour, including bullying, will be regarded as dependent variables in this model and central school-level and classroom-level variables as independent ones. Alternative models will be tested empirically, and an instrument for the schools will be developed and offered to the schools.

### **The Support System**

When support systems are considered, important lessons were learned from the 1983 and 1996 national programs described above. In 1983, the Bergen region was an excep-

tion from the rest of the country because of the support system for the schools. When comparing the results of the program in Bergen and Rogaland where no support system was in operation, as was the case for the rest of the country, the effect of the program was much better in Bergen.

As part of the 1996 program, this principle of a support system was implemented at a national level, as described above. However, the majority of the local professionals (mainly outstanding class teachers) faced great problems in filling their roles. The main problem was that they were not asked by other schools to assist them or that they did not have the practical conditions to do so when they were asked. Those who were headteachers or those employed in the Educational Psychological School Service (EPSS) were in a much better position [Midthassel, 1997].

Therefore, only personnel from the EPSS and headteachers will be directly involved in the very comprehensive and complex new program. In principle, all personnel in the EPSS—approximately 1,700 persons—and all the headteachers in Norwegian primary, secondary, and high schools—about 4,500 headteachers—will probably take part in the program. In addition, the community and county directors of schools will be involved. The program is very large then, as more than 6,000 persons will probably be directly involved in a period of 3 years. There will be several seminars each year in each county in Norway, which means parallel programs in all 19 counties. At these seminars, some of the training will be common for EPSS personnel and headteachers and some will be separated for the two groups.

The content of the program will concern different behavioural and learning problems and strategies of interventions and prevention at the classroom level, improvement of the school as an organisation, and school-based evaluation. The group of EPSS personnel and headteachers will be trained to implement the described concept of improved classroom management, school development, and school-based evaluation at the headteachers' schools. The personnel from the EPSS will also be trained to work with difficult cases concerning behavioural problems and learning and reading difficulties at the schools.

Expert groups from each county will be set up to give key lectures and practical advice to the participants at the seminars. These expert groups will mainly comprise professionals from the universities and regional colleges, besides some EPSS personnel. In the period before the program is started, and during the 3-year project period, these expert groups will have seminars at county and national levels, and national research centres will support them. Also, these national research centres, together with the expert groups, will conduct research about the content of the program and the process of innovation according to a national design. Results will be used in the program and reported elsewhere.

## **TENTATIVE PRINCIPLES OF A LARGE-SCALE INNOVATION**

When designing a national innovation plan, which in principle concerns the whole school system from primary to high schools in Norway, and a large and complex support system, it is considered that the program would profit from having a single focus. Even for innovations at individual schools, this principle seems to be essential. Rosenholtz [1991] has illustrated this point nicely. She identified “pupils learning of basic skills” as a very effective focus for improving the whole school as an organisation

in a study in Tennessee. Apparently, this focus was easy to understand for the teachers, and usually they agreed on the importance of pupils learning of basic skills. Other aspects of innovation, e.g., improved cooperation between teachers, could then be understood as instrumental to achieve learning of basic skills among the pupils.

Of course, it could be debated whether it is the focus or the content of the focus that counts. In our case, it was reasoned that “basic relations” between adults and children would be a proper focus. It is hoped that this focus is concrete enough to be easily understood by professionals, teachers, and parents and that it is appealing to the adult generation. This principle of simplicity and broad appeal has been regarded as important. Furthermore, the focus must also be rich enough to prescribe a complex system of means. The adage “It takes a village to raise a child” is now adopted by some top politicians in Norway and is an example of the potential richness of the focus. It simply says that adults have to cooperate to make good relations between the adults and a single child. It may also be said that good relations between children are part of the village.

The classroom will be focused on as the most important part of the school society, and improved general classroom management, in cooperation with the parents, is regarded as the key to realise good relations between teachers, parents, and pupils. It is argued that this approach will have multiple effects as it will prevent different kinds of behaviour problems and promote pro-social behaviour and learning [Roland, 1998]. An additional important point is that prevention is closely linked with intervention [Durlak, 1995; Kounin, 1970]. Good skills in classroom management, promoting cooperative classes, increase the authority of the teacher. This will make interventions by this teacher much more effective than interventions by a colleague working in a struggling class, and without authority [Blau, 1964; Robertson, 1996; Roland, 1998]. A trusted teacher will probably also be in a better position to give social support to pupils with reading or learning problems and to help them with such problems.

The ambition for the support system is that different, expert parties at the universities and regional colleges and some from the school system should participate in the program, in a cooperative way, to improve teacher–pupil interactions in the classroom. These parties will comprise the expert groups in each county, and these expert groups will also be linked into a national network.

To make such a complex system of different kinds of important institutions and individuals concentrate on a single focus; improvement of teacher–pupil interactions is probably difficult. To make them cooperate may be even more difficult. It seems very important to create an atmosphere of cooperative participation in this network and in the whole school system. One way, among others, to achieve this may be to stimulate Hawthorne processes at all levels of the complex organisation. A Hawthorne process is, as will be recalled, the positive effect on motivation by being observed or recognised by significant others.

The effect of public opinion was observed in 1983, when the first national program to decrease the problem of bullying was strongly featured in the Norwegian mass media. How, can the forthcoming national project be made vital for ordinary people, teachers, and researchers? Another important question is the timing of exposure of different messages in the mass media, journals, and so forth.

Comprehensive simplicity of a single focus, improved classroom management, and a complex system of cooperating parties and means to realise this have been considered important principles of the program.

There are three main research questions. The first one concerns the effects of general improved classroom management on bullying, other behavioural problems, and learning outcomes among the pupils. Second, it is important to investigate how changes in central school-level activities, such as headteachers' leadership together with school-based evaluation, may change classroom management. And finally, the process of the national innovation program, including the effectiveness of the support system, should be investigated. A research program will be designed to investigate these questions. Forthcoming data from this research will be used in the practical part of the program, and results will also be reported in the future. Parts of the data from this forthcoming, nationwide research, in particular those concerning bullying, will be compared with parallel nationwide data, which the Centre for Behavioural Research obtained in 1995 and in 1998. This will make it possible to evaluate the effect of the new program on the prevalence of bullying in Norwegian schools.

## REFERENCES

- Blau PM. 1964. Exchange and power in social life. New York: John Wiley.
- Durlak JA. 1995. School-based prevention programs for children and adolescents. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.
- Heinemann PP. 1973. Mobbing. Gruppevold blant barn og voksne. Oslo: Gyldendal.
- Kounin JS. 1970. Discipline and group management in classrooms. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.
- Midthassel U. 1997. KUFs ressurspersoner mot mobbing. Stavanger: Centre for Behavioural Research.
- Ministry of Education. 1998. Videre satsing på et positivt oppvekstmiljø: tiltak mot mobbing og vold i skolen. Oslo: Ministry of Education.
- Olweus D. 1974. Hakkekyllinger og skolebøller. Oslo: Cappelen.
- Olweus D. 1978. Aggression in the schools: bullies and whipping boys. Washington, DC: Hemisphere Press.
- Olweus D. 1991. Bully/victim problems among school children: basic facts and effects of a school based intervention program. In: Pepler D, Rubin K, editors. The development and treatment of childhood aggression. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates. p 411–448.
- Olweus D. 1993. Bullying at school: what we know and what we can do. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Olweus D, Roland E. 1983. Mobbing—Bakgrunn og tiltak. Oslo: Kirke- undervisnings-og forskningsdepartementet.
- O'Moore AM. 1989. Bullying in Britain and Ireland: an overview. In: Roland E, Munthe E, editors. Bullying: an international perspective. London: David Fulton. p 3–21.
- O'Moore AM, Kirkham C, Smith M. 1997. Bullying behaviour in Irish schools: a nationwide study. *Ir J Psychol* 18:141–169.
- Pepler D, Craig W, Ziegler S, Charach A. 1993. A school-based anti-bullying intervention: preliminary evaluation. In: Tattum DP, editor. Understanding and managing bullying. Oxford: Heinemann. p 76–91.
- Pikas A. 1976. Slik stopper vi mobbing. Oslo: Gyldendal.
- Rigby K. 1996. Bullying in schools and what to do about it. Melbourne: ACER.
- Robertson J. 1996. Effective classroom control. London: Hodder & Stoughton.
- Roland E. 1989. A system oriented strategy against bullying. In: Roland E, Munthe E, editors. Bullying: an international perspective. London: David Fulton. p 143–151.
- Roland E. 1993. Bullying: a developing tradition of research and management. In: Tattum DP, editor. Understanding and managing bullying. Oxford: Heinemann. p 15–30.
- Roland E. 1995. Elevkollektivet. Stavanger: Rebell.
- Roland E. 1998. School influences on bullying. Durham: University of Durham.
- Roland E, Munthe E, editors. 1989. Bullying: an international perspective. London: David Fulton.
- Roland E, Munthe E. 1997. The 1996 Norwegian program for preventing and managing bullying in schools. *Ir J Psychol* 18:233–247.
- Roland E, Vaaland G. 1996. Mobbing: En Lærerveiledning. Oslo: Ministry of Education, Norway.
- Rosenholtz SJ. 1991. Teachers' workplace. New York: Teachers' College Press.
- Rutter M, Maughan B, Mortimore P, Ouston J. 1979. Fifteen thousand hours. London: Open Books.
- Smith PK. 1997. Bullying in schools: the UK experience and the Sheffield Anti-Bullying project. *Ir J Psychol* 18:191–201.
- Tattum D. 1993. Understanding and managing bullying. Oxford: Heinemann.

Copyright of Aggressive Behavior is the property of John Wiley & Sons Inc. and its content may not be copied or emailed to multiple sites or posted to a listserv without the copyright holder's express written permission. However, users may print, download, or email articles for individual use.

Copyright of Aggressive Behavior is the property of John Wiley & Sons, Inc. and its content may not be copied or emailed to multiple sites or posted to a listserv without the copyright holder's express written permission. However, users may print, download, or email articles for individual use.