The problem of bullying at school is serious and widespread. Each year, towards the end of the school summer holidays, the ‘back to school’ features of the popular print and television media will usually include at least a brief focus on the issue, sometimes reporting the tragedies of young people who have taken their own lives, rather than having to face being bullied (see Marr and Fields’ 2001 book Bullycide).

It’s also a pervasive issue. Many of us who went to school in the 20th century, and experienced or witnessed bullying at school, will have read a fictional description of bullying that dated from the mid-19th century (i.e. that perpetrated by the character Flashman in Tom Brown’s School Days). And when the results of the systematic research into the issue of school bullying that began in the 1970s confirmed the impression that many of us had – that if you hadn’t been bullied yourself at school, then you must at least have known someone who had been – almost no one was surprised.

Internationally, according to a study of 35 countries conducted by the World Health Organization in 2004, over one third of young people reported having taken part in the bullying of others at least once in the previous couple of months, and over one third reported having been bullied at least once in the same period.

So what is being done, and can we make interventions more effective?

The Scandinavian approach

Large-scale research into bullying at school began with the pioneering efforts of Professor Dan Olweus, in his native Sweden and especially in Norway, where he has been a long-term resident. Olweus has influenced the ways in which school bullying has been defined (usually, as repeated aggression involving a power imbalance between the perpetrator(s) and the target(s)), researched (generally, through the large-scale implementation of self-report measures with school students) and tackled (see Peter K. Smith and colleagues’ 1999 summary of interventions).

Famously, three tragic school bullying-related suicides in Norway in 1982 prompted the government to support and fund the first nationwide anti-bullying programme, designed by Olweus, and informed by the data that he had collected. From the late 1980s, researchers elsewhere in Europe, and also in Australasia and North America, used Olweus’s methods (and often, translated versions of his data-collection instruments) in establishing the incidence rates of school bullying in their countries, and developing their own anti-bullying programmes, often with large-scale regional or national implementation ambitions.

Peter K. Smith and colleagues, in Sheffield and then Goldsmiths University of London, were key to these efforts.

Central government support continued for anti-bullying efforts in Norway, and with the announcement of the Manifesto against Bullying in 2004, a package of central government-supported measures at a nationwide level, Norway cemented its position as the...
world's leader in the field. Legal reform was a key part of these measures; ultimately rooted in Norwegian perceptions of their responsibilities under international law (i.e. as a signatory to the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of the Child), section 9A-1 of the 2002 Education Act stipulated responsibilities for schools and the state in guaranteeing a satisfactory physical and psychosocial environment for all those enrolled in the nation's schools. The implementation of anti-bullying programmes in schools was effectively mandated, with Olweus's programme and the then newly developed KiVa programme being offered to all schools in Norway. Whilst there are differences between the two programmes, both are based on the creation of local networks trained by small groups of experts. There's an emphasis on awareness-raising at a 'whole-school' level, amongst students, parents, and teachers and non-teaching staff alike) and the adoption of behavioural management strategies in the schools (i.e. the development of anti-bullying policies, that incorporated measures to deal with and prevent bullying behaviour amongst students). I reviewed such programmes in my 2016 book.

Enthusiasm begins to wane?

Though initially a large-scale anti-bullying programme in schools as Sheffield as early as 1990-1992, yet in more recent years, the UK has not progressed down the route of a nationally-implemented anti-bullying programme. The experience gained in the Nordic countries would support that, and for many years I have argued for this in Ireland, where I live (see O’Moore & Minton, 2004).

In the absence of such measures, probably the highest profile anti-bullying effort, in the British public conscience, is Anti-Bullying Week, held in schools in the third week of November since 2003. This is organised in England by the Anti-Bullying Alliance (www.anti-bullyingalliance.org.uk) and in Northern Ireland by the Northern Ireland Anti-Bullying Forum (www.endbullying.com). With a different theme each year, there is an emphasis on the generation of resources and events for and by participating schools. Whilst perhaps not adhering to the emphasis that Olweus has consistently placed on the need for evidence-based, evaluated interventions, we can see the ongoing influence of the Norwegian research and practice in many strategies and resources implemented in British schools in Anti-Bullying Week. Yet 13 years after the measures of the 2003 Manifesto against Bullying, the enthusiasm for direct anti-bullying measures seems to be reduced in Norway, at least in some quarters. In 2016 the national newspaper Aftenposten reported that whilst in 2003, 389 schools started the programme since 2013, 116 no new schools have done so, and that the number of schools that run the Olweus Programme, which was 400 in 2005, has also reduced. The newspaper also claimed that the Norwegian State has spent in excess of 200 million kroner (around £18.4 million) over the last decade on anti-bullying programmes. Has the Norwegian taxpayer been getting value for money? Perhaps the tax payer would have been bullied in disproportionately higher frequencies. The newspaper also reports that bullying behaviour in general is one simultaneously addressing the issue of homophobic bullying, but in other parts of the 2016 report, Gerald Walton asserted that even though homophobia is a prominent feature of schoolyard bullying, it is also 'one of the least researched'. There is also evidence to indicate that members of other so-called 'minority groups' – people with physical disabilities and special educational needs, students who belong to ethnic minorities, and students who belong to alternative subcultures – report having been bullied more frequently than their majority peers. Karl Henrik and Tore Sæthre find that children from straight, non-european, non-white minority groups are also more likely to report having been bullied in Norwegian schools than are their majority Norwegian ethnicity peers who have raised questions as to whether the provisions regarding the guarantee of a safe psychosocial environment made in the Education Act of 2002 work as they should. However, only minority children as they do for the majority. Clearly, from the evidence regarding the bullying of those belonging to the 'other minority' group, it can be seen that bullying intervention programmes have not been effective in reducing such bullying. However, on the other hand, the evidence of students that they have been bullied on one of the 'other minority' groups, such as the students who have been bullied, and having taken part in bullying others (see Hutchings & Clarkson, 2015).

Through its structured work with students in particular, KiVa seems to offer the possibility of a more thorough working through of students' knowledge, attitudes and behaviour. I feel that it would be interesting to see how students who belong to 'minorities' fare in KiVa schools, whilst such variables have not been included in this well-conducted study. Going forward, I would hope to see more thorough working through of students' self-reports of having been bullied, and having taken part in bullying others (see Hutchings & Clarkson, 2015).

I have come to see school bullying as just one of the many examples of aggressive manifestation of 'minorities' populations, so it seems to me that large-scale anti-bullying programmes provide an opportunity to challenge us and their development to the protection amongst large groups of people, at formative ages. I also believe that this potential has not, as yet, been fully realised. It's not enough to rely on the strategies of awareness-raising and behaviour management. It is for these reasons that I see a continued role for anti-bullying programmes in schools, but in a strategically revised form – with thorough attention being given to the detail of the discussion, role-play, film clips, groupwork, written assignments and whole-class activities. Training and implementation resources for schools, interactive parental advice and support websites, and online games have all been developed, as well as detailed procedures for schools and teachers in dealing with actual incidents of bullying (see Hutchings & Clarkson, 2015). Since 2015, KiVa has been implemented in over 90 comprehensive schools in Finland, and it is currently in nationwide rolling out in 2009 evaluations have shown year-on-year reductions in students' self-reports of having been bullied, and having taken part in bullying of the others.

The message that 'bullying can happen to anyone' is undoubtedly helpful in many respects. It can, for example, underscore the general need for us to do something about the issue, and defuse the feelings of being somehow to blame, and the group and whole-class discussion, role-play, film clips, groupwork, written assignments and whole-class activities. Training and
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