GÖTEBORGS UNIVERSITET
**SOCIOLOGISKA INSTITUTIONEN**

Examensarbete för Master

i sociologi med samhällsanalytisk inriktning, 30 hp

# Explorations of the discourses that shape contemporary bullying prevention in Swedish schools

*Thomas Jacobsson*

Micael Björk
HT 2009

## Abstract

Titel:   Explorations of the discourses that shape contemporary bullying prevention in Swedish schools

Författare: Thomas Jacobsson

Handledare: Micael Björk

Examinator: Mark Elam

Typ av arbete: Examensarbete för master i sociologi 30 hp

Tidpunkt: 10.00 Fredagen den 25 September 2009

Antal tecken inkl. blanksteg: 157 907

Syfte och frågeställningar: The first purpose lies in investigating what discursive constructions of bullying prevention exist. The corresponding research question for this purpose is: How may one characterise the main discourses that compete in order to define bullying prevention? The second purpose lies in exploring and comparing discourses concerning bullying prevention in two schools with different socio-economic backgrounds and educational policies as well as the organisation Quadriceps. The corresponding research questions are: Which discourses do respondents in the three organisations studied use when they construct bullying prevention?, How are these discourses patterned and which might be considered as primary and secondary discourses in these schools?, Are discourses constructed differently in the two schools studied with different socio-economic backgrounds and educational policies?

Metod och material: Discourse analysis is used to analyze semi structured interviews and documents.

Huvudresultat: Four ideal type discourses are identified. These are the authoritarian, liberal, boundary setting and democratic discourses. The school with a more disciplinarian educational policy as well as the Quadriceps foundation utilizes primarily authoritarian and boundary setting discourses. The school with a more democratically inclined educational policy utilizes primarily democratic and boundary setting discourses. Consequently, discourses regarding bullying prevention are constructed differently in two schools with different socio-economic backgrounds and educational policies. The main similarity between the schools is that they both utilize boundary setting discourses, perhaps indicating that this discourse enjoys a dominating position within the discursive order "bullying prevention".

Nyckelord: Bullying prevention, Educational policy, Quadriceps, Stephen Law, Tomas Englund

**Table of contents**         **Page**

## 1. Introduction

Bullying has become a favourite topic in Sweden's media this past decade. This is at least partly due to its sensationalist potential, and the shocking and full extent of this "new" problem has received increasing attention from media. Especially the plight, and the sometimes early demise, of people on the receiving end of bullying activities have become highly publicized.

This flurry of writing activity, concomitant political discussions, and the making of new anti-discrimination laws has raised awareness amongst people about bullying. Schools are especially targeted as havens of bullying behaviour, and it is also in this sector where awareness is, and is expected to be by new laws, particularly high. This was evident as early as 1985, when new school laws stipulated that everyone working in schools have to actively work against bullying (Skollagen 1985:1100). In recent years the legislation has become more precise and demanding. By 2009, the legislation stipulates that schools have to actively work towards preventing and stopping bullying and other violating behaviour, and that schools can be subjected to fines and lawsuits if they fail to fulfil their obligations. For example, all schools are required by Swedish law to have a "plan for equal treatment" in order to guide, and encourage, work that prevents and stops bullying and other violating behaviours. A recent report from the department of education found that 96 percent of all schools have a "plan for equal treatment" and that the majority work actively, in some way or another, with bullying prevention (Skolverket 2009, Dnr 2007: 0325). However, the report also found that schools often do not meet the requirements in law with regards to preventing and stopping bullying at a satisfactory rate (ibid:68).

Interestingly, during the same time period some media have become increasingly interested in a perceived school crisis. This crisis is said to originate from an erosion of teachers' authority, status, and disciplinary entitlements, from an underperforming population, and from the "fact" that schools have deviated from their proper role of teaching children useful, lasting knowledge and skills. These complaints are often followed by calls for a reinstatement of teachers' professional status, for more discipline in schools, and for the reintroduction of a knowledge and skills centred educational system. Evidence of this crisis is often found in reports of anarchistic schools where teachers apparently have lost control, and first and foremost from national and international surveys concerning levels of pupils' knowledge, skills, and levels of classroom order. This issue has become very much associated with the Swedish minister of education, Jan Björklund, as he has become famous as a proponent for a more discipline and knowledge centred school system. Since the regime change in 2006, which saw a coalition of conservative and liberal parties take power, considerable changes have been made to the educational system. By March 2008, 31 new laws and 152 directives had been issued by the government regarding the educational system (Scherp 2008:13). The emphasis of these laws and directives are on improving subject knowledge, grades, and on establishing order in schools (ibid: 13- 18).

This development has to be seen in the context of that the Swedish school system was decentralised during the 1990s (Persson 2008). The decentralisation process handed over a great deal of power to local municipalities and schools regarding school and educational policies, as well as initiated a centralised quality control system. This system governs through setting targets and through focusing on results (controlled by grades and written reports), which stands in contrast to earlier school systems that placed more emphasis on the development of a common democratic value and knowledge base. In addition, previous systems focused on using schools as a vehicle with which to increase social equality and

solidarity through, for example, providing additional funding for poorer areas (Englund and Quennerstedt 2008). As will be discussed later on, this trend follows what Englund (1995) has termed a shift from education as a »public good« to an orientation towards education as a »private good«. Broadly speaking, this entails that education is increasingly seen as something for *individuals* to pursue, according to their own conditions, wishes and needs, rather than as a nationwide project along the lines that were elucidated above.

Mapping the reasons why this decentralisation process and concomitant focus on targets and results developed, Guadalupe Francia (2008) argues that increasing emphasis on knowledge measurement (in relation to centralised targets) is a result of the encroachment of the economic market on the school system. This has resulted in the development of systems of quantifiable knowledge measurement in order to meet the standardised demands of the market (ibid: 113).

Whatever the reasons behind this decentralisation process, it was certainly followed by a "silence" at the national level concerning on which ideological grounds council managed education should stand: "The emphasis on result responsibility from the national political level involves a silence concerning the ideological grounds for council educational policy - a silence that opens a space for councils to imprint their school from political and ideological principles" (Englund and Quennerstedt 2008:37). This has led to the development of local school ideologies, which stand in relation to the demands of the local society, and are dependent on the existence, or non existence, of key enthusiastic people (Englund 2005:277). As a result, schools have considerable power to produce different policies regarding education as well as bullying prevention, as long as they conform to centralised targets. Depending on one's point of view, this situation has either been positive in terms of that it has decentralised power to schools, thus enabling them to shape their own schemes in relation to local demands, or negative in terms of that it creates an unequal and/or differentiated system. In addition, a multitude of organisations have developed selling their services to schools regarding both educational policies and bullying prevention, thus attempting to fill this ideological "silence" on a more local level. One such organisation is "Quadriceps" that propagates and spreads a more knowledge focused and disciplinarian view of education.

Academics can be divided into roughly two camps when confronted with the recent changes to national and local educational policies. One camp mostly supports the government's policies. This camp is headed by Lennart Grosin, who argues that schools should be evaluated according to grades, national tests and examination results, and that successful schools are characterised by their prioritisation of knowledge targets (set by the government), by their ordered environment and by that pupils learn "what they are supposed to learn" (Grosin 2004: 37).

The other camp is considerably more sceptical towards the government's policies. Recently, Mats Ekholm initiated a protest against the changes brought about by the government and against any new changes leading down similar paths. Ekholm accuses Björklund of misrepresenting and skewing results from international surveys in such a manner that they support his agenda (see Ekholm 2008). Contradicting Björklund, Ekholm argues that the overwhelming majority of recent research has shown that most schools experience few disciplinary problems and are relatively calm working environments, as teachers hold the initiative and create a friendly, explaining, and negotiating atmosphere (ibid: 15). This camp is also sceptical towards an increasing emphasis on subject knowledge and grades, because they argue that it may exclude factors that research has identified as basic for learning. For example, focusing on grades, standardisation and measurement of subject knowledge can undermine the establishment of trusting relationships between teachers and pupils, and hinder

pupils from "deep" learning, i.e. from developing a more fundamental understanding (Scherp 2008).

An interest in bullying prevention, changing educational policies and the ideological "silence" regarding council managed education led me to further explore how these issues may intersect, and produce different types of bullying prevention schemes. All in all, my initial exploration of the area produced a rather confusing array of perspectives, as various commentators and experts often have contradictory claims as to which educational policy is suitable for providing ideal learning environments, and for preventing bullying behaviour. Worth mentioning at this early stage are those experts and theorists that were of particular interest for me. Stephen Law (2007) argues that authoritarian school regimes produce "moral sheep", with few resources to combat bullies, whilst liberal regimes encourage the development of social skills, and experience lower levels of bullying. Eric Sigsgaard (2004), argues that the institutionalisation of children produces bullying behaviour because institutions are inherently authoritarian with distinct power imbalances. Other theorists are more inclined towards using more disciplinarian methods for bullying prevention. For example, Bengt Grandelius (2006) claims that it is essential, in order to stop bullying behaviour, that adults are able to "set boundaries" so that adults can forcefully, verbally or physically, interfere in a bullying situation. This way, children will learn what behaviour is acceptable and what is not.

Considering these theorists against a backdrop of changing educational policies and the aforementioned ideological "silence", one may hypothesise that the increasing emphasis on subject knowledge and discipline has led to the development of more authoritarian or at least more discipline concerned schools. Especially when considering the relative autonomy of Swedish schools to formulate and implement their own educational policies and bullying prevention schemes, a qualified guess is that there exist several different types of educational policies and bullying prevention schemes in various schools. Of sociological concern would be to explore if there are important social factors that contribute to this presumed differentiation of educational policies and bullying prevention schemes. For example, one might hypothesize that there is a class dimension, as liberal forms of education may seem to be reserved for rich communities, whilst communities endowed with less resources (and pupils from underprivileged backgrounds) may have to resort to more discipline and rules. More disciplinarian strategies might even be considered as the preferred strategy for schools with pupils from underprivileged backgrounds. Here, stricter rules and behavioural codes might be seen to counteract the effects of social anomie and poverty in the neighbourhood.

*Purposes*

The sociological perspective employed by this study focuses on combining an interest in bullying prevention and educational policy. This has entailed that the study focuses on different discourses in relation to bullying prevention and educational policy. The first purpose lies on investigating what discursive constructions of bullying prevention exist. The corresponding research question for this purpose is: How may one characterise the main discourses that compete in order to define bullying prevention? This initial purpose is obliged through the design of an analytical framework that characterises the main discourses. This framework is of a purely theoretical nature and prepares for the analysis. Including this initial and explorative purpose was necessary because no previous research into discourses relating to bullying prevention and educational policy was found.

Furthermore, and relating to the above mentioned sociological concern of exploring what social factors that might contribute to the differentiation of educational policies and bullying prevention schemes, the second purpose lies in exploring and comparing discourses

concerning bullying prevention in two schools with different socio-economic backgrounds and educational policies. In addition, the Quadriceps foundation is analysed because one of the schools has adopted its educational policies and bullying prevention schemes. The analytical framework is used to guide the analysis, to find what discourses are used in these particular settings, and to identify how these discourses are combined and patterned. The corresponding research questions are: What discourses do respondents in the three organisations studied use when they construct bullying prevention? How are these discourses patterned and which might be considered as primary and secondary discourses? Are discourses constructed differently in the two schools studied with different socio-economic backgrounds and educational policies?

This sociological perspective is important and relevant because it combines two controversial and hotly discussed topics systematically in a way that has not previously been undertaken, at least in a Swedish context. More specifically, it provides insights into how educational policy and bullying prevention can interrelate and provides starting points for further discussion regarding the effects of current educational policies on bullying prevention as well as more broadly on the school system as a whole.

Worth mentioning here is that this Master's thesis is not concerned with evaluating the "real" effects of different discursive constructions of bullying prevention and/or educational policies, but rather to investigate which discourses and social practices exist, and what might influence their construction.

The Master's thesis is structured as follows. Firstly, the method chapter addresses both ontological as well as more practical issues regarding how the study is pursued. Secondly, previous psychological research, a sociological critique of this research and sociological research is reviewed. Thirdly, the analytical framework is presented. This chapter is divided into two sections, one first outlining a non-discursive framework, and the latter the discursive framework. These sections are incorporated and summarized in a table. Fourthly, the analysis is presented in three sections. Fifthly, conclusions and discussions are outlined.

## 2. Method

Currently, the research field focusing on bullying, ostracism and violating behaviours is dominated by a methodology with a quantitative approach (Eriksson et al 2002:96). In addition, as Wästerfors (2006:35) points out, the research field has not been overly concerned with the role of environment, but rather with the identification of a specific type of conflict and with a distinct differentiation of moral roles within those conflicts. There is, if you like, a methodological "empty space" that this thesis attempts to position itself in with a qualitative approach.

Whilst filling this "empty space" I want my sociology to be readily accessible to people outside of the discipline. Perhaps the writing style of critical and investigative journalism is best suited, if not as method, but rather in presentation in order to realise the transformative potential of sociological research. This is especially relevant if one wants to pay heed to the sociological tradition of taking the position of, and attempting to improve the lives of the oppressed, underprivileged, those without representation or without voice (Jacobsen 2008: 21). Moreover, research into bullying and violating behaviours is not only relevant for those that are "especially" oppressed. Research has shown that most people have experienced if not bullying (although a significant minority have) but violating behaviour and ostracism within organisations (Hearn and Parkin 2001). Thus, this research also turns itself to "a public whose private troubles and public issues are commonly and routinely experienced by many or most parts of the population at large" (Jacobsen 2008:31).

**2.1 A Theoretical and philosophical "package"**
I have drawn heavily on Marianne Winter Jorgensen and Louise Phillips (2000) methodological approach to discourse analysis, as will become apparent in this chapter. Following this perspective, the main point of departure is that one has to construct a logically coherent theoretical and philosophical "package". This can be achieved through combining elements from different perspectives within the discourse analytical tradition with perspectives from other theoretical schools (ibid: 10). The package used in this thesis consists of three building blocks. The first block consists of a conceptual strategy. The second block outlines a micro level approach based on discourse psychology. The third block explores and explains a focus on a discursive order. However, before delving into these issues, we will take a brief look into what a discourse is.

*What is a discourse?*
In its most basic sense discourses represent different ways in which to talk about the world. The starting point is that language is structured into patterns, and that our semiotic assertions follow these patterns when we act in different domains (ibid: 7). An additional point of departure is that the ways in which we understand and categorise the world is not based on universal principles, but are rather historically and socially specific and therefore contingent (ibid:49). Consequently, discourses are not seen as developing from essential personalities or biological predispositions but are seen as shaped by social context, place, and from social interaction. Hence, the purpose of analysis is to identify different discourses rather than to categorise people into theoretical slots. Of importance is that actors *construct* discourses when they articulate themselves. I follow Jorgensen and Phillips in that discourses should be defined as analytical concepts and that these should be limited in accordance with the research purpose. Consequently, for the purpose of this thesis, discourses represent analytically defined ways in which respondents talk about the world. Even more specifically, discourses are respondents' constructions of bullying prevention and educational policy.

*Block One: the conceptual strategy*
Conceptual inspiration is mainly drawn from Fairclough's critical discourse analysis. This tradition separates discursive practices from other social practices. Discursive practices are reserved for text, speech and other semiotic systems whilst some social practices have to be analysed as functioning through other logics than the discursive, such as through a economic logic (ibid:25). However, discursive practices and social practices are not cut off and separated from each other but are rather mutually dependent. This view positions the broader social developments and structures that influence my study and provide the background for my analysis as outside of discourse, as non discursive logics. It also positions the empirical material as discursive constructions (ibid:145). Positioning background factors and empirical material as in two different forms of logic may seem a rather arbitrary choice, as background factors may very well be considered as operating according to a discursive logic. However, this distinction is not so much based on ontological assumptions as on a strategic analytical choice with the intention of providing coherence for the study, and clarity in regards to what is a discourse and what is not (ibid: 146). For example, one of the social practices in the thesis, "educational conceptions" are analysed as discourses by their author Tomas Englund (2005) but are considered as social practices for the *purpose of this study*. This is due to the fact that they do not represent the discourses that I study, but are considered as important factors influencing the discourses that are relevant for this thesis.

*Block Two: discourse psychology*

I have drawn inspiration from discourse psychology in order to direct attention towards the ways in which agents are active in the reproduction and transformation of discourses, and thus also in social reproduction and change (ibid:146). Discourse psychology is not so much interested in analysing macro discourses and social change as analysing how people strategically use discourses in order to present themselves and the world in specific ways (ibid:13). This approach is well suited to my micro level approach on the local school level as it focuses research on the active use of discourses, rather than on the ways in which actors are supposedly wholly subject to using predetermined macro level discourses.

*Block Three: discursive order*

This analysis focuses on a discursive order. A discursive order is a social domain or space where different discourses compete in order to invest meaning into a specific phenomenon (ibid:64). This space covers all the discourses that compete within the framework and structure the analysis (although one obviously cannot hope to capture all the discourses). Thus, a discursive order is an ordering of discourses into an analytically manageable framework. With regards to this thesis, the discursive order is named "bullying prevention" and the analysis centres around how different discourses attempt to fill bullying prevention with meaning while excluding other explanations. It is also concerned with investigating how these discourses relate to social practices such as the social organisation of schools, the teaching profession and conceptions of education.

## 2.2 Using Interviews as method

I have collected empirical material from interviews with respondents as well as from a few carefully selected texts. The interviews are of a semi structured and themed nature. I chose this strategy because I wanted to give the respondents the opportunity to influence the agenda, and elaborate into longer accounts. In addition, this gave me the opportunity to analyse the discursive patterns that emerge when the respondents use certain discourses in his or her argumentation (ibid:118).

A usual criticism against interviews is that they are influenced by the interaction between those that are involved, as well as by expectations. This supposedly threatens validity. For example, I noticed that some of those that I interviewed became defensive at times and were keen to project a certain version of their work, which is probably because of the controversial and sensitive nature of the topic at hand. However, discourse analysis views subjects as fragmented, as positioned by several places and discourses (ibid:49). One should therefore not expect people to be consistent in their statements because people draw from different discourses in different contexts (ibid:115). Through this perspective, phrases and sentences are analyzed as discourses rather than as factual statements (Wästerfors 2006:55). One can, therefore, involve in the analysis instances when this perceived problem occurs, and rather than perceive them as a problem choose to view them as instances that can generate interesting analytical insights. As mentioned above, discourses represent different ways of viewing the world, it is therefore reasonable to presume that other discourses exist in these settings. However, the respondents probably use those that they consider most important, or most legitimate to voice in my presence. Thus, the analysis will not represent all the possible discourses used in the schools. Nonetheless, the analysis does illustrate how the main discourses (identified through the analytical framework) are used and where some discourses are more prevalent than others. Building on these presumptions, the analytical methodology is centred on "semantic thickness", identifying what discourses the respondents place emphasis on, and what discourses the respondents use first and foremost when bullying prevention is

discussed. As a result, primary and secondary discourses are identified, defined in terms of how often they are used and what level of dominance they achieve in discussions.

The number of interviews amount to seven, one of which was a group interview with two respondents. The interviews varied in length from roughly fifty minutes to two hours, with the exception of a nine hour day with interviews, discussions and lectures when I followed one of the founders of the Quadriceps organisation for one day. At the schools I interviewed the principals and two people involved in preventing and dealing with bullying and other violating behaviour. In the analysis I have made no distinction between the respondents. This is partly due to reasons of anonymity, but also because the material is too limited in its scope to motivate a differentiation.

*Complementing with texts*

The texts are what Jorgensen and Phillips term "naturally occurring material", as they are not shaped, influenced or produced for or by the researcher (Jorgensen and Phillips 2000:117). These texts are used in order to provide a complement to the interviews as well as exploring the more formalised rules, sanctions and values that the respondents have to consider in their everyday lives. The texts complement the interviews in the sense that they are not used as primary but rather as supporting material. These are; "Quadricepsprogrammet" (Bohlin 2008) and the "plans for equal treatment" in both schools. The "plans for equal treatment" are presented anonymously because they contain numerous references and as well as several revealing icons that would make it impossible for me to hide the identities of the schools.

Both the interviews and the texts were originally in Swedish. Translating them to English necessarily involves a limited degree of violation on validity, in order to make the quotations and extracts readable and coherent. In order to limit this problem, the translations have been double checked by an English person who works as an English teacher.

## 2.4 Cases

The research is organised as one case study with three units of analysis. These units are two schools and the Quadriceps foundation. The unit selection process was guided by the principal of critical cases. Most importantly, critical cases should be of strategic importance in relation to the general problem (Flyvbjerg 2004:425). As one of the main purposes is to explore the differentiation of discourses in two schools with different socio-economic backgrounds and educational policies, the unit selection process aimed at finding two schools that were diametrically opposite in these respects. In addition, the principle of critical cases stipulates that the cases used should illustrate critical change and be of such a nature that the conclusions can be used to comment on other, similar cases (Yin 2006:61-62). Thus, the cases should be exemplary in order to explore a more general logic (Howarth 2007:156). At least 150 schools have adopted their educational policies, according to the respondent in Quadriceps. As a consequence, the conclusions regarding Quadriceps and school one can be used to comment on these cases. Additionally, the findings could be used to comment on schools who have adopted similar but not identical policies. Considering that Quadriceps has been heavily backed and funded by Gothenburg city council (Bohlin 2008), one may anticipate that Quadriceps will enjoy further success at least in the region surrounding Gothenburg, within the city itself, but also a possible knock on effect to other regions. Correspondingly, findings from school two can be used to comment on other schools that are similar to it. As Yin (2006:51) points out, qualitative case studies can generate analytical generalisations while it is not possible to make statistical generalisations.

The two schools differ in several respects. School one is situated in the countryside in the Gothenburg area, houses children from year one to nine and is considered to be in an area with relatively low educated and underprivileged families. According to the SALSA scale

(SALSA 2009), provided by the Department of Education, seventy five percent of pupils in this school achieve the minimum educational targets (at least a pass in core subjects). The SALSA scale also provides information regarding parental educational background. The school scores roughly 2 on a scale ranging from 1 to 3. Two indicates that parents have passed the upper secondary school. School one has adopted the Quadriceps' concept and considers itself to be a Quadriceps' school. School one was chosen because of its critical potential as Quadriceps draws academic legitimacy from Lennart Grosin, whose research generally supports the government's educational policies. Additionally, the foundation espouses an educational policy that is explicitly knowledge centred and disciplinarian.

In contrast, school two is situated in an urban area in the Gothenburg region, within a privileged area with a lot of well educated families. At this school eighty seven percent of pupils achieve the minimum educational targets. Regarding parental educational background the school scores roughly 2.4 on the SALSA scale which is almost half a point more than school one, indicating that more parents have attended university than in school one. School two only caters for pupils in year seven to nine. School two can also be regarded as a critical case because it is situated in a rich community, and has a reputation of being a "good school" that is with high achieving students and high quality education.

*Ethical considerations*

The respondents and the schools are anonymous. The Quadriceps foundation is obviously not, as consent was given from one of the founders to use the foundations name. I had email contact with the Quadriceps respondent after the interview as I wanted to make sure that that person could double check if any of the statements from the interview were in need of revision. This precaution was due to that several sensitive topics were covered and some controversial statements were made. The empirical material is kept safely and also anonymous so that no damage can fall upon the schools or respondents. The respondents were informed about the purposes of the research well in advance of the interviews so they had plenty of time to consider if they wanted to participate or not. All respondents agreed to participate when I explained the purpose of the research in person. The respondents will be informed when the research is completed and will be free to partake of the study if they are interested. The empirical material will not be sold to a third party.


## 3. Previous Research

This chapter reviews the previous research on the topic of bullying and other violating behaviours. The purpose of this chapter is to map out previous research on bullying, with the preconception that one cannot understand bullying prevention without first understanding the mechanisms that causes the phenomena. The review is divided into three sections. First, psychological research is outlined. Second, a sociological critique of the psychological research on bullying is presented. Third, sociological research is outlined. This review concludes that the research field needs to be widened in order to properly take into account how organisational and social structures affect bullying and, thus, also how it can be prevented.

### 3.1 Psychological Research

The overwhelming majority of research concerned with bullying and related areas of offensive behaviour has been conducted within the realms of psychology and psychologically inspired pedagogy, as Eriksson et al (2002) have shown in their overview of the research area. Typically, this research focuses on personality types, and their patterns of interaction. There

are a variety of theoretical models, most of which rely on the idea that bullying fulfils biological and/or psychological needs (Lines 2008: 38). For example, bullying may be seen as fulfilling a need of dominating others, of establishing identities within groups, or of exerting aggressive behaviour in order to defend ones position within a group, or pursuing a career within the group hierarchy. Psychological research has identified different types of bullies. There are bullies who exert "heartless violence" (ibid: 62), who are identified as psychopaths. There are "strategic bullies" (ibid: 65) who are more inclined to plan their bullying of a weaker person in order to gain an advantage, such as approval from others of the displayed behaviour. Then there is "strategic name calling" (ibid: 66): "it is when a group of youngsters all turn against a sole individual with the intention of gross humiliation that bullying occurs." This is probably the behaviour that most people associate with bullying. There is also "gross violence and physical assault" (ibid: 67), when children get carried away by herd instinct, "bullying for kicks", a result of teenage hormones and rebellion against authority, and lastly "bullying for approval" (Ibid: 69), in order to gain acceptance from others.

Whatever the bullying "type", the argument is that bullying always involves (un)conscious social or psychological benefits for the actors involved, and that bullying occurs in interaction between at least two parties. As mentioned above, there are some payoffs for bullies as they navigate a status hierarchy or achieve perceived liking from peers, through the persecution of others. Other actors, such as bystanders or people not involved in the bullying situation also receive payoffs through not involving themselves with the victim, as this enhances their sense of normality and popularity (ibid:200). Note that it is aggressive dispositions within individuals which are seen as causing bullying, and not the environment in itself. The environment rather interacts with individual predispositions and, thus, causes them to weaken or to grow stronger.

This perspective also highlights that the consequences for rejected, bullied and ostracized children are harsh. This is explained through that humans are essentially social creatures, and have been such during most of our evolutionary history (Williams et al 2005:2). Some go so far as to say that our sociality is written into our DNA (Brewer 2005:333). Children who suffer rejection experience adverse psychological effects, such as depression, alienation and suicide, as well as adverse behavioural outcomes later in life (Williams el al 2005:2). Furthermore, it threatens the fundamental need to belong, threatens self-esteem and has a unique capacity to threaten one's sense of meaningful existence (ibid:23).

According to Lines, schools provide ideal platforms for bullying because of their hierarchical structure. Children internalise this structure and use it in their relationship work (2008:98). This illustrates that there is a consciousness regarding how the school environment can affect bullying within some psychological research. Somewhat contradictory to this Lines also claims that the "role-modelling behaviour of aggressive individuals appears only to be in check if the school has a more powerful management regime of control and order"(ibid:124). This statement stipulates that in order to successfully intervene and stop aggressive bullies schools need to establish an even more hierarchical system, which paradoxically reinforces the very system that largely contributed to the development of aggressive bullying in the first place. Additionally, and adding to the paradox, this perspective places great emphasis on family background. Studies based on longitudinal surveys have shown that children who act aggressively in schools, bully, and display little or no empathy for others often have a background in families characterized by pervasive physical and mental discipline (ibid: 53). Yet again the paradox lies in the recommendation that schools should replicate the very system that largely contributed to the problem in the first place.

Lines (2008) is positive towards what he calls "progressive pedagogy", a theory that argues for the development of "cost programmes" in schools. This is a clear example of the influence of behaviourism. These cost programmes function through punishing pupils after they have acted in opposition to rules (for example bullying behaviour), but also by providing incentives and encouragement. The basis of this argument in that children develop their morality primarily through role modelling their parents, and secondarily morality is modified through the continuous interaction with others (ibid:206). Consequently, bullying prevention, according to this perspective, is centred around punishing those who break the rules, thereby modifying their morality, and providing role models and encouraging "desired images of self amongst one's fellows" (ibid:206). This thinking is similar to that of behavioural and cognitive-behavioural therapies, therapies that argue that erroneous moral behaviour can be modified through changing the consequences of undesired behaviours.

### 3.2 A Sociological Critique

The Swedish sociologist Björn Eriksson developed in the early years of the present decade a critique of mainstream research on bullying. The main thrust of his argument lies in that the research area suffers from an overly homogenous theoretical outlook, caused by the dominance of pedagogy and psychology (Eriksson et al 2002). Eriksson has also, in collaboration with other researchers, developed several new analytical starting points that can be used for new research in the area. His first and strongest argument is that the actors involved in the research field are strangely unanimous as to how one should demarcate the phenomenon bullying, and that only relatively minor disputes regarding definitions exist (ibid:12). Most social scientists can agree with that this is a most unusual occurrence, as definitions are usually hotly disputed within any given research field.

The point of departure for most definitions of bullying is that perpetrators carry out negative actions against a vulnerable person, and that the perpetrator(s) are stronger than the victim. These negative actions must be repeated and continue over a longer period of time (ibid:12). This homogeneity has led to the unfortunate consequence that researchers tend to concentrate on very similar issues, and as a result miss out on other factors because, as it were, they cannot "see" them (because of the paradigm focus). Eriksson argues that one needs to analyze bullying as a part of very complex organizational situations. He goes on to argue that it is this complexity that researchers within the current bullying research paradigm fail to capture, as they focus on the interaction between inherent personality types (ibid:105). In fact, the research paradigm concentrates all its theoretical weight on actors' qualities or types, and treat them as constant throughout the bullying process (ibid:104).

Eriksson continues his criticism. For example, he claims that the research paradigm neglects the question of intentionality, in other words why bullies bully. He argues that the aim of bullying appears obvious in the research, it is to hurt the victim (ibid:32). I do not wholly agree with him here, as the literature discusses at length if bullying occurs in order to bolster self confidence, stabilize or navigate hierarchies etc, reasons that I consider to be in the realm of intentionality. However, he does have the very legitimate point that the research field lacks a discussion regarding if intentions of bullying should be analyzed as a uniform category or not. Do bullies have the same intentions all the time? The question is neither asked nor answered. Other traditional sociological issues could be important for explaining intentionality such as class, racism, sexism, and homophobia (ibid:36). The lack of theoretical attention towards these issues might be indicative of that the research paradigm has, at least partly, failed to explore how organizational and wider social structures may intersect with personality types and create bullying practices.

Eriksson maintains that a sociological perspective can provide a wider understanding of bullying through the introduction of other theories and approaches. However, Eriksson does not deny that psychology and pedagogy have managed to develop valid theories for the field. He rather claims that we need to put these theories in a wider organizational perspective, and shift attention towards a wider paradigmatic focus.

## 3.3 Sociological Research

The following discussion centres on sociological research. This section illustrates how one can analyse bullying in other ways, and contribute to a widening of the research field through focusing on social and/or organisational structures.

Marie Bliding's doctoral thesis *Inclusionary and Exclusionary practices. A study of childrens' relationship work at school* provides a sociologically inspired study of the ways in which children establish, maintain and change their relationships. Considering theoretical assumptions such as that "children's interactions are situated within social and cultural contexts and cannot be adequately understood aside from their institutional and cultural frameworks" Bliding (2004:268) situates the study firmly within mainstream sociological theorizing, rather than within more psychologically or pedagogically inclined studies. Bliding maintains that children's relationships in school develop through a process that is characterized by continuous flux and uncertainty. Children try, through this process, to experiment with feelings of belongingness and identity by engaging in careers of making and breaking relationships (Bliding 2004:264). As noted above, there are institutional structures that frame these activities. For example, schools involve the collection of large groups of children. Children cannot form relationships with more than a few others at the same time, and it is thus important for children to differentiate and sort out other individuals with whom relationships may be formed (ibid:264). A central part of these projects is distancing oneself from others, an activity that elsewhere has been denoted as "othering", or constructing the "other" resulting in bullying.

Ann-Sofie Holm's doctoral thesis provides an insight into how social structures, in particular gender orders and regimes, intersect and influence the ways in which relationships and identities are formed in schools. Her thesis focuses on two schools (not the same as mine) and explores how ethnicity, location, educational environments, class and gender intersect in the construction of dominant masculinities and subservient others. One of the schools is situated in a rural environment, characterized by a relatively homogenous population. This has resulted in that relationships have formed in accordance with levels of "sportiness" and competiveness (Holm 2008: 217). Groups such as the "dominant girls", the "sporty girls" and the "ordinary" girls were formed, each in relative opposition to each others, each "othering" one another. The second school was rather larger and with a more heterogeneous population. Here "ethnicity was found to be highly relevant to the construction of various femininities and masculinities" (ibid:218). Different groups emerged as a result such as the "blonde girls", the "silent boys" and the "future-orientated boys". Importantly, the groups position themselves against one another, and different groups were invested with varying levels of domination and subordination. Following Blidings argument, these groups will sometimes commit violence on the others as part of their exclusionary practices, and especially on outsiders. However, violence will not occur in a social vacuum but are subject to the influence of structures such as gender and ethnicity. Referring to the aforementioned critique by Ericsson (2002) of an underdeveloped concept of intentionality, these and similar studies might provide insights into why bullying practices occur.

David Wästerfors' (2007) sociological study of prison violence and conflicts is also worth noting in the context of school bullying as it raises similar issues regarding how social

context, such as organizational structures, may affect the prevalence of bullying and aggressive behaviour. Similarly to schools, prisons are defined by the immanent and pervasive presence of others, and by the creation of social systems within their walls. The main difference is, of course, that children go home after a day's work, but prisoners always have to stay in the same social system. In prisons, Wästerfors argues, guards are always working towards maintaining their ideal regime whilst prisoners regularly break the rules, because breaking the rules is one of the few ways for prisoners to re-establish the respect for his or her person (2007:24). Order is maintained by using a system of rewards and punishments, and by using prisoner cooperation. Thus, the prison employs collective, extensive and routine ways of maintaining order (ibid:92).

Wästerfors approach is to analyze chains of interaction rituals in order to gain an insight into why bullying and aggression occur in jails, and how these interactions provide ways for prisoners to construct their identities. This perspective highlights how organisational structures can affect how bullying occurs. Bullying occurs as a result of the intense surveillance and regimental control that prisoners are subjected to, as it functions as an outlet for frustration and a way in which prisoners can (re) establish respect within their community. Bullying intentions might then not primarily be concerned with hurting others but with negotiating identity and status within authoritarian organisational structures.

This perspective is similar to that employed by Gunilla Björk, who claims that all social interaction is defined by the differentiation of power and influence (See Björk 1999). In situations governed by routine and rules, the differentiation of power is taken for granted, accepted and unproblematic until someone questions it. She argues that when rules for some reason are loosened up, power relations are disturbed and rendered unstable. If an actor can regulate this uncertainty it can also gain the powers previously belonging to someone else. Consequently, all power games thrive on uncertainty and in order to win, one needs to be in control of superior resources, such as verbal and physical skills. According to Björk, bullying is a specific type of power game where different actors try to establish themselves as winners. Thus, bullying occurs when there are interactional uncertainties, when there are uncertainties as to who is in charge, who has the most power, and when there are players involved with varying levels of skills and resources.

In conclusion, these sociological studies can be used in order to widen the research paradigm as they point towards how organisational structures can affect how and why bullying occurs. As mentioned above, mainstream bullying research has been mostly uninterested in the role of organisational and social structures with regards to bullying, but widening the research focus in this manner may produce fruitful results. Interestingly, a report from the department of education, published simultaneously as the one mentioned in the introductory chapter, identifies social norms as the main mechanism propelling bullying, and other forms of discriminating behaviours (Skolverket 2009, Dnr 2006: 2495). This suggests that there is an increasing awareness of how social and perhaps even organisational structures affect the prevalence of bullying and also, how it can be prevented.

The next section outlines the analytical framework that was developed in order to answer the first research question: how may one characterise the main discourses that compete in order to define bullying prevention? This framework maps out the discursive order as well as provides a toolbox for analysing the interplay between discourses and social practices. In addition, this new analytical framework enables the main analysis of the two schools in regards to the other research questions. Worth mentioning here is that the framework does not primarily answer why bullying occurs (although most theories do have an explanation) but rather how the various discourses construct how bullying is best prevented.

## 4. Analytical framework

This chapter continues the above discussion and moves it on to the theoretical underpinnings of my Master's thesis. These theoretical standpoints are used more explicitly as part of the analytical toolbox, but should not be regarded as separate from the previous research section. The analytical framework is constructed in accordance with the theoretical and philosophical package outlined in the method chapter. Consequently, the analytical framework is divided into two sections. The first section consists of the social and organisational structures that are considered as non discursive in the sense that they do not represent discourses that compete to define the discursive order. These are rather social practices or structures that exist in a dialectical relationship with the discourses outlined in the second section. These discourses relate to, and construct themselves on these practices and structures. The first section will, henceforth, be called the non-discursive framework, or simply social practices. It consists of three themes. The first theme is concerned with the social organisation of schools. The theme builds on sociological theory regarding the organisational structure of schools and its effect on bullying and bullying prevention. The second theme outlines various conceptions of what education should be, and what educational policies should be pursued. This theme is important because of the critical case selection strategy, which is two schools with different educational policies. The third theme presents developments in the teaching profession that relate to bullying prevention. This theme develops insights into how teachers may relate to bullying. These themes were specifically chosen because they are of theoretical interest for bullying prevention, and because they widen the scope of the analysis.

The second section, the discursive framework, explores the discourses that exist within the discursive order defined as "bullying prevention". Four main discourses are presented. These are the authoritarian, liberal, boundary setting, and democratic discourses.

The theoretical frame needs to be open and flexible enough so that it may be expanded and restructured during the research process so that concepts and logics can be modified (Howarth 2007:157). In accordance with this methodology, the framework has partly developed in relation to the empirical material as I noted inconsistencies and structural problems as work progressed.

### 4.1 The non-discursive framework

As mentioned above, this section outlines three themes that are of importance for bullying prevention. Howard Becker (2008) recommends viewing phenomena that tend to systematically repeat themselves as social machines. Researching with this in mind, means that we explore a part of the "bullying machine", and contribute to an understanding as to organisations systematically produce bullying behaviour. What structures and mechanisms need to be in place for the "bullying machine" to work?

### 4.1.2 Theme A: The Social Organisation of Schools

Eriksson insists that "as a social phenomenon bullying is a consequence of normal social processes, under special conditions" (Eriksson 2001:25). Eriksson initially asks the question: What are the main characteristics of school and work organizations? (Eriksson 2001:16). These are organisations where it is documented that bullying occurs more frequently than in other organisation so it is of interest to investigate what makes these types of organisations unique. Firstly, actors cannot, or have limited powers to influence who they spend their days with. In school, pupils are placed in classes depending more on administrative logic, than on

individual choice. Second, actors have to spend a prolonged amount of time in the same environment. Third, actors cannot leave this environment without incurring high costs. Fourth, the number of actors, and their presence, is arbitrary for the system (see Eriksson 2001: 16-18). Keeping these points in mind, we move on to the central tenants of Eriksson's theory, and relate them specifically to schools. Eriksson claims that tension arising from two systems operating within organisations, the administrative and social, results in bullying.

*The Administrative System*

The administrative system consists of the official structures of the organization such as principals, teachers, registry offices etc. that regulate activities according to time and space. Additionally, schools are governed by school laws and local rule systems that emphasise what behaviour is appropriate, recommended and forbidden (Eriksson 2001:27). The administrative system also creates different classes, where individual pupils are considered equal in status and worth, and where individual differences must be tolerated. Members within the system hold the same right and obligations, and are equal under the law. Thus, this system provides a framework, a formal organizational structure, in which interactions between pupils take place.

*The Social System*

The social system is shaped through interaction between pupils. Social systems tend to break down, differentiate, into smaller groups rather quickly after they are created by an administrative system. Some pupils risk falling outside of these groups, and can become isolated and marginalized. Within these groups common value systems develop, values that their members are expected to defend. These values may consist of trust, shared common experiences, emotional safety, and of a hierarchy within the group and within the social system as a whole (Eriksson 2001:28). Group members share a common feeling of responsibility towards each other, with the result that those within the group are regarded as more valuable and more important than those outside. Eriksson claims that bullying is a result of four mechanisms, mechanisms that once activated are very difficult to stop. In order to stop bullying, the social system that they rely on probably needs to be destroyed (ibid:38). These mechanisms are aggressiveness, a psychological mechanism that some have more of, and some have less. The second mechanism lies in power games, as theorized by Björk (1999).


*Administrative Control Over the Social System*

The third mechanism is systemic restoration, which refers to the ways in which marginalized individuals, individuals who cannot win power games due to insufficient resources, are forced back into similar situations by the administrative system: "The social system rejects certain individuals that later are reinstated by the administrative system, whereby this process continues - exclusion through one system, reintroduction or retaining by the other" (Ibid:33). These three mechanisms are triggering mechanisms. The fourth mechanism is the continuity mechanism. Through repeated systemic restoration, marginalized actors become centralized and associated with negative properties, properties that other actors can disassociate themselves from. Consequently, other actors in the social system use the marginalized, now the bullied, in order to continuously develop and strengthen their identity in contrast to the "other". This is similar to Bliding's (2004) work on bullying, and provides a convincing explanation as to why bullying can continue for a prolonged amount of time.

Marginalized pupils assume disadvantaged positions in classes with strong social systems and weak administrative systems, because the mechanisms that are supposed to protect pupils are weak. Eriksson argues that bullying probably does not develop where there is a powerful

administrative system, as this system will stop the differentiation (the mechanisms) in the social system that result in bullying.

### 4.1.3 Theme B: Educational Conceptions

Tomas Englund identifies (for the Swedish context) three historically significant educational conceptions, or ideological frameworks, each with differing views on education and knowledge. These conceptions are the patriarchal, the scientific-rational, and the democratic, each representing specific historic and ideal models of interpretation of the role of education. Each conception is a conglomerate of political ideologies and educational philosophies (2005:33). The dominating conception provides a framework for what is pedagogically and ideologically possible during its hegemony (ibid:251).

*The patriarchal conception*

According to Englund, the patriarchal conception dominated until the end of the Second World War. This conception was constructed on traditional nationalistic, religious and patriarchal values and espoused an authoritarian view of schools and education (ibid:259).

*The Scientific-Rational Conception*

After the Second World War, the scientific-rational conception replaced the patriarchal conception, and dominated until the 1970s. The scientific-rational conception gained dominance because the cultural climate changed as people became increasingly worried about the survival of democracy. The role of education would thus be to foster democratic people, and democratic education had to rest on solid objective and scientific grounds (ibid:261). Towards the end of the 1950s, this democratic agenda within the scientific-rational conception was, however, lost as society placed increasing emphasis on experts, experts who would rationally plan for the well being of people. The scientific-rational conception is defined by an essentialist view of knowledge, with its emphasis on functional, scientifically proven and inherited knowledge. This view places emphasis on basic skills and knowledge that should be drilled into pupils and thus become a part of them, and that teachers can, if necessary, adopt an authoritarian stance (ibid:235). Throughout the 20th century, calls for essentialism repeatedly came when people became worried over sinking educational standards, as it places emphasis on traditional subjects, competiveness and organizational differentiation (ibid:246).

*The Democratic Conception*

From the early 1970s to the early 1980s the scientific-rational conception became increasingly challenged by the democratic conception (ibid:13). For example, the concept of equality was widened to involve questions of power and influence, questions that became increasingly associated with the educational system. Actors became influential who criticized that schools failed to give children the most basic skills and knowledge, and that the educational system reproduced a class system (ibid:267). Critical voices were also heard that marks induce competition and targets obstruct pupil's development. The emerging democratic conception viewed the school as an instrument to change society to the better, and emphasized the active role that schools should take to bring up pupils to be democratic citizens (ibid:272).

*A Systemic Shift*

Towards the end of the 1980s the scientific-rational conception gradually regained its dominating position, albeit in a slightly different form. In fact, Englund claims that during the 1980s, Swedish educational policy experienced a systemic shift characterized by the reinstatement of "firm" essential knowledge, centralized targets and evaluation, decentralization of power and the expansion of independently run private schools. Furthermore, the contemporary scientific-rational conception is dominated by education for »private good«, rather than the previous orientation towards »public good«, a shift driven

mainly by increasing individualization and marketization of the educational system (ibid:13). Broadly speaking, these changes involved a shift from an emphasis on democracy and participation, to an emphasis on effectiveness, governing through results, competiveness, privatization and freedom of choice (Wiklund:2006:89).

A doctoral thesis by Matilda Wiklund explores further how during the 1990s Dagens Nyheter, Sweden's most influential newspaper pursued an educational agenda very close to that of the scientific-rational conception. The main issue pursued during this time was that of an educational system in crisis, and increasing demands on knowledge, results and quality were seen as central to improvement (ibid:117).

Bullying was constructed as a concrete consequence of that schools had lost control over norms and values, and was seen to emanate from the lack of boundary setting (ibid:117). In order to turn this negative trend, the newspaper propagated that schools had to place more emphasis on marks to enable a better knowledge production (ibid:173), teachers had to create a good working climate through discipline, order and through rational reasoning (ibd:198). During the 2000s, the newspaper has continued with the same line, a line that is almost identical to that of the liberal party now in power (ibid:204). Interestingly, the social democratic party is increasingly using the same rhetoric about schools, indicating that this stance might have become hegemonic across the political spectrum (ibid:205).

### 4.1.4 Theme C: The teaching profession

*Dirty material*

Joakim Landahl uses an historical perspective to illustrate how the teaching profession's attitudes towards what is considered as dirty material, good punishments, and respect for others have changed over time. He uses Mary Douglas' concept of "dirt", the idea of misplaced material that disturbs a certain conception of order, to analyse the ways in which teachers (and others) can perceive tasks as outside of their competence and/or job descriptions. Historically, there has often been doubt about what competence teachers have, and where the professional boundaries should be set (See Landahl 2006:2-3). Landahl argues that "dirty" tasks can be seen as responses to changes in teachers' professional roles. As professional boundaries go into flux, new tasks often become associated with "dirt", as somehow outside of, or maybe below teachers "proper" tasks. An often heard complaint, throughout the life of the profession, has been that fostering tasks that should be the concern of family life have been unrightfully transferred to schools, and that as a consequence the "pure" teaching and learning dimension has suffered.

*Challenges to authority*

Another historically recurring complaint is that the authority of teachers is being undermined by norm breaking and undisciplined pupils. Landahl argues that teachers, in fact, have always had to establish their authority, but that authority has had different meanings at different times (ibid:130). What is considered as authority defying behaviour has changed over time, due to cultural, legal and organizational changes. For example, during the early 20th century lies were seen as the most defiant and worrying behaviour that pupils could engage in. A strongly contributing factor to this was that children were constructed as the other, as foreign, as essentially separated from adults, factors that lead children to became partly "invisible".

Contemporary worries about discipline are not so much the hidden or the unseen, but rather over open challenges of teachers' authority such as when pupils bring hats, mobile phones and jackets into classrooms. These open challenges have led to renewed irritation over perceived discipline problems (ibid:65). Reports from media about discipline problems in schools, contribute to a norm that teachers have difficulties establishing their authority, and thus have to spend too much of their valuable time on "dirty" tasks.

*Changing views on pupils*
Before the 1970s, pupils were expected to behave in a unified manner. This unified conception symbolized order, as a strategy with which teachers could control a potentially disorganized and dangerous situation. The unified collective was also seen as potentially threatening as they could, if given the chance, collectively threaten the teachers authority (ibid:81). Collective punishments were used to differentiate the collective, in order to pit them against each other. It was also usual to recruit pupils as attendants in order to control the class (ibid:74).

With the introduction of the nine year compulsory school system, Swedish schools became more heterogeneous. Social classes and genders mixed, the teacher podium disappeared, and teaching became increasingly individualized (ibid:84). These developments provided new ways of experiencing the relationship between pupils and teachers, as the boundaries between pupils and teacher lost their central position in the classroom. Thus, attention shifted from the overly cohesive pupil collective to a lack of social cohesion and solidarity between pupils (ibid:85). Especially with the introduction of the bullying concept, violations became visible, and illustrated that intra pupil conflict had increasingly become a problem, as opposed to previous conceptions that highlighted the supposedly positive and fostering aspects of these conflicts. Other developments such as individualization and an increasing focus on experiencing happiness in the present, rather than in the distant future, have led to that bullying and other violating behaviour have become scandalized (ibid:146). More than anything else, the emergence of the bullying concept highlighted that a shift had occurred from vertical to horizontal respect. The purpose of teachers' authority came to encompass not only respect for oneself, but also in order to get the subordinate children to respect each other (ibid:136).

*Punishments and Surveillance*
According to Sigsgaard (2004), corporal punishment has been replaced by intensified psychological and organizational control through the development of exclusionary practices, the creation of special classes and schools, specialist treatment, and medicine. He argues that disciplining of children in schools take place through setting boundaries and through the development of individual targets and development schemes (2005:65). In this system, children are constructed as pathological beings, as a unit within a system, subject to continuous assessment, marking, diagnosis and sanctions (ibid:172). These strategies are often not described as punishments, but can be experienced as such by pupils.

Correspondingly, the older emphasis on the authority of individual teachers has been replaced by a belief in cooperation between teachers and other actors, and the importance of unifying behind a collective facade (Landhal 2006:121). Landahl argues that this can be seen as a strategy to establish a more powerful position towards pupils, as cohesion is important for understanding how a group can achieve dominance over another. It can also be seen as a managing strategy to tackle the "dirty" dimensions of teaching. For example, anti-bullying work groups enable teachers to delegate responsibility to others, who can deal with aggressive pupils, and thus relieve the teacher of this "dirty" task (ibid:214).

Summarising this section, these three themes represent the non-discursive aspect of the analytical framework. These themes are used in order to broaden the potential of the analysis.


**4.2 The discursive framework**
This section outlines four discourses that compete within the discursive order "bullying prevention". These were identified through a literature review and are seen as representative

of the different standpoints in the contemporary debate about bullying prevention and educational policy.

### 4.2.1 Liberal or Authoritarian education?

The philosopher Stephen Law argues for what he defines as a liberal education for children, as opposed to an authoritarian education. The main difference between the liberal tradition and the authoritarian, according to his definition, is that the authoritarian tradition involves getting the young to defer to a higher authority, an authority that can determine what is right and wrong for them. In contrast, the liberal tradition insists that people have to make up their own minds about morality, and that the role of education should be to equip the young with the necessary skills to face this responsibility properly (Law 2007:1-2).

In an historical overview of Western education, Law claims that the authoritarian tradition was dominant until the 1960s, when a consensus gained foothold that authoritarian schools were restrictive and oppressive. This consensus developed especially in regards to the Second World War, as it became clear how dangerous it is when people learn to obey without questioning. Additionally, a consensus was growing that freedom of thought and freedom of speech is essential for a functioning democracy. The strongest criticism against an authoritarian education is that young people do not develop the skills necessary to question authorities:"Given that human beings have a disastrous tendency to defer to Authority anyway, surely the last thing we should do is reinforce this tendency" (ibid:46). For example, Miligram's famous experiment has shown us how surprisingly like "moral sheep" we are, as we tend to lack the inner resources to identify and stand up against authorities (ibid:46). Relating this to bullying, children do not interfere and stop bullying practices because they are afraid of those who appear to be strongest (the ones that bully) and afraid of being targeted themselves.

Consequently, the liberal tradition was, until the 1990s, the dominant educational model in Europe and the United States. However, towards the end of the century many began to worry that we had gone too far, that we had become too liberal. Increasing crime, drug addiction, and disorderly classrooms were taken as indicators for that liberalism had gone too far. Consequently, many began to propagate for a return to a more authoritarian educational system (ibid:2).

The core of Law's argument is that as a society we need to allow children to question us and our decisions, and that we have to be prepared to defend our decisions and laws and argue for them. We should not rely on oppressive authoritarian methods in order to get children to behave and think like us. Thus, we need to encourage children to question, think rationally, and deal with problems from an early age (ibid:19). A liberal school education should give children plenty of time to discuss the rules and regulations that they obey, should encourage children to express their opinions especially with regards to what they find unfair, should encourage a climate of open discussions. In addition, teachers have to answer honest and open questions and give reasons and arguments for their stance (ibid:19). The main positive aspects of an liberal education is, according to Law, that it encourages "thinking skills and virtues", and the development of emotional intelligence and social skills: "By thinking critically and carefully about your own beliefs and attitudes, you may develop insights into your own character. By stepping outside of your own viewpoint and looking at issues from the stance of another, you can develop a greater empathy with and understanding of others" (ibid:35). Bullying is thus reduced through the development of empathy and emotional intelligence.

*Freedom of thought and freedom of action*

Law differentiates between "freedom of thought" and "freedom of action". Complete freedom of action is not desirable as we need rules that govern in what manner children are allowed to act. Consequently, one needs a system that regulates action, rather than thought.

Law argues that authoritarian educational strategies are manipulative as they try to get children to believe something without actually providing any grounds for supposing that the belief is correct (ibid:31). Ways of shaping children's behaviour and thoughts involve punishments, incentives in order to encourage "good" expressions of thought, belief and behaviour, social pressure in order to stop children from asking unacceptable questions, control and censure in order to block out alternative explanations, and isolation. However, Law believes that it can be acceptable to use some of these strategies in order to control action and to create a disciplined environment (ibid:34). For example: "The kind of Liberal approach advocated in this book can only work in a fairly disciplined environment where children have got into the habit of listening to different points of view, calmly and carefully considering them, and so on" (ibid:128).

In conclusion, Law argues that freedom of thought is essential for both education and for preventing bullying. However, he is unspecific in relation to the degree of freedom of action, and admits that some authoritarian measures are unavoidable at times. This leaves much open to individual interpretation as to how much punishment should be tolerated and exactly what authoritarian punishments are acceptable. Two possible discourses emerge from this discussion: the authoritarian and the liberal.

### 4.2.2 A Democratic Tradition

Erik Sigsgaard explores how telling off, insulting, scolding and other sanctioning behaviours affects children. These behaviours involve those that adults often feel as natural behaviour towards children, but seem aggressive or violating/offensive if committed against an adult. Sigsgaard argues that these behaviours are essentially negative for children's' development and positions himself within the democratic tradition with its emphasis on participation, play, and living in the present and not just preparing for adult life. This perspective is set against that of the "boundary setting" tradition, a perspective that we will explore below, which according to Sigsgaard established itself as dominant during the 1990s. "When answering the question why it had gone awry for young criminals, drug addicts or the children of the 68-generation the answer became automatically 'boundaries'" (Sigsgaard 2004:16). This gives the impression that children need adults to set demands, decide for them and set prohibitions, and the alternative become synonymous with indifference and neglect. "Boundary seeking" children that "test adults boundaries" are, through the democratic perspective, seen as individuals protesting against their placement in institutions, against their incapacitation and against unfair treatment.

Proponents of this perspective argue that the relationship between adults and children in schools is unequal, especially with regards to that adults have the power to define how children experience themselves through how they react to communication from children, how they label their experiences and actions and what they react to and not. This position of power can be used to encourage independence, self confidence, respect for self and others, but can also be used in order to undermine self-respect and independence (ibid:25). In order to encourage a positive development, adults need to adopt a confirming attitude towards children and try to understand children from their own assumptions and perspectives, rather than from their own.

Furthermore, this perspective argues that the process of institutionalization of children is essentially authoritarian because of the distinct power imbalances that are invested in different actors within the system. Sigsgaard argues for a change in attitudes, replacing punishments

with encouragement and appreciation. Relating this to bullying, Sigsgaard argues that the school environment is conducive to bullying because children identify with how adults treat them, and mirror this behaviour in their treatment of each other. If teachers tell off, insult, scold and engage in other sanctioning behaviours children will do the same to each other (ibid:208).

In conclusion, Sigsgaard arguments result in a possible discourse that is critical of what one might term authoritarian impingements on freedom of action and freedom of thought. Bullying prevention is, thus, constructed as best pursued through a democratic strategy with encouragement, appreciation and equal relationships at the fore.

### 4.2.3 A Boundary setting Tradition

Bengt Grandelius represents the perspective opposed to that of Sigsgaard, namely the boundary setting perspective. Grandelius claims that we need to reinstate adults' authority towards children, so that adults once again can be role models for children. In this context, Grandelius means that authority is to do with a clear and present role for adults, and not totalitarian power (Grandelius 2006:12). Grandelius argues that contemporary adults are insecure because old methods of childrearing have been rejected whilst there is a lack of alternative methods. Furthermore, he argues that many adults today do not want to be adults and assume proper responsibility for their children, which has led to that many children have been forced to grow up too early through a stressful process involving taking too much responsibility. Parents have become too much like friends for their children, and thus denied their own responsibilities and needs (ibd:100). As a result, adults distance themselves from children, act leniently, change rules in accordance to the demands of children, use bribes and threaten with violence (ibid:38). In order to change this we need to establish a healthy and natural authority towards children, where adults take responsibility for fostering and let children develop at their own pace (ibid:43).

The best way to do this, according to Grandelius, is to set boundaries in order to show what behaviour is acceptable and what is not. Setting boundaries is the most important condition for children's development as it protects them from becoming overwhelmed by feelings of failure (ibid:29).

According to this perspective, children have limited experience and need support and guidance from adults, in order to learn how to deal with demands, and failure. Children become manipulative if they do not have clear boundaries as they want to explore how far they can push adults. Many of the problems that we see today in schools are due to a lack of boundaries, because the children are not used to demands and find it difficult to adapt (ibid:82). In addition, schools should function as an opposite pole for pupils with messy homes. Structure, demands and expectations in school facilitate a safe environment for these children.

*Boundary setting as bullying prevention*

Setting boundaries is primarily about saying no, and stopping misguided actions such as bullying (ibid:290): "setting boundaries…can be to stop bullying or harassment in order to protect the bullied part and give some kind of support and discussion with the bully. In short, as long as intentions are good adults should be able to exercise power over children without risking it being experienced as violating. Boundary setting can involve physically taking hold in order to stop, but without inflicting pain (ibid:113). Nevertheless, sometimes situations come up when, for example, a teacher tries to stop bullying and the children physically defend themselves. In these cases teachers should be allowed to intervene, with physical force, without risking being convicted of abuse (ibid:115). In conclusion, this perspective constructs a discourse with an emphasis on restricting freedom of action though setting

boundaries. Curtailing unwanted behaviour is, thus, constructed as the key issue in order to prevent bullying.

*Table 1: The discursive order "Bullying prevention" and the relationship between social practices and discourses.*

### 4.3 Analytical scheme

| Social practices | Discourses | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | **Authoritarian (1)** | **Boundary setting (2)** | **Liberal (3)** | **Democratic (4)** |
| **The social organisation of schools (A)** | Powerful admin. system. Weak social system.Restricts freedoms of thought and action. Bullying a result of weak admin. system. | Strong admin. system setting boundaries for social system. Bullying a result of lack of boundaries. | Weak admin. system in relation to controlling freedom of thought. Admin system can be strong to control action. Bullying a result of lack of emotional development and critical faculties. | Weak admin. system. Bullying a result of authoritarianism/ hierarchies between social and admin. systems. |
| **The teaching profession (B)** | Fostering and disciplinary tasks important. Authoritarian teaching methods. Unified admin. system. | Reestablishment of teachers' authority. Clear separation pupil/teacher. | No control or punishments over pupils' thoughts. Actions subjected to surveillance and punishment. | Limits punishments and surveillance. Egalitarian and confirming relationships pupil/teacher. |
| **Educational conceptions (C)** | Patriarchal or Scientific-rational conceptions. | Silent. | Democratic or Scientific- rational conceptions. | Predominantly democratic conception. Emphasises relationships and the social aspects of learning. |

This table summarizes the discourses and social practices outlined in this chapter (also called the discursive and non-discursive framework) and their relationships to each other. The discourses were identified as constituting the discursive order. That is, they compete in order to define what bullying prevention is, and how it should best be pursued. Consequently, this table provides an answer to the first research question: How may one characterise the main discourses that compete in order to define bullying prevention?

Reading the table as a sliding scale from left to right explains the main differences between the discourses. One of the main differences is how much power that should be invested in the administrative system. The authoritarian discourse especially emphasizes a strong administrative system, whilst the democratic discourse positions itself as the opposite, namely that the administrative system should avoid authoritarian tendencies. The differences between the authoritarian and democratic discourses are also clear in regards to the educational conceptions. Whilst the authoritarian discourse emphasises limited questioning and patriarchal and/or scientific-rational conceptions the democratic discourse rather uses itself, perhaps unsurprisingly, predominantly of the democratic conception. The sliding scale metaphor can also be used in relation to the teaching profession. While the authoritarian discourse emphasises fostering and discipline the democratic discourse rather wants to limit these strategies to the bare minimum and focuses instead on equality and relationships. These distinct differences between the authoritarian and democratic discourses probably mean that they are mutually exclusive in the sense that their existence depends on rejecting the other. The other discourses can probably be combined with each others to a greater extent because they do not build on mutual exclusion, and are therefore more compatible.

The table can be read horizontally or vertically. If one chooses to read it horizontally then all the discourses are compared in relation to one social practice. If one rather chooses to read it vertically, then one of the discourses will be set in relation to all of the social practices. This table functions as a structuring mechanism for the analysis and is used in a vertical manner. This is facilitated through a number and letter system. If you look closely at the table, you can see that under each heading there is a number or a letter. For example, when discussing authoritarian discourses and the teaching profession in the analysis the position on table will be indicated as (1B).

## 5. Analysis: exploring the patterning of discourses

The analysis is divided into two sections. Section one consists of two parts. The first part explores the discourses used by Quadriceps. This part functions to familiarize the reader with the Quadriceps foundation, their educational policy and views on bullying prevention. The second part moves the analysis to school one. Section two consists of the analysis of school two. This analysis aims at providing the answers for three of the research questions. These are: What discourses do respondents in the two schools studied use when they construct bullying prevention? How are these discourses patterned and which might be considered as primary and secondary discourses? Are discourses constructed differently in the two schools studied with different socio-economic backgrounds and educational policies?

### 5.1 Section One: Quadriceps

As mentioned in the method section, school one is a so called Quadriceps school, as it has adopted the foundation's educational concepts. This part will analyse what discourses Quadriceps constructs through analysing citations from the Quadriceps handbook (Bohlin: 2008) and from the interview. The analysis follows the structure outlined in table 1. However, before we plunge into the analysis, I will briefly mention what kind of schools Quadriceps considers to be attracted to their services. The Quadriceps respondent argues that it is mainly schools in poorer areas that request their services, although there are exceptions:

> "Those that work in ...ghetto schools... they are more ambitious in looking for programs that can help the children. If you've got a quite smooth running school with some middle class families then it flows anyway [without Quadriceps]". (respondent 1).

This at least partly supports the idea put forwards in the introductory chapter about social factors influencing the differentiation of educational policies. It could be that "ghetto schools", that is schools in underprivileged areas with associated problems, are more attracted to more disciplinarian and knowledge centred educational policies. This could be due to that these schools are under more pressure from the surrounding society as they have to deal with repercussions emanating from material, social and cultural exclusion. This socio-economic dimension is evident when Quadriceps argues that schools should act as opposite poles to society at large:

> "The school should be as society should be like and not reflect society".(respondent 1)

Exactly what society should be like is never forthcoming but is does imply, as we shall see below, that an ordered and disciplinarian environment is seen as beneficial for children. Especially considering the above statement regarding middleclass families brings the thought to mind that the differentiation of educational policies is, for Quadriceps, largely a question of class. Another dimension is the organizations knowledge centered educational policy, aimed at increasing grades, which probably does make the organization attractive for schools that suffers with low performing students. Thus, schools may see an opportunity to increase their standing in the target based system, materialized in the SALSA scale, through engaging with target focused educational polices sold by, for example, Quadriceps.

*Authoritarian discourses*

(1A) The respondent representing Quadriceps argues that in order to facilitate bullying prevention, teaching and administrative staff have to be unified about the aims of teaching, and about a rule, sanction and value system:

> "Adults have to behave in a certain manner towards children. A common structure that is anti-bullying… that does not allow violations but intervenes directly. There cannot be any doubt about sanctions as they should be known off by heart, rules should be framed and put up everywhere. It is good for the children and the teachers. Then there is no scope for bullying". (respondent1)

This discourse argues that bullying is prevented through the establishment of a unified, and thus strong, administrative system. These rules, sanctions and values are formulated by staff and are considered non-negotiable. The values are, among others, the "rules of respect" that include respecting yourself, your friends, and property. Through establishing collective systems for rules, values and sanctions the administrative system is seen as preventing bullying behaviours. The underlying assumption is that actors in the administrative system have to intervene whenever bullying occurs, and that they utilise these collective systems of control.

(1B) This discourse can be related both to the teaching profession and the development of horizontal and vertical respect, and to an attempt to discipline children into certain relationship patterns (such as the values noted above). It could also be seen as an attempt from the administrative system to affect the social system in such a manner that it may become self regulatory and self disciplining. Rather surprisingly, Quadriceps advocates the use of indoctrination for socializing pupils into the rule, sanction and value system:

> "Do indoctrinate them, but don't cram it in".(respondent1)

In this sense, Quadriceps uses an authoritarian discourse as it argues that pupils should accept these rules, sanctions and values without questioning. Thus, pupils' rights in regards to rules, sanctions and values should be that everyone has the right to know everything about them, but not the right to question them:

> "Pupils rights should be that everyone should know about all the rules".(respondent1)

Returning to the issue of unity, the respondent in Quadriceps stipulates that everyone in the administrative system has to be loyal to the collective aims, rules and values. The administrative system has to internalise the Quadriceps values in order for it to work:

"If you want to get anywhere with this programme then the school has to own it".(respondent1)

This discourse can be seen as an attempt to forge together the administrative system into one unit, thus establishing it in a position of power towards the social system. This is evident in statements claiming ownership over schools that stipulate that pupils, and (other) outsiders have to know that this is "our" school:

"children have to know who is in charge but also that we like them. They have to know that this is our school, and that we decide here...".(respondent1)

Consequently, the school is constructed as belonging to the administrative system, and the social system as belonging to a separate category subject to the power of the administrative system. It can also be seen as a strategy to deal with the teaching profession and "dirty" tasks, namely that it is the responsibility of all teachers to intervene in bullying situations:

"all children belong to everyone".(respondent1)

This widens the responsibility to all actors within the administrative system to participate in strategies that deal with bullying prevention and education.


(1C)
"Some schools try relationship training. These schools only get more problems. It is only when schools are schools that personal development can be achieved". (respondent1)

In this statement the respondent distances himself from the idea of relationship training. Thus, this person establishes his/her point of view as legitimate and effective through claiming that it is: "only when schools are schools that personal development can be achieved." I interpret this as an authoritarian discourse because it positions itself against liberal strategies that encourage emotional intelligence and social skills (although it could also be conceived of as a boundary setting discourse). "Relationship training" is constructed as useless in dealing with bullying prevention. Instead, bullying prevention is linked to achievements in school:

"The basic values and structures in this program lead to increased learning for everybody. It removes feelings of powerlessness and frustration over school failure and the Quadriceps programme works then both as crime prevention and against bullying". (Bohlin 2008:14)

Thus, focusing efforts on learning is constructed as the best way in which to prevent bullying. I would argue that this is built on an "essential" view of knowledge and education (remembering the scientific-rational conception). For example, Quadriceps prioritises subjects, targets, rewards and encouragement for good work, high expectations, order without repression, and individualisation combined with taking into account pupils' level of knowledge (Bohlin 2008: 8). This is made explicitly clear in another citation:

"One is in school to learn, not to make friends...".(respondent1)

In this sense, the discourse is knowledge centred and thereby at least partly excludes the democratic ideas of collective learning and the social aspects of education (within the democratic conception of knowledge and education). As a result, bullying prevention is linked to an essential view of knowledge within the boundaries of the scientific-rational conception. Thus, educational policy is linked with bullying prevention.

*Boundary setting and democratic discourses*

(4A)  "Professor Dan Olweus gives four points which are preventative of bullying:

- A school environment characterized by warmth, interest and engagement from adults.
- Clear boundaries against undesirable behaviour.
- Consistent use of some form of non-physical and non-hostile sanction against those that break the rules.
- Adults, both at school and at home, who act as authorities ".(Bohlin 2008: 14)

Here, Quadriceps legitimizes its bullying prevention strategy through drawing from an expert from the academic sphere. The first point uses the democratic discourse in terms of that it emphasises the use of a confirming attitude towards children. This discourse is often used in the Quadriceps handbook and by the respondent.

(2A) However, democratic discourses often become secondary in the sense that other discourses can dominate over it. This is hinted at in the second and third points above where Quadriceps uses the boundary setting discourse, clearly emphasising the need for boundaries, rules and sanctions. Quadriceps also uses the boundary setting discourse when legitimizing its emphasis on rules and sanctions:

> "A natural order is the best for children. Boundaries and frames are a condition otherwise one inhibits growth".(respondent1)

Here, order, rules and sanctions are constructed as meeting an innate need for children.

(2B) The fourth point is more elusive as it does not define what authority is. However, using the word authority in this context at all denotes that Quadriceps refers to the boundary setting tradition (or possibly the authoritarian) as the democratic tradition argues that authority is conducive to bullying, rather than preventative. Authority is also constructed for teachers, because they are paid (as opposed to pupils) and because children have an innate need to be lead:

> "Authority should be for teachers...it is the teacher who is the leader that gets paid. Passive leadership is not good because children have to be lead". (respondent1)

*Liberal discourses*

(3A) A somewhat contradictory liberal discourse is also used, namely that schools should actively strive towards pupil participation though stimulating discussion in meetings:

> "The school should create participation through continuously developing class councils to discussion forums where language and self-esteem are strengthened". (Bohlin 2008:13)

However, this discourse is often downplayed as an important factor for bullying prevention and certainly never achieves a primary position. Additionally, a liberal discourse is used when arguing that teachers should teach pupils to question, and should be able to answer questions concerning what is right and wrong, good and bad:

> "The role of the teacher is to teach how one questions. One has to be able to answer what is right and wrong, bad and good". (respondent1)

This discourse allows for some power to be handed over to the social system and recognizes teachers' responsibility to teach pupils how to question, although it seems in a limited form through answering what is right and wrong rather than reasoning about the premises of these values.

In conclusion, Quadriceps primarily constructs bullying prevention through using authoritarian and boundary setting discourses. The use of a "knowledge" centred educational policy is constructed as an effective way of preventing bullying. The liberal discourse is used in a limited sense in regards to pupils' participation in meetings but this is not linked to bullying prevention, and Quadriceps clearly distances itself from "relationship training". The democratic discourse is used in a limited sense in regards to that adults should relate to children with warmth and interest. I interpret through this analysis that Quadriceps' main argumentative thrust is to strengthen the administrative system so that it can influence the social system through indoctrinating it into a rule, sanction and value system. In this sense, Quadriceps espouses a patriarchal view of education as it demands obedience without questioning, whilst providing protection and care.

## 5.2 Section One: School One

As previously mentioned, school one profiles itself as a Quadriceps school. This section will explore what discourses are prevalent in this school with regards to bullying prevention. It will also investigate to what extent these discourses converge with those espoused by

Quadriceps itself. However, before embarking on this analysis, we will briefly touch on why this school was attracted to Quadriceps. One respondent (in a leading position) argued that the school chose to buy the Quadriceps concept because the pupils at the time did not consider school work to be important, and because the teachers suffered from low self esteem with regards to their profession:

> "What we saw as problematic was that a lot of the children did not think that school was important. We thought that it was too usual that one came here and met friends and passed the time...we thought that the lessons did not start on time and that the pupils drifted in and didn't bring their stuff and lessons were interrupted. We also felt that a lot of the teachers had low self esteem in their professional role."(respondent2)

The school invited Quadriceps to give a lecture after which they decided to buy the whole concept and become a "Quadriceps school". Quadriceps managed to convince them because:

> "He [the Quadriceps representative] talked about teachers competence and education and…that we are experts in pedagogy and you have to take two steps forwards as teachers…And I think that they felt very strengthened and I felt very strengthened as a school person when I heard him say that. And we talked about learning and that a lot of teachers during the past decades have thought that the school has had to retreat with learning because there is such a lot else that we need to do". (respondent2)

Thus, school one was attracted to Quadriceps because they believed that the organization could provide the solutions to the problems that they encountered in their school. One such perceived problem was that pupils did not think that school was important and that pupils only came to school to meet friends, socialize and waste their time. Another related problem was that learning was not prioritized in the school. These problems could have a lot do with that school one is situated in an area with rather low socio-economic status, with problems emanating from material, social and cultural deprivation (or exclusion) but also from a working class family culture that does not prioritize school work. In this context, Quadriceps markets itself as providing the solutions to these problems through prioritizing subject knowledge and targets. Another important dimension is the emphasis on teacher's poor professional self esteem. Through strategies aimed at boosting professional self esteem, Quadriceps arguably becomes very attractive to teachers, who experience that their profession has lost legitimacy, through for example prioritizing learning and reducing the importance of "dirty" tasks. This is an example of how socio-economic factors may play an important role in influencing the differentiation of educational policies in a system defined by ideological "silence".


*Authoritarian Discourses*
(1A) The respondents primarily use authoritarian discourses when asked questions how bullying prevention is best pursued. Thus, authoritarian discourses are invested in "semantic thickness" as the respondents place emphasis on them, and are the first discourses used when bullying prevention is discussed. These authoritarian discourses are, as mentioned previously, constructed in terms of limiting freedom of action as well as thought, and expect pupils to unquestioningly accept the rules they are subject to. For example, one respondent argues that the value, rule and sanction system implemented in the school is unquestionable. When asked whether there are rules that the pupils are not allowed to question the respondent says that:

> "Yes there are. These documents [the rule, sanction and value system] that we adults have decided ...". (respondent2)

As a result the value, rule and sanction system can be seen as belonging to the administrative system, and not to the social system. This system can, thus, be seen as a tool for the administrative system to exert control over the social system. This control becomes unproblematic because the administrative system owns the preferential right of interpretation

of this system, as the social system is invested in no rights of questioning or legitimate rebellion against this authority.

(1B) Similarly to Quadriceps, respondents in school one argue that pupils should be socialized into the system:

> "...it is our document [values, rules and sanctions] and it is placed on every wall, an A3 version of them...we have decided that in the first week in the autumn term they have to be taken up once a day one way or another and during the first month, the remaining three weeks once a week and during the remaining year once a month...I think that it is a good way to marinate the pupils, as I usually say to steep them in it. I even said that one should indoctrinate the pupils...".(respondent2)

These values are, as in Quadriceps, respect yourself, respect others and respect your surroundings (Bohlin 2008). "Respecting yourself" includes directives such as taking responsibility for strengthening self esteem and being honest about misdeeds. "Respecting others" involves understanding everybody's equal worth and showing consideration and care for others. Rules worth mentioning here are do not use physical violence and do not violate, and avoid all activities that disturb your and others' possibilities to learn. Sanctions involve reprimands from staff, discussions with the form master or with the teacher team, parental contact, and pupil welfare conferences with the headmaster. The respondents emphasize that it is through the use of this rule, sanction and value system that bullying is best prevented, as it provides a framework for staff to fall back on and use when intervening in bullying situations. In order to facilitate this, it is of importance that the administrative system employs a unified approach towards the social system:

> "But it is the teachers that choose relationships instead of raising then one comes into conflict with one another when some keep to the rules and some don't, and that is troubling...".(respondent3)

This respondent constructs those teachers that are relationship focused rather than raising focused as not adhering to the common rules. This presents itself as a problem here because it means that the administrative system is not unified. Thus, according to this point of view bullying prevention is hampered because some teachers choose to build relationships with the pupils rather than focusing on raising them. Using the word "raising" indicates, in this context, that it is the teachers role to socialize pupils into the specific behavioural code outlined above, rather than establishing relationships with them. I would argue that this presumes a hierarchical division of authority, namely that teachers and other actors in the administrative system need to be authoritative. This can be exemplified through the following extract from a discussion regarding leadership:

> " …I mean that the more strategies, the more structure, the more calm and order we have in school the less bullying and conflicts we experience…clear leadership in the whole organization where the principal has to be a clear leader and gives the direction for the development of the school and the whole schools strategy for values and equal treatment and attitudes, that we don't have different attitudes and pedagogical leaders… and if we have a school where the teachers are not clear leaders then it is the pupils that take on that role and fix things and set the tone and decide how it should be and then it is on their terms. One can also see this with animals, with flocks of animals. If you don't have a cock in the chicken farm then the chickens hack each other, so leadership is very important". (respondent4)

Consequently, strong leadership is constructed as providing the solution for bullying both in terms of that it unifies the administrative system and in terms of that it intervenes in the social system in such as manner that bullying is reduced.

(1C) Echoing the knowledge centred and disciplinarian educational policies employed by Quadriceps, respondents argue that pupils achieve well being through succeeding with learning:

> "…succeeding with that which the organization is intended for creates a way for one to mature socially, that one feels good and comes part of the group and feels comfortable and it has to do with self-esteem and self-confidence, that I am good enough".(respondent2)

Consequently, well being is constructed as achieved through succeeding with subjects. This focus on achieving good results in school may also affect what efforts are placed on bullying prevention. If well being, self-confidence and group belonging is considered to be primarily affected by achieving results, one may not place as much emphasis on group processes or personality types when considering bullying prevention:

> "…and I think that schools were afflicted by for some time that one forgot to talk about the obvious one only talked about how children felt in school and not about what they learnt which is the most important". (respondent2)

*Boundary setting discourses*

(2A) The respondents use boundary setting discourses when emphasizing the role of restricting freedom of action when preventing and stopping bullying. Intervening in the processes of the social system is constructed as an effective way in which to stop bullying. One respondent says that (s)he intervenes whenever words or actions occur with the intention of violating or bullying:

> " That one for example reacts to small things when it is about bullying… That one loudly in front of the class emphasizes that that one does not accept it quite simply… it is very important to or mark disapproval of all the words,  offensive words and those small small things because if we don't then we have said that it is okay".(respondent4)

Thus, according to this articulation, teachers should constantly survey the class and react to bullying behaviour. Surveillance and intervention are key tools for bullying prevention.

(2B) Setting boundaries against bullying informs the social system of what behaviour is acceptable and what is not. One respondent argues that keeping the pupils in the classroom is preferable as this enables the teacher to observe and intervene:

> "if we have a very free way of working as we have a lot of today then the pupils can go away to all kinds of places and then we can't see what is going on. But when we have the pupils gathered in the classroom then we can see and set the tone...".(respondent4)

Consequently, surveillance and control over the social system is enabled through assembling the pupils in the classroom. This in turn allows teachers to prevent bullying. Another statement argues that it is through learning pupils to report to teachers that violating behaviour and bullying can be prevented:

> "… and [the pupils] can handle these situations like when they get angry so that they instead of running off and getting even with the person that they are going to hit and are angry with they calm down and go to the teacher instead and come out with their anger".(respondent2)

Bullying is thus prevented through redirecting conflicts from the social system to the administrative system. The administrative system can then set boundaries against unwanted behaviour without directly engaging in surveillance and control, as pupils are disciplined into transferring conflicts.

2C) Boundary setting discourses are employed when respondents legitimize limited pupil influence on teaching. For example, one respondent argues that it is stressful for children to influence teaching because it forces them to make choices, choices that especially young pupils are not ready for:

> "…sometimes I think that we do the children a disservice because they constantly have to choose. I think that it often becomes stressful…pupils obviously have to influence where they can influence, where it isn't stressful for them…but I think that one has to be active and set boundaries about what it is reasonable that they can influence".(respondent3)

This discourse limits children's capacities and constructs the need for boundaries in relation to how much influence pupils should be able to exert over their situation. It thereby limits how much influence the social system should have on the administrative system.

*Liberal discourses*

(3A) The respondents make limited use of liberal discourses in terms of stimulating emotional intelligence and social skills. These discourses are not primarily used in discussions regarding

bullying prevention but are rather used secondarily and are indicated to be less important. For example, one respondent says that:

> "…we try to prevent [bullying] through our obvious rules and values… and most children clearly know that they apply and these are the base for bullying [prevention]…and then one constantly works with in all years with how we treat each other".(respondent3)

Here, the rule and value system is constructed as providing the basis for bullying prevention. Liberal strategies are relegated to a secondary position for preventing bullying, and are probably mostly used in a complementary capacity.

*Democratic discourses*

(4A) In terms of how teachers should relate to pupils, the respondents in school one use what I would like to call a pseudo democratic discourse. It is pseudo because it may appear as democratic, i.e. egalitarian, but is really more authoritarian as it constructs the relationship as based on power asymmetries. In addition, this relationship is constructed to aid the indoctrination of the pupils as it stipulates that teachers should persuade the pupils that the rules are for them and not for teachers:

> "…one meets the pupils in such a manner that they understand that this with learning and the rules are for them, it is not for our sake but for your sake and then one meet them in a loving, humble, open but resolute and firm way…".(respondent2)

The loving, humble and open part of the relationship indicates that teachers do not solely rely on authoritarian measures. However, that does not mean that it is a democratic discourse, because the relationship is hardly constructed as egalitarian in relation to bullying prevention. Similarly to Quadriceps, it rather constructs the relationship as patriarchal. conclusion, authoritarian and boundary setting discourses are dominant in school one because they are most frequently used and most frequently used first when discussing bullying prevention. Respondents used authoritarian discourses in regards to restricting freedom of thought and action through indoctrination into a common value, rule and sanction system. In addition, authoritarian discourses were used in relation to a unified administrative system, and to the importance of strong and clear leadership. Boundary setting discourses were used when legitimizing control over the social system, when discussing interventions, surveillance and redirecting conflicts. Liberal discourses assumed a secondary position but indicate that some "relationship training" is considered useful for bullying prevention. "Pseudo democratic" discourses were also used in a secondary manner. Consequently, one may argue that the discursive order is defined by authoritarian and boundary setting discourses in this setting.

## 5.3 Section Two: School Two

School two was chosen on the basis of that it gave the impression of being a more democratically inclined school. It was therefore rather surprising to find out that school two's main ambition in regards to bullying prevention is to cover the school with a surveillance system. This system is enabled through the use of several different strategies that are combined in order to observe and intervene in order to stop and prevent bullying. Teachers, parents, logbooks, friend supporters (elected pupils that report instances of bullying) report to the centre of the system, the anti-bullying group. The plan for equal treatment reads:

> "In the bullying preventative work there are many channels to discover harassment. All the information that comes from staff observations, from teachers knowledge, messages from the logbook, from friend supporters reports, from surveys and from parental contacts shall be reported to the anti- bullying group if it is flagged "bullying warning".

This analysis will explore what discourses are constructed with regards to this surveillance ambition.

*Boundary setting discourses*

(2B) In school two, boundary setting discourses are used when respondent discuss how they stop ongoing conflicts. One respondent claims that they are not scared of conflicts at the school and that teachers intervene and stop harassments and bullying activities immediately:

> "But we are not scared of conflicts.... Often we can solve it very quickly… But if you turn your back then it is the same as saying it is okay to say such things… ".(respondent5)

This person constructs a boundary setting discourse that stipulates that "we", referring to the teaching collective, are not scared of conflicts and that they solve these quickly through interfering and setting boundaries. Setting boundaries are everybody's responsibility and not a "dirty" task for teachers:

> "…everybody has to be involved in the work and that all pupils are everybody's responsibility. One can never say that this does not concern me because I only teach in this subject". (respondent6)

Boundary setting is, thus, constructed as the concern of everybody and an important part in the surveillance strategy. Bullying is prevented through constant intervention. This is similar to school one. In addition, the anti bullying group is seen as providing more authority for teachers:

> "…pupils take it quite seriously even if they come with small arguments it is different to talk with pupils in the form of the anti bullying group even though we are the same people and it is perhaps the same people that one has argued with maybe a thousand times before ". (respondent7)

This example illustrates that contemporary punishments may not seem as punishments to teachers, but may be interpreted as such by pupils. This interpretation invests the anti-bullying group with a measure of authority. One respondent says that they report bullying cases to the police. This constructs bullying as a criminal offence and as a clear boundary that has been crossed:

> "…they [the police] often want us to report to the police if a violation of the law has occurred and we do that. It is also something for the pupils and parents so that they get a feeling that the law applies here".(respondent6)

Thus, the administrative system is invested with more authority as it becomes associated with the law and police. Surveillance is also facilitated through the use of "friend supporters". These are pupils that are recruited to report to the anti-bullying group when bullying occurs. This strategy enables the administrative system to increase its surveillance capacities:

> "…two from every class are elected, and now and again they can report anonymously to the anti-bullying team about what they have seen if something has happened. This way we have unearthed a lot that we have been able to work with in time ". (respondent6)

This surveillance strategy increases the opportunities for the administrative system to set boundaries against unwanted behaviour. The respondent constructs bullying prevention as being possible through this surveillance. The reasoning goes that as long as one finds out, one can stop it through setting boundaries.

The respondents construct why bullying occurs in medical or psychological terms:

> "…there might be some that I miss but I think about those that we have a lot of contact with. There is always something either they have a diagnosis or they have some difficulties with one thing or another" (respondent5).

Constructing the reasons behind bullying as partly due to medical problems, a diagnosed problem, or other "difficulties" can place the blame on individuals rather than on social structures or organizations. It may also reproduce the dominating view of bullying as originating from innate psychological traits and excludes other possible factors such as identity construction and group processes. However, the use of the phrase "other difficulties" problematizes this assumption because it may indicate that the respondent considers difficulties at home or in school as leading to bullying.

*Liberal discourses*

(3A) Liberal discourses are used in school two in relation to how much influence pupils have on teaching and with regard to activities stimulating thought processes. Pupils can affect teaching through evaluations that are handed out regularly:

> "We usually have evaluations every now and again and there they can write if there is something that they think that we should change or do differently…". (respondent7)

Pupils are constructed to have some influence over their situation through evaluations. Thus, pupils are considered to have some power over teachers in the sense that they can have a say in, and criticize how teaching is conducted.

(3B) In a discussion about rules and sanctions one respondent said that the school had abolished a rule forbidding caps and other attire. The rule has been criticized by the students as unfair and unnecessary. The teachers and principal had then decided to get rid of those rules because they could not explain why they had it:

> "… And if we can't explain why we have the rule then it is unnecessary that it exists". (respondent6)

This is a liberal discourse in the sense that it presupposes that teachers have to motivate rules and do not expect them to uncritically accept them. These discourses outline some possibility for the social system to affect the administrative system. Thus, pupils may have a say in how their working environment should be, and learn that they are capable of changing things and of criticizing authorities. In addition, this illustrates that school two has a more democratically inclined educational policy than school one. Considering those activities that Law (2007) terms as philosophical, aiming at stimulating thought process and developing social skills and critical faculties, school two says that it has a "life knowledge" subject. However, liberal discourses always assume secondary positions when they are explicitly connected with bullying prevention.

*Democratic discourses*

(4A) Democratic discourses are used when the respondents consider the relationship between pupils and teachers. This relationship is constructed in informal and egalitarian terms. However, it is also clear that this relationship is not entirely on equal terms. For example, one respondent said that his relationship with pupils should resemble a friend relationship as long as the pupils respect his authority as a teacher and do not treat him in a similar fashion as the pupils treat each other:

> "… there has to be a distance. I am a friend but I am still the teacher. Because I do not want to be treated as they treat one another sometimes…".(respondent5)

This respondent uses a democratic discourse in the sense that using the word friend denotes that (s)he considers the relationship as relatively egalitarian. Authority is not unquestionable, hierarchical and strict as in authoritarian discourses. However, there is still vertical respect as pupils have to respect that the teacher sets the agenda, that they listen to him or her and that they do not treat teachers in the same manner as they treat one another.

(4C) The respondents also use a democratic discourse when discussing the importance of establishing a relationship with pupils. When one respondent was asked what characterizes a good teacher, the establishment of "good relationships" was constructed as primary:

> "It is a teacher who can listen to the pupils. Be flexible, have good values. Really gets to know the pupils and really wants something with his/her professional role. Good contact is very important. Then one must obviously be good at one's subject area as well". (respondent6)

Placing listening, getting to know one's pupils, and establishing good contact with pupils as primary in the teaching role is using a democratic discourse in the sense that it highlights relationships without mentioning boundaries and restrictions, as well as focusing on egalitarian relationships. Especially the word listening brings the thought to the democratic tradition as it supposes that teachers should take heed of what pupils say and let their ideas influence them.

One may also relate this to educational policy. Prioritizing relationships rather than subjects points towards the use of the democratic conception of education. This conception emphasizes the social nature of learning, the development of relationships, critical faculties, and democratic citizens. This can be illustrated through two quotes:

> "But I would say that my work as a teacher consists to 80 percent of building relationships with pupils and 20 percent of pure subject knowledge really. Then knowledge and the subject are obviously important as well but the be all and end all is that one has a good relationship with the pupils and then everything is a lot easier". (respondent7)

> "…if one passes with distinction and feels bad then it is no good. Then it is better to pass and feel good. That is much more important for me". (respondent6)

Thus, establishing relationships with pupils and creating an atmosphere for them to feel good in is constructed as the primary objectives of teaching. Subject knowledge is delegated to a secondary position. As was argued in the analytical framework, establishing relationships with pupils has not historically been seen as the main purpose of teaching and may thus be seen as "dirty" work. However, the discourses constructed by the respondents from this school places relationship building as non "dirty".

(4A) Relationship building is also seen as enabling surveillance and control, because the relationship building processes extend beyond the boundaries of the classroom and in to areas of the school usually reserved for pupils. For example, one respondent says that he is often in the student break room in order to create and maintain relationships:

> "You know my job doesn't stop when the pupils leave the classroom because I spend a lot of time in the student break room and talk with them when we don't have to be there, as we do have a time that one has to be there. But I am there a lot more than I have to. And it is only because one gets contact". (respondent5)

Accordingly, the establishment and maintenance of good relationships is pursued in order to aid teaching and facilitate the well being of pupils. These relationships in turn enable surveillance over the social system. In addition, it makes the disciplining of pupils easier:

> "…if one has a good relationship with the pupils then they can also take it if one becomes angry". (respondent7)

Thus, surveillance and discipline is constructed as best pursued through good and democratic relationships. Good relationships with pupils also encourage pupils to report to the teachers when bullying and fighting occurs:

> "They are used to it , they come and tell us when things happen… they are acclimatized to this from the nursery. They want help with solving conflicts". (respondent5)

As a consequence, democratic surveillance and discipline is enabled through pupils reporting to teachers. This disciplinary dimension of the relationship building process is especially interesting with regards to key individuals in the social system. The respondents argue that through establishing good relationships with troublesome pupils the teachers can control many more pupils:

> "For various reasons one quickly gets to know all those that are a little noisy and troublesome and if one has a good relationship with these then automatically half the school follows you can say. You win an awful lot by that".(respondent7)

Consequently, good relationships are constructed to enable surveillance, discipline and control over the social system. These relationships are also constructed to be egalitarian and friendly, albeit with more authority invested in teachers than in pupils. As a result, teachers are seen to exert "soft power" over pupils as they demand respect but are mostly seen as equals to the pupils. Thus, through the use of democratic discourses the respondents establish a specific relationship between the social and administrative system. This relationship is based on an idea of that the school has "good" pupils:

> "We have very good pupils. So I can imagine that other schools have a lot more of the fostering role than we have. And we also have the time, because I think at least that most of my pupils manage very well so we have time to talk about other things…".(respondent3)

Thus, pupils are not conceived of as being in need of disciplining, or fostering, but are seen as achieving well in subject knowledge, providing the ideal circumstances in which a democratic and egalitarian relationship ideal can flourish. In addition, the school is seen as calm in the sense that it does not experience a lot of conflicts. This calm has led to, according to the respondents, that they can to a larger extent intervene and put a stop to those few conflicts which arise:

> "...we deal with a lot but then it is also like this because it is mainly a calm and good school then we fall in properly here about things that probably don't even get noticed in a heavier school where the difficulties are much greater".(respondent4)

Privilege, resulting in the sense of calm and highly achieving students, is here seen as resulting in enabling the democratic bullying prevention system. Yet again, surveillance is also constructed as the main tool to combat bullying. Intervention in the social system is constructed as providing the base for bullying prevention, as bullying is seen to be stopped early:

> "We deal with quite small things and that is perhaps why we don't get so many big problems".(respondent4)

These strategies are in turn seen as stopping the processes in the social system that lead to the emergence of bullying, and are similar to those which were spoken of in school one, with the main difference that the relationships in school two are constructed as more egalitarian and less value, rule and sanction bound.

Relating this to bullying preventative ambitions outlined in the beginning of this section, these democratic discourses construct surveillance, control and discipline as enabled through relationships. These relationships are seen as affecting pupils' thoughts and actions through discussions and through listening to peoples' points of view. Worth noting here is that this section illustrates that democratic relationships also require control and discipline.

In conclusion, the respondents in school two use three of the discourses outlined in the analytical framework. There is an absence of authoritarian discourses defined as attempts to control both thoughts and actions of pupils. The respondents use democratic discourses in relation to the establishment of egalitarian relationships and surveillance, liberal discourses in regards to how much influence the social system should have on the administrative, and boundary setting with regards to how interventions in the social system should be undertaken. The use of boundary setting discourses do not include constructions of pupils innate need of boundaries, but are rather used in more pragmatic terms in relation to how specific bullying preventative interventions are performed. The more general emphasis on (panoptical) surveillance in this school points towards the democratic and liberal schools need of surveillance, discipline, and control. This emphasis on surveillance may appear paradoxical due to the otherwise democratic and liberal focus of this school. However, as Law (2007) argues, curtailing freedom of action is not the same thing as repressing freedom of thought. In fact, in order to establish an environment in which freedom of thought can be exercised (and also seemingly to prevent bullying), one needs to some extent utilise (authoritarian) methods to curtail freedom of action.

## 6. Conclusions and Discussion

This last chapter will outline and discuss the main conclusions of the Master's thesis in relation to its purposes and research questions. The first purpose was to investigate the prevalence of discursive constructions of bullying prevention.

*How may one characterise the main discourses that compete in order to define bullying prevention?*

This question directed my attention towards the need of a new analytical framework because none such could be found in the previous research that I reviewed. This framework includes

the authoritarian discourse, the boundary setting discourse, the liberal discourse and the democratic discourse. In addition, the analytical framework outlines the main social practices that were included in order to broaden the analysis. The authoritarian discourse affects the social practices by stipulating that the social organisation of schools should be characterised by a strong administrative system (consisting of teachers and other actors) and a weak social system (consisting of pupils and their relationships). The authoritarian discourse constructs the teacher collective as in need of unification, of surveillance and of using authoritarian methods of upbringing children. In addition, the authoritarian discourse stipulates that a patriarchal or scientific-rational conception of education should be employed as part of schools educational policies. The boundary setting discourse is in many ways similar to the authoritarian discourse apart from that it does not emphasise control of thought. The boundary setting discourse emphasises interventions with the intent of controlling action rather than thought. Considering the relationship with social practices, the boundary setting discourse emphasises a strong administrative system capable of setting boundaries for the social system. In addition, it emphasises the (re)establishment of authority for teachers and the idea that teachers should not be friends with pupils.

The liberal discourse places emphasis on the development of critical faculties and emotional development. This discourse affects the social practices through constructing a relatively weak administrative system with regards to controlling pupils' thoughts. However, this discourse is rather ambivalent with regards to control of action (that is surveillance and control over pupils' actions) as it recognises the need of some coercive strategies to maintain order. Both the scientific-rational and democratic conception of education can be employed within the boundaries of this discourse.

Finally, the democratic discourse emphasises, in opposition to the authoritarian and boundary setting discourses, a weak administrative system and the use of egalitarian relationships. This discourse is probably most compatible with a democratic conception of education.

The second purpose was to explore and compare discourses concerning bullying prevention in two schools with different socio-economic backgrounds and educational policies. The analysis aimed at providing answers to the following question:

*What discourses do respondents in the three organisations studied use when they construct bullying prevention?*

Table 2 distils the findings from the analysis into primary and secondary discourses, and illustrates how the discourses are patterned.

*Table 2: Organisations and discourses.*

| Organisation | Discourses | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | **Authoritarian** | **Boundary setting** | **Liberal** | **Democratic** |
| **Quadriceps** | Indoctrination. Patriarchal Unified structure No "relationship training". Well being through learning **Primary** | Teacher authority. Unified and common structure. **Primary** | | Confirming relationships **Secondary** |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **School one** | Indoctrination Unified structure Leadership Well being through learning. **Primary** | Limits pupil influence Intervention Surveillance Conflict transference **Primary** | "Relationship training" **Secondary** | Pseudo-egalitarian relationships **Secondary** |
| **School two** | | Intervention Authority in anti-bullying group. "Friend supporters" **Primary** | Pupil influence Explain rules "Life knowledge" **Secondary** | Egalitarian relationships Conflict transference Surveillance **Primary** |

Thus, the respondent in Quadriceps utilise authoritarian, boundary setting and democratic discourses. The respondents in school one utilise all four discourses, and the respondents in school two make use of boundary setting, liberal and democratic discourses. The next research question was as follows:

*How are these discourses patterned and which might be considered as primary and secondary discourses?*

As mentioned previously, primary discourses are those that are used most and prioritized by the respondents in relation to bullying prevention. Secondary discourses are used less, and are invested with less legitimacy or importance than the primary discourses. These primary and secondary discourses constitute the discursive order "bullying prevention".

Quadriceps utilised the authoritarian and boundary setting discourses in a primary capacity. These discourses construct bullying prevention as pursued through an increase in teacher authority, a united teacher collective, indoctrination of rules and values, and an emphasis on achievements in school. Democratic discourses are used in a secondary capacity as confirming relationships between teachers and pupils are emphasised as an important route to preventing bullying. Educational policy was found to be linked with bullying prevention through a focus on learning and targets, thus leading me to draw the conclusion that Quadriceps draws from a scientific-rational conception of education.

The respondents in school one use similar discourses to those espoused by Quadriceps, indicating that its educational principles have been adopted by the school or at least that these principles have intermingled and strengthened some ideas, while diminishing others. Two primary discourses were identified in the analysis, the authoritarian and boundary setting discourses. These discourses largely define how bullying prevention should be pursued and the other discourses mainly complement these definitions. Boundary setting and authoritarian discourses are not constructed in opposition to each other, that is competing to define bullying prevention. This is probably due to the fact that authoritarian and boundary setting discourses are harmonious in the sense that they do not rely on constructing themselves in opposition to each other. For example, the emphasis placed on restricting freedom of action by boundary setting discourses can easily be complemented with authoritarian discourses that emphasize unquestioned control over both freedom of action and thought. The dominance of authoritarian and boundary setting discourses can be seen as indicating an ambition to strengthen the teacher collective in such a manner that it can exert enough influence on pupils to severely curtail bullying. This is what Eriksson (2001, 2002) terms a powerful administrative system. This system can intervene and stop the differentiation process in the

social system that causes the process of identity formation that lead to bullying. Thus, bullying is primarily seen to be prevented through a strong and unified administrative system characterized by clear leadership, indoctrination, "well being through learning", limited pupil involvement, surveillance and interventions.

Liberal and democratic discourses were used in a secondary capacity in school one. Thus, "relationship training" and what I have termed "pseudo-egalitarian" relationships were used as arguments for bullying prevention but are invested with less importance than the primary discourses. Concerning educational policy, the discourses in school one mainly employed the scientific-rational conception of education through an emphasis on learning, targets and limited pupil involvement.

The discursive usage in both school one and Quadriceps suggests a resemblance to Lines (2008) argument regarding "progressive pedagogy" outlined in the previous research section. This theory stipulates that a system of rules, sanctions and role models prevent bullying. A tentative conclusion would be that school one and Quadriceps adhere (probably relatively unintentionally) to a loosely defined bullying prevention tradition with behaviouristic roots. This tradition would then emphasise rules, sanctions, a strong teacher collective combined with (depending on context) varying degree of (pseudo) democratically inclined relationships. Wästerfors (2007) study of prison life provides an illustrative example of what might happen if rules, sanctions and surveillance become oppressive in their character. Bullying might then play an increasing role for pupils identity work, as well as function as an outlet for frustrations brought about by an authoritative system.

The analysis of school two painted a different picture. In this school, surveillance was constructed as the main bullying prevention strategy. Democratic and boundary setting discourses were used in a primary capacity when discussing how surveillance was to be pursued. Democratic discourses were used to illustrate how egalitarian relationships enable surveillance and control both in terms of establishing relationships with key individuals and extending surveillance from the classroom to other parts of the school. Boundary setting discourses were primarily used when considering how teachers stop conflicts and not related to an innate need of boundaries. Teachers were said to intervene because they are not "scared of conflicts". The authority invested in the anti-bullying team was said to aid bullying prevention.

Liberal discourses were used in a secondarily capacity as regards to how much influence pupils should have on their environment and in regards to rules. The respondents argued that rules have to be motivated and that they may be questioned. Considering the issue of educational policy the discourses from school two emphasises relationships and "feeling good" over subject knowledge, targets and marks. This suggests that school two is more democratically inclined (moving within the parameters of the democratic conception) than school one and Quadriceps. It could be argued that bullying prevention in school two belong to a different school of thought than Quadriceps and school one. Rather than focusing on rules and sanctions and a unified teacher collective the emphasis lies on establishing relationships and exerting surveillance through, if you like, "soft power". Nonetheless, there is also an emphasis on boundary setting and the latent threat of the "anti-bullying group" as well sanctions such as possible police involvement and relegation. This discussion leads us on to the final research question:

*Are discourses constructed differently in the two schools studied with different socio-economic backgrounds and educational policies?*

Continuing the comparison between the three organisations, an important conclusion is that boundary setting discourses were used in a primary capacity in all three organisations. This is

perhaps an indication of that this discourse enjoys a dominating position within the discursive order "bullying prevention". Referring yet again to Law (2007), this finding is probably due to the fact that liberal and democratic forms of education require instruments of order and discipline. This is especially apparent as regards to bullying prevention, because these strategies are aimed at reducing violence, and enabling a climate in which learning can take place. In addition, as Eriksson (2001, 2002) points out, schools need a relatively strong administrative system to combat bullying. An important difference between school one and school two should be noted in terms of the use of boundary setting discourses. In school one and Quadriceps boundary setting discourses are used to explain an innate need of rules and sanctions. In school two these discourses are used in a more instrumental fashion, simply referring to a method of control and surveillance rather than to any innate need. In addition, school two does not combine boundary setting discourses with authoritarian discourses as school one does. Thus, although the discourses use a similar language, they might have very different meanings for the actors who use them.

Another similarity between the three organisations is that they do not primarily advocate the development of horizontal respect in relation to bullying prevention. The respondents in school one argue that liberal strategies, in terms of stimulating emotional development and mutual respect, are secondary to learning because learning in itself provides the necessary building stones to develop self-esteem and group belonging. The idea is that focusing efforts on learning rather than making pupils "feel good" will reduce frustration, bullying and crime. This may be due to these organisations focus on learning and subject knowledge, and that these factors have "migrated" to other areas where they have been used in order to explain how bullying prevention should be pursued.

In addition, in school one respect for others is seen as developing from unquestionable rules and values. In fact, the schools have in common that they both emphasize panoptical surveillance and that bullying prevention is not "dirty" work for teachers. The bullying prevention strategies in school one and two are rather similar in this respect, with the main difference that the relationships are constructed as more egalitarian and less value, rule and sanction bound in school two than in school one.

As a last note in this comparison, one may remark upon the absence of authoritarian discourses in school two, or put differently, the *presence* of authoritarian discourses in a Swedish school and in an organisation working with some success spreading these discourses to other schools. Perhaps most surprising is the use of the highly controversial word "indoctrination", with questionable consequences for democratic development. It is also noteworthy that liberal discourses assume secondary positions in both schools. Thus, the emphasis lies on surveillance and external control and not primarily on affecting the processes in the social system that causes bullying (through developing emotional skills).

The most obvious, but perhaps also the most important, conclusion from this study is that bullying prevention is described, and presumably also implemented very differently in the schools that were studied here. This is an example of what has happened since the decentralisation of the educational system, as well as of the ideological "silence" at the national level as regards to educational policy. As a result, different types of educational policies and ideologies as well as bullying prevention schemes have evolved in local settings. Put in the language of discourse analysis, the discursive order of "bullying prevention" is hardly unified or stable, but is instead fragmented and embattled by different explanations attempting dominance.

Importantly, the areas in which the schools are situated differ in socio-economic status, and the schools employ different types of educational policies. Although this conclusion cannot

lead to any statistical generalisations, as was elucidated in the method section, one may use it to draw analytical generalisations. As we have seen, a school in an area with relatively low socio-economic status and with a certain educational policy is dominated by authoritarian and boundary setting discourses in terms of bullying prevention. In the other school, in an area with higher socio-economic status and different educational policy, democratic and boundary setting discourses dominate. Drawing analytical generalisations from these statements thus entails that it is reasonable to presume that a *significant proportion* of other similar schools will be dominated by discourses that resemble those that have been presented here. In fact, I would argue on the basis of previous research and on my case selection that the discourses presented here will most certainly be employed in other settings. However, the cases used in this study are of a critical nature, and one may expect different combinations and variances in other schools. The class differences between these cases also point a tentative finger towards the idea that class might be an important social factor in explaining the differentiation of educational policies and bullying prevention schemes. It is also possible that schools with fewer problems and with more resources (such as school two) are more inclined to employ democratic bullying prevention and educational policies than schools in poorer areas and more problems. Certainly, the results from this thesis suggest that class is an important factor in the differentiation of educational policies and bullying prevention schemes, especially when considering the reasons the respondents gave for why schools adopt the Quadriceps concepts.

Adding to this, the current economic downturn has already resulted in cut backs in schools, maybe ushering in a new era of rationalizations and downsizing. With fewer resources, it will be more difficult for schools to pursue resource intensive bullying prevention programs, especially for schools in areas that already experience a lot of problems and are underfunded.

It is also reasonable to presume that there might be, at least in the short term, an increase in bullying prevention schemes and educational policies similar to those found in school one because they are similar to the policies espoused by the current government, other political parties and by large sections of the media (see Wiklund 2006). This would also follow a more general trend since the 1990's in western educational systems towards an increasing emphasis on discipline (see Sigesgaard 2004, Englund 2005 and Law 2007). The primary use of boundary setting discourses in school two might be an indication of this trend, as more disciplinarian ideas, directives, policies and laws regarding education are injected into the educational system. This may also be an indication of that this discourse is slowly establishing a dominating position within the discursive order "bullying prevention". It is, as always, up to the scientific community, the media, and the public to discuss if this is a positive development or not.

However, I would argue that the scientific community as well as other parties involved, such as the department of education and interest groups, have a special responsibility to evaluate current bullying prevention schemes. In fact, this is a unique opportunity to evaluate what works and what does not work in terms of different strategies dealing with bullying prevention. These findings could provide a basis for more centralised policies concerned with bullying prevention if such were deemed appropriate.

As a final note, I hope that this study has contributed to the research community by filling an "empty space" in the current bullying research. This has primarily been achieved through combining and synthesising various types of studies from different research traditions, and by developing a new analytical framework. In particular, the study combines the issue of bullying prevention with educational policy in a hitherto unseen way. In addition to this, the framework was applied in three settings using a qualitative approach which is unusual in

other studies that are interested in bullying. This has hopefully contributed to a widening of the paradigmatic focus within the bullying research tradition.

However, I consider that the most important contribution that this study can make is to add to the general increase of awareness of bullying, through highlighting different bullying prevention strategies. Hopefully, this study can contribute to a defamiliarization process, making the familiar world of people unfamiliar to them (Jacobsen 2008:40), for actors involved in the educational system and in the academic sphere. It can also contribute to a refamiliarization process, making the unfamiliar world of people familiar to them, especially for those that have not yet interested themselves in the subject (ibid:40).

## 7. Further Studies

- Interesting results could be found if a larger variety of schools were explored and/or more in-depth studies were pursued. Utilising an actor-network approach combined with participant observation and interviews could result in interesting studies as these methodological strategies hold the potential to delve deeper into what "really" goes on in schools.

- Effect analysis of different bullying prevention schemes.

- Studies that further explore how intentionality and social structures intersect in bullying situations.

## 8. Bibliography

Bliding, Marie (2004) *Inneslutandets och uteslutandets praktik*, Göteborg: Göteborgs Universitet

Becker, Howard (2008) *Tricks of the Trade. Yrkesknep för samhällsvetare*, Malmö: Liber

Björk, Gunilla (1999) *Mobbning: en fråga om makt?*, Lund: Student litteratur

Bohlin, Bengt (2008) *Quadricepsprogrammet*, Göteborg: Quadriceps

Brewer, M. "The Psychological Impact of Social Isolation. Discussion and Commentary" in (Eds) Williams, Kipling. Forgas, Joseph. Hippel, William von. (2005) *The Social Outcast,* Hove: Psychology press

Ekholm, Mats (2008) "Att veta istället för att tro om skolors inre liv", *Kapet* vol. no. 1 2008: 16-32

Eriksson, Björn (2001) "Mobbning: en sociologisk diskussion", *Sociologisk forskning*, vol. no. 2: 8-43. Växjö: Sociologisk forskning

Eriksson, Björn. Lindberg, Odd. Flygare, E. Daneback, K (2002) *Skolan – en arena för mobbning – en forskningsöversikt och diskussion kring mobbning i skolan*, Stockholm: Liber

Englund, Tomas and Quennerstedt, Ann (eds) (2008) *Vadå likvärdighet? Studier i utbildningspolitisk språkanvändning*, Göteborg: Daidalos

Englund, Tomas (2005) *Curriculum as a Political Problem*, Göteborg: Daidalos

Flyvbjerg, Bent (2004) "Five Misunderstandings about Case-study Research" in *Qualitative Research Practice*, 2004, pp.420-434.

Grosin, Lennart (2004) *Skolklimat, prestation och anpassning i 21 mellan- och 20 högstadieskolor,* Stockholm: Stockholms Universitet

Grandelius, Bengt (2006) *Att sätta gränser*, Stockholm: Natur och Kultur

Francia, Guadalupe (2008) "Likvärdighet, betyg och kunskapsbedömningar" in Englund, Tomas and Quennerstedt, Ann (eds) (2008) *Vadå likvärdighet*? *Studier i utbildningspolitisk språkanvändning*, Göteborg: Daidalos

Hearn, Jeff and Parkin, Wendy (2001) *Gender, Sexuality and Violence in Organizations*, London: Sage

Holm, Ann-Sofie (2008) *Relationer i skolan*, Göteborg: Göteborgs Universitet

Howarth, David (2007) *Diskurs*, Malmö: Liber

Jacobsen, Michael (2008) "Public Sociology-Towards a Triple Hermeneutic" in (ed) Jacobsen, Michael *Public Sociology*, Aalborg: Aalborg University Press

Jorgensen, Marianne and Phillips, Louise (2000) *Diskursanalys som teori och metod*, Lund: Studentlitteratur

Landahl, Joakim (2006) *Auktoritet och ansvar*, Stockholm: Arbetslivsinstitutet

Juvonen, J. Elisheva, G "The Rejected and the Bullied. Lessons About Social Misfits from Developmental Psychology" in (Eds) Williams, Kipling. Forgas, Joseph. Hippel, William von. (2005) *The Social Outcast,* Hove: Psychology press

Law, Stephen (2007) *The War for Children's Minds*, London: Routledge

Lines, Dennis (2008)*The Bullies. Understanding Bullies and Bullying*, London: Jessica Kingsley Publishing

Persson, Sofia (2008) *Läraryrkets uppkomst och förändring*, Göteborg: Göteborgs Universitet

SALSA (2009) *SALSA,* [Online] Available at: http://salsa.artisan.se [accessed: 10 April 2009]

Scherp, Hans-Åke (2008) "Vart tog forskningen vägen?- regeringens skolpolitik under luppen" in *Pedagogiska magasinet*, vol, no. 3 2008:13-18

Sigsgaard, Erik (2004) *Utskälld*, Stockholm: Liber

Skollagen 1985:1100

Skolverket (2009) *Barn och elevskyddslagen i praktiken*, Dnr 2007: 0325 4-5, Stockholm: Skolverket

Skolverket (2009) *Diskriminerad, trakasserad, kränkt?*, Dnr 2006: 2495, Stockholm: Skolverket

Wiklund, Matilda (2006) *Kunskapens fanbärare Den goda läraren som diskursiv konstruktion på en mediearena*, Örebro: Örebro Universitet

Williams, K. Forgas, J. Hippel, von W. Zadro, L "The Social Outcast. An Overview" in (eds) Williams, Kipling. Forgas, Joseph. Hippel, William von. (2005) *The Social Outcast,* Hove: Psychology press

Williams, K. Zadro, L "Ostracism . The Indiscriminate Early Detection System" in (Ed) Williams, Kipling. Forgas, Joseph. Hippel, William von. (2005) *The Social Outcast,* Hove: Psychology press

Wästerfors, David (2006) *Fängelsebråk,* Lund: Studentlitteratur

Yin, Robert (2006) *Fallstudier: design och genomförande*, Malmö: Liber