

FOSTERING DEMOCRATIC PREPAREDNESS TO PREVENT GROUP FOCUSED ENMITY IN NORWEGIAN SCHOOLS

Claudia Lenz¹ and Peder Nustad²

¹The European Wergeland Centre

²The Center for Studies of the Holocaust and Religious Minorities

c.lenz@theewc.org;

p.e.nustad@hlsenteret.no

Abstract

This article introduces the conceptual framework of a Norwegian project which sets out to counteract racism, anti-Semitism and other forms of group focused enmity through education in lower secondary schools. The project with the title “Democratic preparedness against Racism and Anti-Semitism” (Dembra) combines elements of in-service teacher training and school development. Conceptually, it operationalized insights from international research on group focused enmity (Zick et.al 2008, 2011) according to which people who feel marginalized, disconnected and deprived from opportunities in society are most likely to hold negative attitudes about one or several minority groups. Prejudice against minorities, a sense of being threatened by their presence and anti-democratic attitudes seem to go hand in hand.

As a consequence, the approach towards prevention of group focused enmity through education focuses on developing inclusive school environments, as well as fostering critical thinking, debate and active participation in democratic and diverse environments.

The article describes the whole school approach applied in the project, combining a focus on classroom practice, school governance and culture, which need to be developed in the particular context of each school. Based on these principles, the three-year project has worked with teachers and school leaders from 11 Norwegian schools. The article gives concrete examples of how some of the participating schools implemented activities related to diversity, prejudice and negative attitudes towards certain minorities. Based on the feedback from the participating teachers we will discuss the project’s positive impact on the teachers and the participating schools.

Key words: democracy; critical thinking; prejudices; teachers

Introduction

The Norwegian society holds a strong self-image of democratic traditions and an egalitarian and liberal culture. International value surveys¹ and Norway's international reputation as a nation leading in peace and human rights – a result of a foreign policy profile as peace negotiator and host of the Nobel Peace Award – contribute to and reinforce this self-image.

Against this background the events on 22nd of July 2011 confronted Norway with something completely unexpected: A Norwegian terrorist, Anders Behring Breivik, detonated a bomb outside the government building in Oslo killing 8 people and, two hours later, went on with a killing spree at the labour party's youth camp on Utøya, killing 69 youths and adults. Norway was off course deeply shocked by the scope and devastation of this terrorist attack. But the identity and motives of the perpetrator also caused strong reactions. Right after the bomb in Oslo detonated many believed that this was another case of Islamist terror. There was also reported harassment of Norwegian Muslims due to the reaction to the terror attack. But it soon became clear that a Norwegian man had been arrested and State Secretary Torgeir Larsen (2012) commented on this by saying: "The face of hate in Europe is Norwegian."²

The Norwegian society was confronted with the fact that such a destructive act was not committed by «one of them», a threat from the outside, a foreigner or a member of a minority than rather «one of us». Anders Behring Breivik is Norwegian, but there is more: he also insists that his actions were executed in the name of the Norwegian people as a defense of the pure and true Norwegian public. Breivik is truly an extremist. Not only are his ideas radical but he also pressed ahead with actions. But he is not the only one that carries elements of this ideology in the Norwegian society. There are people that share his mindset regarding nationalism, authoritarianism and Islamophobia in closed online forums, but there are also many *softer* or *diluted* versions of these points. Here are some survey findings giving a picture regarding prejudices and negative attitudes towards minorities among Norwegians:

A yearly survey, the "Integration barometer" (IMDi 2012) shows a general appreciation of encounters between members of different cultures among the majority of respondents. At the same time, the survey reveals scepticism and negative attitudes regarding more concrete aspects of this multicultural reality.

Especially scepticism towards Muslims has been stable in recent years. Another survey shows that 40% men and more than 30% women of Sami origin have experienced discrimination linked to their Sami background (Hansen 2012). Persons of African origin, especially Somali people experience more discrimination than any other group (Blom & Henriksen 2008; Tronstad 2009). This finding is also supported by the survey in attitudes towards Jews among Norwegians (Hoffmann et.al. 2012), which concluded that 12.5% of the population can be considered as being significantly prejudiced against Jews. Regarding the desire for social distance, the survey included different minorities and the findings show that Roma and Somali are the groups who are met with most scepticism.

It is this landscape of different types of prevailing prejudice and negative attitudes against minorities, in which the project *Democratic preparedness against racism and anti-Semitism and undemocratic attitudes* (Dembra) operates.

1. E.g. the Global Democracy Ranking http://democracyranking.org/?page_id=738#prettyPhoto, or the World Values Survey 2005-2008

Structure and methodologies of the Dembra project

Dembra is a three year project (2013-2015) geared towards teachers and school leaders in lower secondary schools³ aiming to support them in their work against racism, anti-Semitism and group focused enmity (Zick et.al. 2011) in general. The three-year project, composed by in-service teacher training and school development elements, is built on the pre-assumption that strengthening democratic competence and building inclusive and democratic school cultures are crucial pre-requisites for the prevention of group focused enmity. Democracy requires that citizens are motivated, able and willing to acknowledge their co-citizens as equals and interact with them, regardless their cultural, ethnic or religious background.

The project does not promote an approach of behavior regulation based on definition of undesired behavior and sanctioning mechanisms (bans, punishment). Instead, it tries to give teachers approaches and methodologies at hand that develop critical thinking in learners, create arenas in which problematic attitudes are challenged by counter-arguments and where contradictory views and convictions can be explored and negotiated in mutual respect.

Being able to identify racist ideology can be learned in cognitive ways; developing an immediate discomfort when someone is offended or statements requires other, more holistic ways of learning – and the rest of this article will be about an effort to encourage this behavior by building a participatory and pluralistic school culture.

The whole project architecture is constructed as a two-track effort:

1. Addressing the entire teacher staff of the participating schools with trainings focusing on awareness-raising for the issues of prejudice and group focused enmity as well as on practical approaches and methodologies for classroom practice
2. Involving a smaller team of head teacher and teachers in the more profound work of analyzing the schools situation regarding the phenomena in focus as well as planning and organizing actions for improvement.

During the six months of each cycle, the entire teaching staff from each school participates in three seminars with theoretical and historical content, combined with hands-on methodological exercises, inspiring uses in learning processes inside and outside the class room. At the same time, a selected team – including school leaders – take part in a process of analysing the school's situation regarding participation, views on minorities and prejudices, resulting the planning and organization of local activities at each participating school.

These activities shall aim at school ethos and school climate, having in mind that prevention of racism and anti-Semitism is not limited to teaching and learning in the classroom.

The different elements of the programme shall help the participating school to identify the appropriate ways of addressing prejudice, discrimination and/or violence based on group focused enmity in their specific context. Each school is different, has different challenges and resources to play on and a different history regarding these issues. Some of the participating schools have had focus on Dembra topics for a long time; others are just about starting to actively work with them.

2. The project is funded by the Norwegian Directorate of Education and Training and has been developed and is conducted by three institutions: The Center for Studies of the Holocaust and Religious Minorities (leading partner), the European Wergeland Centre and the Department for teacher Education and School Research, University of Oslo. 11 schools with a total of more than 400 teachers are involved during the project period (2012-2015), each project circle involving 2-5 schools simultaneously over a period of 6 months.

In the next paragraph, we will present the Dembra related work of two schools which took part in the first project cycle in order to demonstrate the significance of contextualization and local adaptation.

Experiences from two participating schools

G. school/Oslo

The school is situated in the eastern part of Oslo and has a high proportion of pupils with an immigrant background; 42 different native languages are spoken by the pupils. Due to this composition, the schools of that area have not a good reputation and there are tendencies of “white flight”. However, the school has a strong belief in diversity - which seems to be a “disadvantage” – as a strength and special quality of the school ethos and they regarded the participation in Dembra as a chance to work more systematically on this. As a focus for their Dembra activities, the team choose *“Inclusive community – building awareness about the positive sides of diversity and using the student’s intercultural competence as a positive resource.”*

The school used a range of the elements of the Dembra project immediately in their activities. In December 2013, the school organized a five day event, the «week of friendship». During this week, both teaching and extra-curricular activities were linked to topics related to building an inclusive school community.

Among other things, they based one activity on the results of the survey which had been conducted in the beginning of the project cycle. The main focus was the use of devaluating and stereotyping language and swear words. The survey had shown that a range of swear words with a negative group focus are used among the students, but that there is not a high degree of negative attitudes towards these respective groups. The students should be invited to reflect on the negative consequences of stereotyping language. To this end, the Dembra team created a variation of an exercise on the different aspects of a person’s identity, which had been introduced during the team workshops: The students were asked to write their name in the middle of a white page and then some qualities they associate with their own person, around it. They were then asked to replace these qualities by the swear words which are usual among the students. This was followed by a debriefing about the question of the consequences of such language on the self-esteem and confidence of the one targeted by it.

The main focus during that week was to create an inclusive environment and a sense of «belonging». Students were given a “secret friend” who should be extra kind and nice during that week. Activities were conducted across classes and grades, so many students had positive experiences with peers they had much contact with before. The week ended with a day of «open house» to which also parents and other interested people from the local community were invited.⁴

During the final team workshop, the team of the G school formulated their ambition to make the week of friendship a yearly event and to generate broader ownership among students and parents.

3. This description of the activity was published: <http://theewc.org/news/view/week.of.friendship.to.fight.bullying/>

H. school/Bærum

This school is situated just outside the city of Oslo, within an area in which quite wealthy and educated middle class families live. In the beginning, the school head had some doubt if his school would fit into the Dembra project, since he assumed that this would be for schools with “minority” issues. But he soon decided that this would be exactly the angle from which his school would address issues of plurality – challenging the students to look beyond the “homogeneous bubble” they live in, as he expressed it, developing an awareness of being a part of a society which is becoming more and more diverse.

The focus for the Dembra activities which was chosen by the team of the H. school was “teachers, students and parents become more aware of their own attitudes and which attitudes they show to others related to racism and equality.”

The main Dembra related activity organized by the school was a role play, which took place for three full days in the school. The title is “we are different” and aims to trigger reflections on privileges. For that purpose, each class was divided in different groups which had different rights and privileges. The teachers were part of the role-play and the school was divided in areas to which only the members of certain groups would have access. On day two the “privileged” students travelled to the city centre of Oslo and met sellers of the street magazine “=Oslo” and “Folk er Folk” (the first being an initiative to support homeless people, the latter an initiative to support Roma people from Eastern Europe). The activity ended with a de-briefing in the classes on the third day.

When the organizers learnt about the plans of the school they were concerned about the resemblance with the historical psychological experiments (Milgram experiment, Stanford experiment), resulting in well-known ethical concerns: Does a role play allow for critical reflection or is it emotionally overwhelming? At one point while the role-play was going on a concerned relative of one student contacted the organizers since this student had complained at home about the rude treatment she would experience. One group of “non-privileged” students also established a group on Facebook where they shared their anger about the whole role-play. The group had the title “yellow ribbons for all” – the yellow ribbon was the marker of the privileged.

In their report, the team of the H. school expressed satisfaction with the outcome of the activity: engagement. There had been intense debates about the activity, among the students and even parents. In the end, both the student council and the parent representatives supported the initiative and welcomed it being continued. But what was regarded to be most successful and for sure to be continued were the encounters with the sellers of the street magazines, a successful way of getting out of the bubble.

For both of these schools as well as three other which took part in the first cycle, the participation in Dembra ended in March 2014. What did the participating teachers and school heads gain from the project? Can some lasting positive effects on schools, their ethos and their culture be expected? In the next part of this article we will look into various feedback and evaluation data which were gathered during this first project cycle in order to determine the question of the positive effects and impact of Dembra.

What did the teachers and team members gain from Dembra?

Continuous feedback and evaluation were an integrated part of the Dembra project design. One reason for this is the fact that the entire project was a pilot and the feedback and critique from participants was crucial in order to identify potential for improvement and further development. The other reason is related to the overall aims and ethos of the project: trying to support schools in developing democratic educational environments and practices. Participatory evaluation just means to operationalize the principles which we wished the participating schools to embrace.

We will look into three different kinds of sources (feedback after team workshops, Most Significant Change technique, and final evaluation survey) which highlight three different aspects of the participants' Dembra experience:

- a) individual personal and professional development
- b) exchange of experiences and cooperation with colleagues from their own and other schools
- c) school development

Feedback after team workshops

After each of the three workshops for the school teams, we used a very simple method for workshop evaluation: each participant was given three post-it notes and was asked to write down the three most important things she/he wished to give as feedback after the workshop. We then put three different signs to a wall – a smiley, a neutral expression and a sad face (J K L) – asking the participants to place their comments in one of these categories.

With this simple method we could see that the teachers had very much enjoyed the first two workshops (introduction to the project, development of the action plans).

Here, most of the comments were about the appreciation to have some space for joint reflection with teachers from the own school, exchange of experiences with teachers from other schools and the methodology applied in/moderation of the workshops. The latter can be interpreted as a successful facilitation of the reflections and planning processes among the teachers – something which they seldom have a chance to do in the everyday life of their schools.

The third workshop, however, was evaluated more negatively. Here, we had spent some time on the Most Significant Change (MSC) technique, which has a strong focus on self-reflection and exploration of the qualities of the changes which have occurred. Some participants bluntly called this a waste of time. Why so? In our de-briefing and further evaluation of that workshop, we also took into consideration a final round of comments where the participants were asked in which ways they wish to continue the Dembra focus in their schools. Representatives from all five schools expressed the fear that there would be little or no impact of Dembra beyond the project cycle. Some said they hadn't come far enough to achieve something durable. Others said that after the end of the project nobody any longer would have the time and energy to keep things going. The more optimistic voices said that the awareness for the Dembra topics probably would last and that some of the concrete things they had done during the project period might be repeated.

Reviewing that conversation we understood that the teams needed some space and support/structure to deal with the questions “What will continue after Dembra?” and “How could it continue”? In the second project cycle, we changed the content of the last team workshop accordingly and replaced MSC by a session on interactive planning “beyond Dembra”.

Even if the MSC activity was not very much appreciated by the participants, it gave some very interesting insights into the Dembra outcomes at the individual level.

Findings from the Most Significant Change technique

The most significant change (MSC) technique is a form of participatory monitoring and evaluation which has been developed in the context of developmental aid programmes (Davies/Dart 2005). It reflects the ambition to reduce the hierarchical structures through empowering procedures. MSC is based on the collection of stories from participants in which they describe what they regard as the most relevant outcome of the programme. In the original version of MSC, a panel of elected representatives then cluster the stories according to overall topics and rank these topics according to their significance. In this procedure of selection and tagging, some major impacts are “distilled” out of the broad variety of stories from the field.

We have adapted this method for our purpose and asked all members of the school teams to write down a one-page account of what they regarded to be the most relevant results and effects of their own Dembra participation. During the team workshop, we divided the participants in four groups (composed by teachers from different schools) and invited two and two of them to read each other’s stories and to “tag” the changes which were described there. Next, all of these identified changes should be written on “Post It” papers and be collected and then clustered on a poster. In this way, the group should together decide which of these changes they would regard as “significant”.

In a last step, all posters were displayed at a wall and each participant could put three crosses on any of these categories which she/he assumed to be the most significant.

The result of that exercise was very interesting:

Table 1: Overview over changes mentioned in the MSC stories

Most significant Change/Dembra pilot

Awareness	Attitudes	Knowledge/Competence	More focus/Time
(15 selected as most significant)	(9 selected as most significant)	(5 selected as most significant)	(5 selected as most significant)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Related to use of language(3x) - Related to prejudice, racism and antisemitic attitudes (3x) - Brought up the situation of Roma - Related to the school’s work for tolerance <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Reflection (2x) - Related to values - Reflection and focus on important topics (2x) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 2x just awareness 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - More focus on one’s own and other’s tolerance, prejudices etc. - Being challenged with regard to negative views on different groups - A difference in how to comment what student say - Less conflicts starting with “ (s)he, has called me..” 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Useful information - Screening of student’s attitudes <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <i>More knowledge</i> - More competence in the staff regarding Jewish history and how they were treated throughout history - More competence in the school 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Enforced our school’s existing focus on the celebration of important days - Enforced our school’s value base and strategic plan - More time to organize teaching about the themes (more legitimate) - Change through process and time

Awareness	Attitudes	Knowledge/Competence	More focus/Time
<p>Cooperation (4 selected)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Good discussions among the colleagues • More cooperation with the staff of the school (Dembra - participants in particular) related to the work on attitudes and inclusion • Exchange of experiences <p>Inspiration (1 selected)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Inspiration through the encounters with others • Inspiration through a dynamic program, meet different schools in different arenas <p>Critique (Scepticism)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Maybe I have more questions than answers, but the reflections are useful. • One can ask if the particular outcome is worth the use of time 			

Changes in the awareness of phenomena related to group focused enmity and prejudice in school were by far the most reported and supported, followed by changes in attitudes towards these phenomena. These effects are mostly at an individual level. Changes in cooperation with colleagues and even in school culture are much less reported.

This is a very interesting result which might point to the already mentioned limitations regarding the systemic effects which a project with a six months duration can make. At the same time, this might point to the fact that systemic strategies against negative attitudes against minorities, stigmatization and bullying need to start in the individual – her/his “readiness” to see and respond to these phenomena.

So, the result of the MSC might point to the need address *both* the level of personal and professional development of each individual teacher and head teacher who participates in Dembra *and* the systemic level of school culture and school governance. The intermediate element which lots of empirical research (Postholm 2012) has proven is, of course, teacher’s *cooperation*. The fact that this dimension of change only was selected by 4 participants shows that future Dembra cycles should have a stronger focus on that dimension of the “team approach”.

Final evaluation survey

The final evaluation survey was divided into two clusters of questions: five questions for the members of the Dembra teams about their experience and evaluation of the elements of the projects in which only the teams had been involved and nine questions for all teachers (including the members of the Dembra team) on the individual gains and possible effects of the Dembra involvement for the whole school. 92 teachers responded to the survey, among them 11 team members. However, only 10 team members (out of 18 who participated) answered all questions within the first cluster and 72 teachers (compared to 111 teachers who had answered the initial survey which was used for the school’s needs analysis) answered all questions within the second cluster.

When it comes to the evaluation of the positive outcomes for the individual participating teacher, we see very high ratings both for the knowledge component, the awareness rising (including self-reflection) and the exchange with colleagues:

Table 2: Dembra survey/ question 8

Which of the following statements on your benefits from the Dembra participation do you agree with?					
Answer Options	Strongly agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Response Count
Understanding how school should work with prevention	16	47	11	2	76
Useful knowledge about racism and anti-Semitism	31	40	4	1	76
Useful methods	19	30	23	2	74
Awareness on use of language	24	34	15	3	76
Waste of time	4	12	22	37	75
Good exchange of ideas with colleagues	22	37	13	3	75
Useful knowledge about democracy in school	11	42	17	5	75
Awareness of my own prejudice	11	42	14	8	75
<i>answered question</i>					76

However, the fact that a third of the respondents thinks that they haven't been given some useful methods for the work of preventing group focused enmity is not satisfactory. At least, this indicates that the learning processes which were facilitated during the teacher trainings were not recognized as *activities* which also included elements of methodology.

An interesting aspect of the responses also came forward in the open ended comments to this question: some teachers gave poor ratings because they thought that they "were good at this" already – before the Dembra project. This shows a particular attitude towards one's own professional development, a kind of "having it all". During our trainings, we tried to point out that we neither deliver "quick fixes" or promise that one ever will be "done" with the challenges of prejudice and discrimination. The question is, if this developmental perspective can be embraced by teachers who feel the pressure to "deliver" teaching the next day.

So, what about the evaluation of the outcomes and possible impact of the school development dimension of Dembra?

Two questions from the cluster for the team members are interesting here:

Table 3: Dembra survey/ question 3

Did you experience the work in the Dembra team as valuable for working with prevention in your school?		
Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly agree	40,0%	4
Agree	50,0%	5
Disagree	10,0%	1
Strongly disagree	0,0%	0
<i>answered question</i>		10

Figure 4: Dembra survey// question 4

Do you think the Dembra team will continue to cooperate on Dembra related topics?		
Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Yes	50,0%	5
No	10,0%	1
Unsure	40,0%	4
<i>answered question</i>		10

These answers show that the team members experienced the team component of the project as valuable but are not sure if the cooperation with the colleagues (who obviously share the appreciation) will last beyond the project period. One of the reasons for this discrepancy which was articulated in an oral feed back during the last team workshop is lack of time in a double sense: the project period was too short to establish cooperation routines which are really embedded in school routines throughout the whole school year. Without the framework of the project other obligation of school life will “take over again”. One of the teachers expressed it like this in an informal talk after the end of the project cycle: “We see what needs to be done to keep on this relevant work, but find it hard to legitimate the use of time now”.

Even clearer is the divide between the evaluation of immediate positive outcomes and long lasting effects when we look at the responses from all teachers:

Table 5: Dembra survey/ question 10

Did your school improve its work on preventing of group focused enmity by taking part in Dembra?		
Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly agree	14,5%	11
Agree	60,5%	46
Disagree	23,7%	18
Strongly disagree	1,3%	1
<i>answered question</i>		76

While the vast majority of the respondents is quite positive (even if not enthusiastic) about the positive effect of the project on their school's capacity to prevent GFE, under half of the respondents is optimistic with regard to long lasting impact:

Table 6: Dembra survey/ question 11

Do you think that Dembra will have a long lasting effect on your school?		
Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly agree	2,6%	2
Agree	42,1%	32
Disagree	28,9%	22
Strongly disagree	7,9%	6
Don't know	18,4%	14
<i>answered question</i>		76

The overall impression of the responses can be summarized as such

- good to very good evaluation of most aspects related to the team process;
- good evaluation of aspects related to the individual teacher's awareness raising, new and useful knowledge and impulses for work with prevention of GFE;
- sceptical outlook regarding lasting effects of Dembra participation on the whole school – especially among the teachers who were not a part of the school teams;

These results are not surprising in the light of research about the effects and impact of projects aiming at teachers professional development and school development. According to Postholm et.al. (2012) are two years needed to reach stable changes in teachers' professional practice and school governance. Shorter interventions tend to have short term effects but individuals and institutions often return to habitualized "old" patterns. So, even if the participating teachers appreciate the immediate outcomes in terms of new knowledge, raised awareness and methodological inspiration, seems their scepticism regarding lasting effects to be realistic.

Concluding reflections

In this section, we will draw on the experiences of the first Dembra cycle and describe our lessons learned so far. What is needed to make a difference regarding prejudice, exclusion and group focused enmity in schools?

The experience from the Dembra project so far indicates that some elements need to be in place in order to enable school staff to employ inclusive and democratic school culture for the prevention of all forms and expressions of racism, anti-Semitism or other variants of group focused enmity:

- Self-reflection and situation analysis
- Local ownership

- Whole school approach – connecting classroom and teaching to school governance and school ethos/culture
- Involvement of various stake holders
- Time frame – enough time to set up components of sustainable changes

How do these points spell out?

Teachers and school leaders need to have the time, the intrinsic motivation and methodologies to develop a proper understanding of the phenomena under discussion *in the context of their own school environment*. We have seen that the local context of each school – the composition of the student population in terms of ethnic, cultural and religious backgrounds – plays a major role regarding the ways in which prejudices, mechanism of bullying, exclusion and discrimination are experienced. This includes very varying degrees of *awareness*. Addressing challenges requires too see and acknowledge them.

The process of addressing these phenomena requires knowledge (unfortunately, the categorical ban of racism and anti-Semitism also results in a lack of engagement with these phenomena – you are against it and that's it), but even more it requires an understanding of what they mean in one's own environment. The absence of a particular minority does not mean the absence of prejudices against them – but they will crystalize in different ways, and therefore require a different type of responses. So, the analysis of the situation at each school, including their challenges but also their genuine resources – as we have seen in the case of the G. school – is a necessary basis for the development of appropriate preventive and responsive strategies.

As a part of this contextualization, each teacher needs to have the space and the encouragement to reflect on her/his individual practice: about being aware of issues, about strategies and “techniques” to respond, about creating inclusive learning environments, about cooperating with colleagues and actively taking part in building a school culture. For the team members Dembra seemed to be such kind of reflective space, and many of them are afraid that it will disappear once the project is finished. For the rest of the teachers, who only took part in the lectures, Dembra mostly seems to have worked as a “reminder” of relevant and (potentially) interesting issues. This leaves us with the question if and how the project can support the teams in becoming multipliers of what they experienced: the interplay of reflection and exchange of local experiences and theoretical and conceptual impulses which are relevant for the own professional practice.

This leads to the next relevant insight of the Dembra project. Given the above mentioned diversity of local contexts, it seems to be impossible to offer a “one fits all” formula for the preventive work and there is absolutely no “quick fix”. What is needed are long term efforts and strategies which include all levels of school life and which need to actively involve as many as possible stake holders (students, parents, school administration in addition to the teachers and head teachers). This is what we call local ownership to locally tailor made solutions. We see clearly that the schools who have had an engagement on issues related to Dembra (bullying, inclusive school culture) where better equipped to “make use” of what Dembra had to offer, linking it to these existing efforts, creating synergies, re-activating or re-adjusting what had been successfully conducted before.

Last but not least, we have much evidence that the time frame of the Dembra project hardly is sufficient for any school to set up processes which will result in sustainable changes. Within six months, teachers can get lot of impulses, new knowledge or put “things in perspective”. They can start to cooperate regarding new types of teaching practice, activities and events which include the whole school and they can develop ideas and first steps towards what can become more formalized elements of school governance (codes of conduct) or school ethos. But this will always only be a start and after the end of the project the lack of a framework might put these developments to rest.

On the other hand, we have seen that schools quite successfully used their Dembra participation to transform processes which had begun with previous participation in programmes or just related to an existing focus area into something more systematic and sustainable. This said, one of the lessons learnt from this first Dembra cycle is the need to support schools in identifying the possible links and synergies with other existing focus areas and to re-think and develop them according to the themes, principles and approaches of the Dembra project.

As it seems, one of the strongest sides of Dembra is the openness and flexibility it gives schools regarding the possible ways to employ inclusion and participation to foster reflection, critical thinking and to create arenas for debate and democratic, self-regulative processes curtailing prejudice and hate against “the other. What Dembra provides, is not “solutions” to challenges but a *working mode*, consisting of situation analysis, familiarization with relevant knowledge and methodologies, developing locally tailor made responses at all levels of school life. The remaining cycles of the project will show to which extend the next Dembra schools will make use of this working mode in order to develop their prevention strategies and practices.

References

- Blom, S. & Henriksen, K. (2008). Levekår blant innvandrere i Norge 2005/2006. *Rapporter*. Oslo: Statistisk sentralbyrå.
- Eidsvåg, I. (2011). *Det kan skje igjen*. Rapport fra Kunnskapsdepartementets arbeidsgruppe om antisemittisme og rasisme i skolen. Oslo: Kunnskapsdepartementet.
- Davies, R./Dart, J. (2004) The 'Most Significant Change' Technique. A Guide to its Use. www.mande.co.uk/docs/MSCGuide.htm
- Hoffmann, C., Kopperud, Ø. & Moe, V. (2012). *Antisemitism in Norway? The Attitudes of the Norwegian Population towards Jews and other Minorities*. Oslo: HL-centre. <http://www.hlsenteret.no/publikasjoner/antisemitism-in-norway.html>
- IMDi. (2012). Integreringsbarometeret 2012. Holdninger til innvandring, integrering og mangfold. *IMDi-rapport*. Oslo: Integrerings- og mangfoldsdirektoratet.
- Larsen, T. (2012) Hatets Europa [Hate of Europe] artikle in the newspaper Dagsavisen, 26.11.2012, <http://www.dagbladet.no/2012/11/26/kultur/debatt/kronikk/hoyreekstremisme/europa/24547486/>
- Lødding, B. & Vibe, N. (2010). «Hvis noen forteller om mobbing...». Utdypende undersøkelse av funn i *Elevundersøkelsen om mobbing, urettferdig behandling og diskriminering*. Oslo: Nordisk institutt for studier av innovasjon, forskning og utdanning (NIFU).
- Postholm, M.B. (2012) Teachers' professional development: a theoretical review. *Educational Research*. 54 (4), 405-429
- World Values Survey Association (2010) World Values Survey Wave 5 2005-2008 OFFICIAL AGGREGATE v.20140429. World Values Survey Association (www.worldvaluessurvey.org). Aggregate File Producer: Asep/JDS, Madrid SPAIN.
- Zick, A., Küpper, B. & Hövermann, A. (2011). *Intolerance, Prejudice and Discrimination. A European Report*. Berlin: Friedrich-Ebert-Stiftung.

POTICANJE DEMOKRATSKE SPREMNOSTI KAKO BI SE SPRIJEČILO NEPRIJATELJSTVO USMJERENO PREMA MANJINSKIM SKUPINAMA U NORVEŠKIM ŠKOLAMA

Claudia Lenz and Peder Nustad

Sažetak:

U ovom radu predstavljen je konceptualni okvir norveškog projekta kojemu je cilj suzbijanje rasizma, antisemitizma i drugih oblika neprijateljstava usmjerenih prema manjinskim skupinama, kroz obrazovanje u nižim razredima srednje škole. Projekt pod naslovom "Demokratskom spremnošću protiv rasizma i antisemitizma" ("Democratic preparedness against Racism and Anti-Semitism" – Dembra) kombinira elemente stručnog usavršavanja nastavnika i razvoj škola. U projektu se koristilo uvidima iz međunarodnih istraživanja o neprijateljstvu usmjerenom prema skupinama (Zick et.al 2008, 2011), prema kojima će ljudi koji se osjećaju marginalizirano, isključeno i lišeno mogućnosti u društvu najvjerojatnije zadržati negativne stavove o jednoj ili nekoliko manjinskih skupina. Predrasude prema manjinama, osjećaj ugroženosti njihovom blizinom i protudemokratski stavovi, čini se, idu ruku pod ruku.

Posljedica toga je da se pristup prema prevenciji neprijateljstva usmjerenog prema manjinskim skupinama kroz obrazovanje fokusira na razvoj inkluzivnog školskog okruženja, kao i na poticanje kritičkog razmišljanja, raspravu i aktivno sudjelovanje u demokratskim i različitim okruženjima.

Ovaj rad opisuje cjelokupni školski pristup primijenjen u projektu, kombinirajući fokus na nastavnu praksu, školsku upravu i kulturu, koji se moraju razvijati u pojedinačnom kontekstu svake škole. Temeljeno na ovim principima, u trogodišnjem projektu radilo se s učiteljima i voditeljima 11 norveških škola. U radu se mogu vidjeti konkretni primjeri kako su pojedine škole implementirale aktivnosti povezane s različitostima, predrasudama i negativnim stavovima prema određenim manjinama. Koristeći se povratnim informacijama dobivenim od učitelja, razmotrit ćemo pozitivan utjecaj koji je projekt ostvario na učitelje škola koje su sudjelovale u njemu.

Ključne riječi: *demokracija; kritičko mišljenje; nastavnici; predrasude,*