

Contents

| | |
|---|-----------|
| 1 Introduction | 9 |
| <i>Klaus Fröhlich-Gildhoff</i> | |
| 2 Theoretical background | 13 |
| <i>Klaus Fröhlich-Gildhoff</i> | |
| 2.1 Discussion about violence prevention and intervention in schools in the five consortium countries | 13 |
| 2.1.1 France | 13 |
| <i>Patrick Lecaplain & Christophe Moreau</i> | |
| 2.1.2 Germany | 14 |
| <i>Klaus Fröhlich-Gildhoff & Katharina Rauh</i> | |
| 2.1.3 Poland | 16 |
| <i>Anna Wojciechowska, Tomasz Wojciechowski & Malgorzata Cuzyrek</i> | |
| 2.1.4 Portugal | 18 |
| <i>Miguel Prata Gomes, Paula Medeiros, Paulo Silva & Vanda Gonçalves</i> | |
| 2.1.5 Sweden | 19 |
| <i>Sara Högdin, Cecilia Kjellman & Lisbeth Ranagården</i> | |
| 2.2 Promotion of resilience as violence prevention | 22 |
| 2.2.1 The background and roots of violent behaviour | 22 |
| 2.2.2 Change of paradigm – the importance of resilience | 28 |
| 2.3 Conclusion - leading to the framework and the evaluation design | 30 |
| 3 National educational context | 37 |
| 3.1 Educational context – France | 37 |
| <i>Patrick Lecaplain & Christophe Moreau</i> | |
| 3.2 Educational context – Germany | 40 |
| <i>Katharina Rauh & Klaus Fröhlich-Gildhoff</i> | |
| 3.3 Educational context – Poland | 43 |
| <i>Anna Wojciechowska, Tomasz Wojciechowski & Malgorzata Cuzytek</i> | |
| 3.4 Educational context – Portugal | 44 |
| <i>Miguel Prata Gomes, Paula Medeiros, Paulo Silva & Vanda Gonçalves</i> | |
| 3.5 Educational context – Sweden | 47 |
| <i>Sara Högdin, Cecilia Kjellman & Lisbeth Ranagården</i> | |
| 3.6 Educational context in each country – international comparison | 50 |
| <i>Christophe Moreau</i> | |

| | |
|---|-----------|
| 4 Design of the project | 61 |
| <i>Klaus Fröhlich-Gildhoff & Katharina Rauh</i> | |
| 4.1 Aims of the project | 61 |
| 4.2 Evaluation design | 65 |
| 4.2.1 Qualitative evaluation | 65 |
| 4.2.2 Quantitative evaluation | 67 |
| 4.3 The French pre-inquiry: keen involvement of school actors | 71 |
| <i>Patrick Lecaplain & Christophe Moreau</i> | |
| 4.3.1 Closest to expectations in challenged organisations | 71 |
| 4.3.2 Pupils: well-being predominant and well-delineated problems | 73 |
| 4.3.3 A statistical confirmation of the researchers' first observations | 74 |
| 4.4 Pilot study in Portugal | 75 |
| <i>Miguel Prata Gomes, Paula Medeiros, Paulo Silva & Vanda Gonçalves</i> | |
| 4.4.1 Method options and justification | 75 |
| 4.4.2 Analysis of children's interviews and parents' surveys | 76 |
| 5 The national implementations of STRONG | 83 |
| 5.1 A successful realisation of the STRONG project in France | 83 |
| <i>Patrick Lecaplain & Christophe Moreau</i> | |
| 5.1.1 A complex process of implementation in France | 83 |
| 5.1.2 Contrasting results from one school to another | 91 |
| 5.1.3 Several recommendations to encourage implementation and evaluation of a programme of prevention of violence at school | 105 |
| 5.2 National implementation – Germany | 107 |
| <i>Katharina Rauh & Klaus Fröhlich-Gildhoff</i> | |
| 5.2.1 Project process and presentation of the schools | 107 |
| 5.2.2 Timeline of the German implementation | 110 |
| 5.2.3 Experiences and qualitative and quantitative results | 115 |
| 5.2.4 Reflection and discussion | 129 |
| 5.3 National implementation – Poland | 131 |
| <i>Anna Wojciechowska, Tomasz Wojciechowski & Malgorzata Cuzytek</i> | |
| 5.3.1 Project's process | 131 |
| 5.3.2 Experiences and qualitative and quantitative results at various levels | 144 |
| 5.3.3 Reflection on instruments | 150 |
| 5.3.4 Further effects – additional development | 153 |
| 5.3.5 Sustainability | 154 |
| 5.3.6 Short national conclusion | 154 |

| | |
|---|------------|
| 5.4 National implementation – Portugal | 155 |
| <i>Miguel Prata Gomes, Paula Medeiros, Paulo Silva & Vanda Gonçalves</i> | |
| 5.4.1 Project's process and presentation of the schools | 155 |
| 5.4.2 Timetable | 157 |
| 5.4.3 Initial observations and needs analysis | 161 |
| 5.4.4 Characteristics of implementation | 163 |
| 5.4.5 Experiences and qualitative and quantitative results | 164 |
| 5.4.6 Reflection and discussion | 182 |
| 5.5 National implementation and evaluation – Sweden | 184 |
| <i>Sara Högdin, Cecilia Kjellman & Lisbeth Ranagården</i> | |
| 5.5.1 Project's process | 184 |
| 5.5.2 Presentation of the schools | 184 |
| 5.5.3 Characteristics of implementation | 185 |
| 5.5.4 Experiences and qualitative and quantitative results | 190 |
| 5.5.5 Conclusion and discussion | 208 |
| 6 International comparison | 215 |
| 6.1 Initial observations and needs analysis | 215 |
| <i>Tomasz Wojciechowski</i> | |
| 6.1.1 School level | 215 |
| 6.1.2 Teacher level | 216 |
| 6.1.3 Pupil level | 217 |
| 6.1.4 Characteristics of implementation | 217 |
| 6.2 Results encouraging the development and diffusion of the STRONG programme across Europe | 219 |
| <i>Cecilia Kjellman & Patrick Lecaplain</i> | |
| 6.2.1 Representative results requiring prudence in their interpretation | 219 |
| 6.2.2 A new approach and results specific to each organisation | 220 |
| 6.2.3 Teachers | 221 |
| 6.2.4 A change in the nature of school violence and a development of social skills used by pupils | 223 |
| 6.2.5 Differing co-operation with pupils' immediate before- and after-school environment | 225 |
| 6.2.6 Fruitful co-operation between teachers and researchers | 227 |
| 6.2.7 The pertinence of a multidimensional approach for the prevention of school violence | 228 |
| 6.2.8 Reflection on the instruments in the toolbox | 228 |
| 6.2.9 Further effects | 232 |
| 6.2.10 Sustainability | 233 |

| | |
|--|------------|
| 6.3 Quantitative data of the international comparisons | 235 |
| <i>Katharina Rauh</i> | |
| 6.3.1 Teacher level | 235 |
| 6.3.2 Pupil level | 239 |
| 7 Reflection, Discussion, Perspectives | 255 |
| <i>Klaus Fröhlich-Gildhoff, Christophe Moreau & Miguel Prata Gomes</i> | |
| 7.1 Reflection on methodology and implementation process | 255 |
| 7.1.1 General discussion | 255 |
| 7.1.2 Success factors | 257 |
| 7.1.3 Sustainability | 259 |
| 7.1.4 What was learnt? | 260 |
| 7.2 The additional benefit of the international project and the comparison between countries | 260 |
| 7.3 Ideas for following projects | 261 |
| Author information | 263 |
| References | 268 |
| Appendices | 279 |