



# MASTEROPPGÅVE

«Korleis profesjonelle som arbeider med elevar i første til tiande klasse i Norske skular rangerar kjente bidragsfaktorar til problematisk skulefråvær»

«How Professionals Working With students in 1<sup>st</sup>–10<sup>th</sup> grade in Norwegian schools rank known risk factors contributing to problematic school absenteeism”

**Bjørn Arvid Garpestad**

Master i spesialpedagogikk

Fakultet for lærarutdanning, kultur og idrett, Institutt for pedagogikk, religion og samfunnsfag. Sogndal

Rettleiar Professor Jon Ingolf Medbøe

Innlevering 14.05.2021

Eg stadfestar at arbeidet er sjølvstendig utarbeida, og at referansar/kjeldetilvisingar til alle

kjelder som er brukt i arbeidet er oppgitt, jf. Forskrift om studium og eksamen ved Høgskulen på Vestlandet, § 12-1.

## Samandrag

Av ulike orsakar, og på ulike tidsrom, er det elevar som er borte frå skulen. Høgt fråvær har konsekvensar på både kort og lang sikt for eleven, familien, og samfunnet. Tidlegare forskning har knyta fråvær, og spesielt skulevegring, til individ- og familiefaktorar. Nyare forskning stiller spørsmål til den einseitige koplinga.

Både elevar, og foreldre til elevar som er borte frå skulen, peikar på skulefaktorar som dei viktigaste bidragsfaktorane til problematisk skulefråvær. Lærarar i Sverige peikar primært på familie og individuelle orsakar til skulefråværet. For å undersøke diskrepansen i desse resultat vart den svenske undersøkinga gjennomført i Norge for å sjå om den gav tilsvarende resultat.

Målet med studien har vore å undersøke korleis profesjonelle som arbeidar med elevar i første til tiande klasse i skulen, rangerar kjende bidragsfaktorar til problematisk skulefråvær, og utforske om det er ulikskapar mellom demografiske grupper i korleis dei rangerer bidragsfaktorar som er gruppert i kategoriar.

Det teoretiske grunnlaget for den svenske undersøkinga vart undersøka, og spørjeskjemaet vart oversett til norsk og endra for å inkludere fleire profesjonar og fleire nivå av undervisning. Spørjeskjemaet vart distribuert via e-post til lokale rektorar, og til ei lukka lærargruppe på Facebook i oktober/november 2020. Totalt 266 respondentar rangerte 16 kjente bidragsfaktorar til problematisk skulefråvær i to ulike kvantitative målingar. To opne spørsmål vart også inkludert, for å spørje om orsakar til problematisk skulefråvær. Resultatet vart samla inn ved bruk av SurveyXact, og analysert ved bruk av SPSS 27, Word, Excel, og enkle reiskap tilgjengeleg online.

Dei fem viktigaste bidragsfaktorane inkluderte to «individuelle» faktorar, to «sosiale» faktorar, og ein familiefaktor. Den individuelle faktoren «nervøsitet, angst, uro» vart rangert høgst. Resultata viste nødvendigheten av å fokusere på mental helse og på pro-sosiale ferdigheiter for å førebygge problematisk skulefråvær. De 16 faktorane vart samla i individuell, familie, sosial, og skulerelatert gruppe, og det vart funne signifikante forskjellar i rangering med tanke på klassifisering av respondentane etter «profesjon», «alder», og «undervisningsnivå siste 5 år».

Respondentane anerkjende problematisk skulefråvær som ei utfordring som strekk seg over fleire faktorar samtidig. På gruppenivå rangerte skulearbeidarane individuelle årsaker og familieårsaker høgst, med sosiale og skulefaktorar betydeleg lågare. Til saman stiller denne

undersøkinga, saman med den svenske, spørsmål om dei profesjonelle i skulen er i stand til å identifisere fráværegrunnar frå eigen kontekst. Eit skulebasert fráværeteam vert referert til som ein mogleg veg framover.

## Summary

Some students do, for different reasons, and for longer periods, not attend school. High absence leads to several short- and long-term consequences for the student, the family, and the community. Earlier, absenteeism, and specifically school refusal was linked to individual or family factors. Recent research questions this simplified assumption.

Students, and parents of school-non-attenders, regard school factors as the most important factors contributing to problematic school absenteeism. Teachers in Sweden rate family and individual causes as the primary factors. Replicating the method used in Sweden, this survey investigates if a similar result can be found in Norway, further investigating the discrepancy between two different views.

The objectives of this study are: To investigate how professionals working with pupils in Norwegian school levels one to ten rate the importance of known contributing factors to problematic school absenteeism. Further to explore if there are socio-demographic differences in how they rank the different factor domains contributing to problematic school absenteeism.

The theoretical foundation of the Swedish survey was reviewed, the questionnaire was translated into Norwegian, and a broader selection of professionals and teaching levels were included. The survey was distributed via mail to headmasters in a local area, and a closed “teacher group” on Facebook in October/November 2020. 266 respondents ranked 16 known reasons of problematic absenteeism in two separate quantitative measures. Two open questions were also included, asking for reasons for problematic school attendance. The data were collected using SurveyXact and analysed using SPSS 27, Word, Excel, and simple tools available online.

The top five list of most contributing factors was a mix of two “individual” factors, two “peer” factors, and one “family” factor. The individual factor “Nervousness, anxiety, worry” was rated highest. The overall result shows that necessity of working with students’ mental health, and prosocial skills to prevent absenteeism. When the 16 reasons were collected into individual, family, peer, and school domains, significant differences were found between domain rating in relation to classifying the respondents according to “profession”, “age”, and “teaching levels last 5 years”.

School-workers view problematic school absenteeism as a multifactorial problem. On domain level, school workers rated individual and family domain highest, with peer and school domains being rated significantly lower. Together, the Swedish and the Norwegian survey question the school-workers ability to identify absence-reasons from their own context. A school-based absence team may be a possible way forward.

## **Forord**

Med denne oppgåva avsluttar tre hektiske år med arbeid og studie, noko som har blitt merka av både meg sjølv og dei rundt meg.

Det er ei rekke med personar som fortener sin del merksemd, grunna deira bidrag til dette endelege produktet. Først og fremst vil eg trekke fram min rettleiar Jon Ingolf Medbø, for konkrete og ryddige tilbakemeldingar, sjølv om spørsmåla og tankane som vart sendt på e-post, ikkje alltid var like lette å avkode.

Eg vil òg takke dei som deltok med svara sine i undersøkinga. Det er openbart at det ville vore vanskeleg å gjere denne undersøkinga utan deltakarar. Og sist men ikkje minst, sender eg ein stor takk til kona mi, som i tillegg til utvida oppgåver i heimen, også har hjelpt til med korrekturlesing, og våre to ungar som måtte leve med at «Pappa er nede i kjellaren å skriver» i alt for lang tid. Eg er svært takksam for at de alle gav meg den tida eg trong for å få dette til.

Nærbø 05.05.2021

## Innhold

Samandrag.....	2
Summary .....	4
Forord.....	6
Abstract .....	9
Keywords:.....	9
Introduction.....	10
Views on causes.....	10
Aims.....	11
Theory.....	12
Risk factors for problematic school absenteeism .....	12
Factors linked to the individual domain.....	12
Factors linked to the family domain.....	13
Factors linked to the school domain .....	13
Factors linked to the peer domain .....	14
Methods .....	15
Procedures.....	15
Participants.....	15
Questionnaire.....	18
Questionnaire structure .....	18
Modifications of Gren-Landell's original questionnaire.....	19
Ethics .....	19
Quantitative analyses.....	20
Open questions .....	20
Results .....	21
School size and number of students with problematic absenteeism .....	21
Proposed contributing causes.....	21
Classification into contributing domains.....	22
Answers on open question.....	24
Discussion .....	25
Limitations.....	29
Implications .....	30
Conclusions.....	31
Acknowledgements.....	31
Declaration of interest statement.....	31
References.....	32

Appendices .....	36
Meldeskjema NSD .....	36
Godkjenning NSD.....	40
Godkjenning Gren-landell. ....	41
Informasjon gitt i epost, og facebookinlegg for rekruttering.....	42
Table 1. ....	43
Table 2. ....	44
Table 3. ....	45
Table 4. ....	46
Forfatterveileding.....	47
Spørreskjema.....	48

Written according to author guide for Scandinavian Journal of Educational Research, more details see page 47.

Wordcount according to author guide:8473

# How Professionals Working With students in 1<sup>st</sup>–10<sup>th</sup> grade in Norwegian schools rank known risk factors contributing to problematic school absenteeism

Bjørn Arvid Garpestad. Primary-school teacher and student of “Master of special education” at Western Norway University of Applied Sciences (HVL), Sogndal campus.

## Abstract

People working with 1<sup>st</sup> – 10<sup>th</sup> grade students in the Norwegian schools were asked to rate the importance of known theory-based contributors to problematic school absence. 266 respondents, recruited among regular and special-education-teachers and other professions, completed the survey. Results show all professionals regard problematic school absenteeism as a multifactorial problem. Individual factors were rated highest, with “nervousness, anxiety, worry” as the most important factor. The contributing factors were classified in four domains (individual, family, school, and peers). Depending on background (profession, age, and teaching level last 5 yr) the responders rated the importance of domains differently. More specifically, special-education-teachers rated “school-domain factors” as being more important than regular teachers did ( $P = 0.008$ ). Professionals in school rated individual and family related reasons significantly higher than peer and school related factors. The data suggest that school workers judge factors outside school to be most important for school absenteeism.

**Keywords:** school-absenteeism; teacher; school-worker; mental health; anxiety; bullying.

## Introduction

Problematic school absenteeism is a major challenge for both students and their families (Havik, 2018). The Norwegian department for education recognises students developing a high level of absenteeism by having increased levels of absenteeism in sixth-form-college (St. Meld. 6 (2019-2020)). Research shows that short term consequences are increased risk for social isolation, increased stress levels, and lower school performance (Holden & Sällman, 2010). Also identified are increased risk of conflicts in family, and lower emotional coping (Havik, 2018). In the long term, absenteeism leads to increased risk of drop-out from school, lack of, or lower level of, education, unemployment, problematic relationships, lower mental and social functioning of the adult individual (Kearney, 2008).

A large number of terms have been used to define factors contributing to school absenteeism (Heyne, Gren-Landell, Melvin, & Gentle-Genetty, 2019). The lack of a common and consistent set of terms has complicated research on these topics (Kearney, 2018a). A recent article made an effort to clear up misassumptions and how to use terms related to students absenteeism (Heyne, Gren-Landell, Melvin, & Gentle-Genetty, 2019). In the present study we use the definition of problematic absenteeism of Kearney (2018a):

Problematic absenteeism could refer to school-aged youths who (1) have missed at least 25% of total school time for at least 2 weeks, (2) experience severe difficulty attending classes for at least 2 weeks with significant interference in a child's or family's daily routine, and/or (3) are absent for at least 10 days of school during any 15-week period while school is in session (i.e., a minimum of 15% days absent from school). Regarding the latter situation, days absent from school would include days a child missed at least 25% of the school day (Kearney, 2008a, s. 265).

This definition includes both partial and complete, authorised, and unauthorised absence. Some critiques will find this too inclusive, but persistent authorized nonattendance can also be problematic (Tonge & Silverman, 2019). The consequences of persistent absenteeism can result in losing out in the social network at school, difficulties following the curriculum, and mental health issues (Kearney, 2018).

## Views on causes

An extensive amount of the research on problematic school absenteeism is linked to “school refusal”, “school refusal behaviour”, “truancy”, “parent induced absenteeism”, or similar

subcategories of problematic school absenteeism. The predominant view on school refusal have historically been to see separation anxiety as the primary cause not attending school (Brouwer-Borhuis, Sauter, Heyne, & Scholte, 2019). The child's fear of leaving the parents for school, instead of fearing to go to school, makes the problem individual/family-related, rather than a problem related to school environment (Pilkington & Piersel, 1991) in (Brouwer-Borhuis, Sauter, Heyne, & Scholte, 2019). Recent research shows a larger interest of peer and school factors, emphasizing environment, rather than individual or family-related factors. But the earlier focus on individual and family factor effects seems to have influenced the understanding of school refusal, and by that also the understanding of problematic school absenteeism by the professionals working in school (Brouwer-Borhuis, Sauter, Heyne, & Scholte, 2019). This assumption is confirmed by research done in Sweden, where teachers rated family and individual factors to be the most contributing reasons for problematic school absenteeism, significantly higher than peer and school related factors (Gren-Landell, Allvin, Bradley, Andersson, & Andersson, 2015). This gives a discrepancy in research as other results point at school, school environment, and the student-teacher relationship as the most important factors, e.g.: "One should always consider school factors when a young person is home from school" (Havik, Bru, & Ertesvåg, 2015a). The main goal of this research has been to explore the discrepancy between these conclusions and to see if the last result can be replicated.

## **Aims**

The objectives of this present study are:

1. Investigate how professionals working with pupils in Norwegian school grade one to ten rate the importance of known contributing factors to problematic school absenteeism.
2. Explore if there are differences in how demographic subgroups rank the different factor domains contribution to problematic school absenteeism.

## Theory

### Risk factors for problematic school absenteeism

Risk factors coexist, interact with one another, and change constantly, making it nearly impossible to uncover a single factor leading to problematic school absenteeism (Thambirajah, Grandison, & De-Hayes, 2008). Research therefore often sorts them into risk factors, protective factors, and factors upholding problematic absenteeism (Havik, 2018).

Categorizing risk factor is influenced by Bronfenbrenner's ecological perspective on the child and development (Bronfenbrenner, 1986). This is one of the reasons why research on school absenteeism mainly focuses on the microsystems around the child. Consequently, the main set of essential factors have been classified as child-related factors (individual) and further factors related to family, peer, and school (Gubbels, van der Put, & Assink, 2019). Some researchers add community factors (Kearney, 2018). Other studies do not differ between school and peer-related factors (Ingul, Havik, & Heyne, 2019). The following factors are found in theories of what makes children stay away from school and create the foundation for the survey. The factors are listed according to how theory connects the factors to each domain.

### Factors linked to the individual domain

A meta-analytic review identified "psychiatric symptoms/disorders", "anti-social behaviour/cognitions", "other internalizing problems", together with "smoking", "drug use", and "alcohol abuse", "having a negative school attitude" and "being a sexual minority", as having a significantly large effect on school absenteeism, (Gubbels, van der Put, & Assink, 2019). Whilst "depression", "poor physical health", "anxiety", "low academic achievement", "showing risky behaviour", "poor physical health", and "risky coping/personality profile" all show medium or low effect (Gubbels, van der Put, & Assink, 2019). Other researchers confirm that anxiety disorders, and/or depression as being important contributing factors (Jones & Suveg, 2015) (Ingul & Nordahl, 2013) (Egger, Costello, & Angold, 2003) (Kearney, 2018) (Dannow, Esbjørg, & Risom, 2018) anti-social behaviour (Egger, Costello, & Angold, 2003) (Kearney, 2018) and somatic symptoms/complaints (Havik, Bru, & Ertesvåg, 2015a) (Egger, Costello, & Angold, 2003) (Jones & Suveg, 2015) (Dannow, Esbjørg, & Risom, 2018) are also factors linked to school absenteeism. The link between mental health and school absenteeism is bidirectional, meaning that mental health problems may cause absenteeism, and absenteeism may cause mental health issues (Wood, et al., 2012). Diagnosis like neurodevelopmental disorders show a higher risk of developing problematic school absenteeism. Students with autism

spectrum disorder (ASD) attending regular schools show a 40% higher risk of “school refusal behaviour” than students without ASD (Munkhaugen, 2018).

### **Factors linked to the family domain**

“Low parental school involvement”, and “history of child abuse and victimization”, have both been identified as having a large effect on absenteeism (Gubbels, van der Put, & Assink, 2019). “Low attachment to parent”, “being in a non-nuclear family”, “parental mental/physical problems”, “low parental acceptance”, “low parental education”, “ineffective family systems”, “low family SES” and “low parental control” are all rated with medium or low significance (Gubbels, van der Put, & Assink, 2019). Maladaptive family functions are found in a large sample of youth with established school refusal (Heyne, Sauter, & Maynard, 2015). Family transitions like divorce, childbirth, loss of family member, or financial stress may play a part (Thambirajah, Grandison, & De-Hayes, 2008), as well as parent involvement (Van Eck, Johnson, Bettencourt, & Johnson, 2017), and parental overprotection (Filippello, Buzzai, Messina, Mafodda, & Sorrenti, 2019) (Thambirajah, Grandison, & De-Hayes, 2008). A child who experiences separational difficulties and school refusal, could be described as in a triangular relationship between an overprotective mother, a distant father, and an over-dependent child (Thambirajah, Grandison, & De-Hayes, 2008)

### **Factors linked to the school domain**

School factors identified with a high effect is “poor pupil-teacher relationship”. Medium impact factors are identified as “negative class climate”, and “education” (Gubbels, van der Put, & Assink, 2019). School climate represented as “school connectedness”, “relationship with teachers” “learning environment, and the “interpersonal links between youth/family and school staff“ is also linked to “chronic absence” (Van Eck, Johnson, Bettencourt, & Johnson, 2017). “Negative classroom management”, “lack of student – teacher relationship”, (Havik, Bru, & Ertesvåg, 2015a) (Egger, Costello, & Angold, 2003) (Gregory & Purcell, 2014) (Dannow, Esbjørg, & Risom, 2018). Poor monitoring/ inconsistent consequences of absenteeism (Kearney, 2018) (Dannow, Esbjørg, & Risom, 2018) and factors identified as “large gatherings”, “unpredictable learning environment”, “maladjusted academic level”, “special needs not being met” are identified as contributors (Dannow, Esbjørg, & Risom, 2018) (Kearney, 2018). Predictors related to “feeling safe in school” have also been identified (Ingul, Klöckner, Silverman, & Nordahl, 2012).

**Factors linked to the peer domain**

The relationship between school absence and social factors in- or outside school is found in a number of studies (Heyne, Sauter, & Maynard, 2015). Difficulties concerning isolation and “peer relationship” (Heyne, Sauter, & Maynard, 2015) (Egger, Costello, & Angold, 2003), bullying at school (Thambirajah, Grandison, & De-Hayes, 2008) (Havik, Edvin, & Sigrun K., 2014) (Kearney, 2018), bullying and/or peer victimisation (Egger, Costello, & Angold, 2003) (Havik, Edvin, & Sigrun K., 2014) (Kearney, 2018) as well as participation in gang related activities, or group demands such as leaving school (Kearney, 2018) have also been proposed as causes.

## Methods

### Procedures

This research was conducted to examine how professionals in 1<sup>st</sup> to 10<sup>th</sup> grade schools in Norway rate known contributing factors to problematic school absenteeism. The study has been done in a descriptive cross-sectional design. Based on well-established theories of known causes to problematic school absenteeism, a questionnaire directed to professionals working with the children in Norwegian schools for 2 yr or more was made, and 266 responds were obtained and analysed.

The results were collected using two identical online questionnaires, one distributed using Facebook, and one sent by e-mail to schools in four local communities in Norway. Recruiting in social media consisted of a post with information about the survey, and a clickable link to a questionnaire in SurveyXact (Rambøll) ([surveyxact.no](http://surveyxact.no)). The Facebook posting was done in two closed groups, one for teachers, and one for people working for, or having children experiencing problematic school absenteeism.

A mail was sent to the headmasters in all schools in the municipalities Hå, Time, Klepp, and Gjesdal in the south-western part of Norway, municipalities with altogether 70 000 people (1.3% of Norway's population). It consisted of a "ready to print" information sheet with a QR-code link, and the same information as posted on the social media platform. No follow-up was done.

The collection of data started on the 21<sup>st</sup> of September and ended at the 11<sup>th</sup> of November 2020, during a period when the Norwegian Directorate for Education and Training collects school statistics in Norway, giving an overview of the total population this survey is aimed for.

### Participants

At the time of this survey, 69 361 teachers worked in the schools of 1<sup>st</sup>–10<sup>th</sup> grade in Norway, 17 377 (25%) male and 51 984 females. Similarly, 21 445 "assistants/others" worked in Norwegian schools, 4 857 (23%) male, and 16 598 females. The official accessible statistics does not provide information on the same level of details as this study asked for in the survey, nor does it provide information on how long they have been employed in the Norwegian school (Utdanningsdirektoratet, 2021).

The total relevant population in the four local communities reachable by mail was 974 teachers (male, 34%), and 330 assistants/other (male 14%). 60 of these answered via the link (4.6% of those asked).

In total for both surveys, 459 people logged in via the links, 148 (32%) people entered the survey, but left without filling in anything, 45 persons (10%) started the survey, but did not complete it. Thus, 266 persons (58% of all logging in) completed the questionnaire.

All professionals working with children in 1<sup>st</sup>–10<sup>th</sup> grade for the last 2 yr were eligible for participation. Participation was anonymous, with no control over who filled in the survey.

Population recruited via Facebook had a lower proportion of men (10%) compared with those recruited via mail (25% men), the latter equalling the gender-distribution among Norwegian schoolteachers. Mail recruits had a higher representation of people with relevant bachelor's degree (10 of 60 vs 3 of 206). Mail recruits also had a higher representation on lower primary school (20 of 60 vs 35 of 206).

The distribution across regions seems to be in line with the total population in each county, except Rogaland county being overrepresented because of the 60 recruited by mail. Consequently, 91 participants (34%) were from Rogaland (9 % of Norway's population).

Except for people working in 1<sup>st</sup> grade (7%), there is a tendency towards increased number of participants to higher teaching-grades (2<sup>nd</sup> grade 3% - 6<sup>th</sup> grade 13%). 7<sup>th</sup> grade 11% and 8<sup>th</sup> grade 10%. People working at 9<sup>th</sup> and 10<sup>th</sup> grade thus together accounted for 31% of the participants.

Table 1. Demographic data of participants total ( $n=266$ ) and social media ( $n=206$ )

Background variables		Total	Social m.
		<i>n</i> (%)	<i>n</i> (%)
Male		34 (13)	19 (9)
Female		232 (87)	187 (91)
Age			
	21–30	36 (14)	24 (12)
	31–40	82 (31)	65 (32)
	41–50	95 (36)	76 (37)
	51–60	46 (17)	37 (18)
	61–	7 (3)	4 (2)
Occupation*			
	Teacher	208 (78)	166 (81)
	Spec. ed. teacher	20 (8)	17 (8)
	Relevant Bachelor	9 (3)	3 (2)
	Skilled worker	14 (5)	7 (3)
	Other**	13 (5)	11 (5)
Teaching grade			
	1 – 4 <sup>th</sup> grade	61 (23)	43 (21)
	5 – 7 <sup>th</sup> grade	95 (36)	70 (34)
	8 – 10 <sup>th</sup> grade	110 (41)	93 (45)
Main level of teaching last 5 yr***			
	Lower primary	55 (21)	35 (17)
	Upper primary	98 (37)	77 (37)
	Lower secondary	113 (43)	94 (46)
Experience			
	less than 5 yr	37 (14)	29 (14)
	6 – 10 yr	68 (26)	47 (23)
	11 – 15 yr	56 (21)	45 (22)
	16 – 20 yr	49 (18)	40 (19)
	21+ yr	56 (21)	45 (22)
Type of school			
	State funded	247 (93)	194 (94)
	Private	19 (7)	12 (6)

\* Due to low number, assistants were grouped in "other".

\*\* Among these were: 1. Headmaster teaching at 5<sup>th</sup>, 7 team leaders, 3 spec. education/counsellors, 3 using different synonyms for teacher, and 2 assistants.

\*\*\*The teaching levels in Norwegian mandatory school are Lower primary level grades 1 – 4 (age 6 – 10 yr), upper primary level grades 5 – 7 (age 10 – 13 yr), lower secondary grades 8 – 10 (age 13 – 16 yr).

## Questionnaire

This study follows that of Gren-Landell et al. (Gren-Landell, Allvin, Bradley, Andersson, & Andersson, 2015). Their questionnaire was translated to Norwegian, discussing key elements with a Swedish speaking professor at the university. An electronic version of the questionnaire was made in SurveyXact for subsequent distribution by mail and Facebook, and for further data collection.

The questionnaire defined problematic school absenteeism inspired by Kearney (2008a), but emphasises the consequences of absenteeism, rather than the numeric approach by Kearney, because teachers most likely would have trouble remembering numeric details in retrospect for the last five years:

This questionnaire is examining “problematic school absenteeism”. With this we opt to include all absenteeism that can lead to detrimental effects in obtaining school diplomas, social exclusion, and mental health problems. Also including terms like truancy, school anxiety and school refusal. Problematic school absenteeism includes both authorised and unauthorised absenteeism. Namely all absence that may cause significant negative consequences for the student.

### Questionnaire structure

Introduction of the questionnaire gave information about the reasons for this research and general terms to the respondent’s participation, anonymity, and the possibility to withdraw, target group, and formalities concerning informed consent.

The second part consisted of nine elements of demographics addressed as open question: “What do you think are the most contributing factors to problematic school absenteeism?” - and further an estimate of the number of students with problematic school absenteeism that they have met during the last five years.

The third part asked questions on 16 items, each representing one of the four domains (four questions for each of the four main domains), addressing respectively individual, family, peer, and school related causes for problematic school absenteeism. The questions were “To what extent do you think (this possible cause) contributes to problematic school absenteeism?” The respondents rated each item on a 5-point Likert-scale rated as “not at all”, “a little”, “moderately”, “quite much”, and “much”.

A new open question asking the responder to write in any reasons the found missing, followed by a second measuring tool where the respondents were asked to “Choose the five reasons

you think contribute most to problematic school absenteeism”, with the same 16 items as above.

All questions required an answer (using the “forced answer-option”) except for the two open questions.

Before submission the questionnaire was pretested on five colleagues, followed by an interview to identify any mistakes, or items that needed revision.

### **Modifications of Gren-Landell’s original questionnaire**

We recorded the region of Norway without asking for a postal code, in line with recommendations of the Norwegian centre for research data. The variable “profession”, originally consisting of “teacher” and “special education teacher”, was extended to include “social worker/social educator or the like, with a relevant bachelor-degree”, “skilled worker” “assistant” and “other”. The demographics recorded includes extended levels of teaching, (1<sup>st</sup>–10<sup>th</sup> grade), and the main level of teaching for the last 5yr.

The four school-domain factors in the original questionnaire was “The students experienced level on classroom teaching/tutoring”, “Lack in school routines concerning absence and consequences”, “Teaching is not adopted to students with learning disabilities”, and “Organisational difficulties”. In this survey, the factor “organisational difficulties” was replaced with “Lack in emotional and professional support from the teacher” to emphasise the teacher’s role. The reasons for this change is that recent research has shown that the teachers’ ability to establish, build, and maintain relationships to students have a significant impact on school absenteeism (Gubbels, van der Put, & Assink, 2019) (Havik, Bru, & Ertesvåg, 2015a)

### **Ethics**

All participants eligible for participation were adult professionals, able to understand the information about the reasons for this research and general terms to the respondent’s participation, anonymity, and the possibility to withdraw. The information given was in line with requirements from “The National Committee for Research Ethics in the Social Sciences and the Humanities” (Forskningsetikk.no). The research was approved by NSD (Norwegian centre for research data), and no further approval was needed.

## **Quantitative analyses**

The collected data can be divided in two sets. The first set of data came from the two measures “how much do you think XX contributes to problematic absenteeism”, and “choose the five most important factors”. And the second dataset came from the open questions. In the first dataset, each factor mean and standard deviation was calculated and given a rank according to the response in the first measure, and a supplementary frequency table showing results from the second measure, with a secondary rank number (table 2),

The 16 reasons for absenteeism used in the two measures were grouped into the four main domains (Individual, Family, Peer, and School) so that each domain included answers from four different questions. The degree of relationship of the answers on the four questions within each domain was expressed by Cronbach’s alpha. Additionally, a calculation was done, examining if mean values from each domain differed significantly.

Quantitative data were analysed in SPSS (version 27) and are summarised as mean and standard deviation, and as the number of answers obtained. In analyses of variance possible problems with heteroscedasticity, by SPSS termed homogeneity, were addressed. If problems were found, Games-Howell approach was chosen according to recent recommendations (Sauder & Demars, 2019). Otherwise Bonferroni-Šidák post hoc correction was used to correct for multiple comparisons.

## **Open questions**

Text was copied into the spread sheet Excel and manually counted and thus recorded for each time an Individual, Family, Peer, or School reason was mentioned.

A second copy of the answers were put into the text editor Word. Capital letters were changed to lowercase letters, spelling mistakes were corrected, all non-text signs removed, and the full text was entered into an online program to sort all words alphabetically ([textfixer.com/tools/alphabetical-order.php](http://textfixer.com/tools/alphabetical-order.php)). The words were examined again so that words with same meaning, but with different grammatical endings were changed to make the program identify them as the same word. Then each word was counted using the “word list” function on an online word cloud generator ([wordclouds.com](http://wordclouds.com)), generating a frequency of word list in descending order. Thereafter insignificant text binding words were removed. The whole process reduced more than 2500 words to a list of about 1200. Words appearing only once were removed. The final list of words included 112 different words.

## Results

### School size and number of students with problematic absenteeism

The mean reported school size from the 266 participants was 330 children ( $SD = 167$ , median 300), ranging between 10 and 1200. On the question “How many students with problematic school absenteeism have you met within the last 5 years?”, the reported mean was 7 children ( $SD 9$ ). The answers ranged between 0 ( $n = 21$ ) to 100 students ( $n = 1$ ); the median was 5 children.

### Proposed contributing causes

The three highest rated causes for problematic school absenteeism were 1. Nervousness, anxiety, worry; 2. Adverse home situation (divorce, conflicts, violence); and 3. Bullying, victimisation (Tab. 2). The scores on each of these proposed causes averaged 3.8 or more (max. possible 5), which means that the majority of the responders rated these causes high. This result was largely confirmed by the results of the second measure (see Tab. 2, right column) where responders were asked to rank the five most important causes from the same 16 causes. The proposed causes in this table are ranked according to the scores on the first question. It is seen that the ranking on the second questions is quite similar ( $r = -0.95$ ). Likewise, the frequency of the five most proposed common causes correlated closely to the mean score of each cause ( $r = 0.93$ ).

Table 2. Rating of contributing factors to problematic school absenteeism (left columns score scale 1–5), and ranking of five most contributing factors (right columns).

Proposed factors	<i>n</i> = 266	Rating of factor		Five most common causes	
		M	SD	Frequency	Rank
Nervousness, anxiety, worry (I)		3.98	0.75	186	1
Adverse home situation (F)		3.83	0.82	140	3
Bullying, victimisation (P)		3.81	0.90	165	2
Low mood, or depression (I)		3.71	0.79	123	5
Peer problems (P)		3.62	0.79	99	7
Parental permissive style (F)		3.61	1.02	123	5
Somatic complaints (I)		3.56	0.89	127	4
Parental mental illness and/or alcohol/drug abuse (F)		3.30	0.91	72	8
Lack of emotional and professional support from teacher (S)		3.26	0.98	53	9
Education is not adapted to learning difficulties (S)		3.06	0.98	50	10
Students perceived level of education (S)		3.01	0.97	41	13
Antisocial behaviour (I)		2.99	0.89	42	12
Lack of support or involvement in schoolwork from parents (F)		2.98	0.93	41	13
Enticing activities outside school (P)		2.86	0.93	50	10
School's lack of attention to presence, and little consequences for absenteeism (S)		2.56	1.05	13	15
Peer influences to stay away from school (P)		2.10	0.77	5	16
Sum				1330	

The data in the two leftmost columns are mean and SD on the question "To what extent do you think XX contributes to problematic school absenteeism" scored on a Likert-type scale 1–5 (1 = not at all; 2 = a little; 3 = moderately; 4 = quite much; 5 = much). The data in the two rightmost columns are number of times the factor in question was mentioned on the question "Choose the 5 most important causes for problematic school absenteeism", and the ranks of these ratings. The proposed causes are given in descending order of the answer to the first question. (I)=Individual domain; (F)=Family domain (P)=Peer domain (S)= School domain. The contributing factors are ranked in descending order of the mean score on the first question (leftmost data column).

### Classification into contributing domains

The sixteen possible causes in table 2 were classified into one of four suggested domains, individual (I), peers (P), school (S), or family (F). Cronbach's alpha was used to investigate internal consistency within the four domains, giving the following scores: Individual,  $\alpha = 0.47$ ;

Peers,  $\alpha = 0.49$ ; School,  $\alpha = 0.67$ ; Family,  $\alpha = 0.71$ . These values suggest a somewhat low internal consistency for each factor. However, the total score for all factors pooled was  $\alpha = 0.79$ .

Scores for single factors within the same domain on question “To what extent do you think XX contributes to problematic school absenteeism?” were added (Tab. 3). The rated importance of each domain differed systematically ( $p \leq 0.01$ ). Likewise, for answers on question “Choose the 5 most important causes for problematic school absenteeism”, frequencies for each single factor within a domain were added. The order of the pooled frequencies was equal to that of the scores on the first question (Tab. 3, right column).

Table 3. Domains by ranking order from test 1 with Mean and SD. Frequency from test 2.

Domains	Test 1		Test 2
	M	SD	Pooled frequency
Individual	14,2	2,1	478
Family	13,7	2,7	376
Peers	12,4	2,1	319
School	12,0	2,8	157
Sum			1330

Range M= 4–20

Comparing the mean value in each domain within demographic subgroups made it possible to examine if any subgroup rated the importance of the domains differently, and if the differences were statistically significant. Differences were found according to “profession”, “teaching grade”, “age”, and “teaching level last 5 yr” (Tab. 4.). In the profession variable, skilled workers rated School domain significantly higher than teachers did ( $P=0.008$ ). A significant difference was also found between teacher and skilled worker when comparing Individual domain where skilled workers scored highest ( $P=0.045$ ). A similar difference was found as skilled workers rated the Peer domain higher than the teachers and the group “other” did ( $P \leq 0.002$ ). The skilled workers also rated the Individual domain higher than the teachers did ( $P = 0.04$ ; Tab. 4). Only statistically significant differences between groups are shown in the table.

Table 4. Significant differences identified in domain ratings between groups of school workers

Analysis based on	Domain	variable	M	SD	Variable	M	SD	Mean dif.	Sig.
Profession	Individual	Teacher	14.1	2.1	Skilled W.	15.7	1.7	1.6	0.045*
	Peer	Teacher	12.3	2.0	Skilled W.	14.5	2.1	2.2	0.002*
	Peer	Others	11.2	2.6	Skilled W.	14.5	2.1	3.3	<0.001*
	School	Teacher	11.6	2.7	Spes. Edu	13.8	2.3	2.2	0.008*
Teaching grade	Individual	7 <sup>th</sup>	15.2	1.5	9 <sup>th</sup>	13.5	2.1	-1.7	0.006**
Age	Peer	21–30 yr	13.4	2.2	41–50 yr	12.2	2.8	-1.2	0.045**
Teaching lvl. last 5 yr	Peer	U. Pri- mary	12.9	2.0	Secondary	12.0	2.1	-0.9	0.005**

No. of professions: Teacher ( $n = 206$ ), Others ( $n = 15$ ), Skilled Workers ( $n = 14$ ), Special education teachers ( $n = 20$ ). No. of teaching grade: 7<sup>th</sup> grade ( $n = 29$ ), 9<sup>th</sup> grade ( $n = 42$ ). No. of ages: 21–30 yr ( $n = 36$ ), 41–50 yr ( $n = 95$ ). No. of teaching level last 5 yr: Upper primary school ( $n = 29$ ), Secondary school ( $n = 113$ )

The data are mean  $\pm$  SD for scores on a scale 4–20.

\*ANOVA and multiple comparison with Sidak correction.

\*\* Post Hoc: Homogeneity not met. Games-Howell - Equal variances not assumed

Only significant findings are listed

### Answers on open question

On the question “What do you think are the most common reasons for problematic school absenteeism, 38 people answered with one single factor or word, while the rest of the responders emphasised multifactorial reasons, expressing difficulties in identifying single causes, pointing out that they meant that single causes mutually influence each other.

The ten most used word in the text in descending order was 1. Missing (61) 2. Psychic (57) 3. Parents (52) 4. Anxiety (44) 5. Bullying (40) 6. Home-environment (37) 7. School (37) 8. School-refusal (36) 9. Pupils (35) 10. Mastering (34) ( $\sum n_i = 433$ .  $\rightarrow 433/266 = 1,63$  words/respondent in average).

When possible, the key words in the answers were classified into one of the four domains, giving the following frequency: Individual domain 193 times, School domain 143 times, Family domain 132 times, and Peer domain 119 times. Some answers appeared multifactorial like “bullying in relation to school”, or “anxiety over stressing school environment”. When this

happened, one mark was given to each of the appropriate domains. Some answers could not be classified into the current scheme, for example “student’s lack in motivation due to ...”, “students feeling uncomfortable at school”. These answers were therefore left out. No responders mentioned more than three factors in each domain.

The last open question asking if responders felt any factors or causes was missing, 60 people mentioned something. 12 people answered “No” or similar. 16 responds were related to “problematic school absenteeism seldom having single causes, and often being related to a combination of reasons”.

In both open questions several factors not addressed in this study were identified. The most common being related to “organisational difficulties”, and answers related to “school workers lack knowledge about neurodevelopmental disorders”.

## **Discussion**

This study has examined the importance of causes for problematic school absenteeism, as judged by professionals working with school children. The top 5 list were in descending order “nervousness, anxiety, worry”, “adverse home situation”, “bullying, victimisation”, “low mood or depression” and “peer problems”. Factors were grouped into one of four possible domains. Individual and family-related reasons were rated higher than peer and school-related reasons. Finally, the importance of domains differed between subgroups of the participants.

The first research question was to find how the professionals working in schools ranked the 16 known contributing factors to problematic school absenteeism. They were further asked to point out the five most important ones. Two out of top five factors were linked to individual reasons, specifically mental health issues. These two factors were “nervousness, anxiety, worry”, and “low mood or depression”, respectively. The factor “nervousness, anxiety, worry” was rated highest in both measures. In the open question, psychic was the second most, and anxiety was the fourth most used word in the wordcount, showing a high degree of consistency between answers. It is well documented that anxiety and psychiatric symptoms/disorders are important risk factors for problematic school absenteeism (Gubbels, van der Put, & Assink, 2019). Several studies have shown that some of the most common diagnoses for children are anxiety-related (Ingul & Nordahl, 2013). Further, when comparing students with anxiety problems and different levels of absenteeism, students with anxiety and

normal absence have fewer problems across multiple tiers like family, friends, or school compared with students with anxiety problems and high absence (Ingul & Nordahl, 2013).

Mental health issues on an individual level are by some not considered to be within the teachers' duties (Gren-Landell, Allvin, Bradley, Andersson, & Andersson, 2015). But other researchers claim professionals working in schools to be one of the main providers of mental health services to children (Cunningham & Suldo, 2014). On their own, research shows that teachers lack precision in identifying which of the children do experience at-risk levels of anxiety and depression (Cunningham & Suldo, 2014). Taking this into account, teachers, and school professionals are in need help to uncover students at risk of developing problematic school absenteeism, as anxiety, and other mental health issues are important contributing factors (Kearney, 2018). School workers can make an impact by increasing their knowledge and awareness of how to identify students at risk, and how school factors interact with mental health issues. By identifying problem-areas and students at risk on an earlier stage, one could lower the risk of the mental health issue developing further (Havik, 2018), thus preventing absenteeism.

Responders rated "bullying, victimisation", and "peer problems", both linked to the peer domain, third and fifth on the list. Bullying, a specific type of problematic peer relations, and "peer problems" have known links to school environment (Havik, Bru, & Ertesvåg, 2015). Bullying, peer problems, and school environment are known factors contributing to problematic absenteeism (Havik, Edvin, & Sigrun K., 2014) (Van Eck, Johnson, Bettencourt, & Johnson, 2017). Proper use of research-based anti-bullying programs have proven effect on bullying (Gaffney, Ttofi, & Farrington, 2019). Interventions on bullying and enhancement of prosocial behaviour and activities can also enhance mental health and each student's feeling of safety at school (Havik, 2018) (Kearney, 2018). Research shows that prosocial activities could benefit students risking absenteeism on an individual level (Ingul & Nordahl, 2013). The Norwegian Education Act commits all school workers to act upon bullying, violence, discrimination or harassment in school environment (The Education Act, 1998). Preventing bullying and further establishing good relations among students' peers is therefore an important part of everyday tasks for school professionals, not only because they are obliged by law, but also because of the effect on problematic absenteeism.

The Swedish survey had three of the top five factors linked to the family domain (Gren-Landell, Allvin, Bradley, Andersson, & Andersson, 2015), while in the present study only the factor "adverse home situation" was mentioned among top five, ranking second. The reason

for this difference could indicate either a difference between the teachers in Norway and Sweden, or that knowledge among professionals in schools have changed over time. Further research is needed to elucidate this.

The individual domain was rated highest, followed by family, peer, and school domain, in that order. This rank was supported by the pooled frequency of responders asked to choose the five most important factors. The low rank of school domain is supported by the Swedish survey (Gren-Landell, Allvin, Bradley, Andersson, & Andersson, 2015). These results support the assumption that professionals in schools may not be able to identify causes in their own context (Brouwer-Borhuis, Sauter, Heyne, & Scholte, 2019), or that professionals think of separation anxiety and family causes as the main reasons, in line with the earlier knowledge (Brouwer-Borhuis, Sauter, Heyne, & Scholte, 2019). This raises a question of why school factors are rated low, in contrast to results from students' and parents' ratings, as they report school factors as main contributors. These latter groups rate the student-teacher relationship as being particularly important (Havik, Edvin, & Sigrun K., 2014) (Havik, Edvin, & Sigrun K., 2014). Other researchers have also found strong links to school environment, and student-teacher relationship (Van Eck, Johnson, Bettencourt, & Johnson, 2017) (Gubbels, van der Put, & Assink, 2019).

School domain, scoring lowest, had mean 3.0 averaged over its four factors, a score shown as "Moderately" on the Likert scale. All other domains had a higher average score over its four factors, indicating that they are scored to contribute more than "Moderately". This shows that the responders see the phenomenon of school absenteeism as a multi-, and cross-factorial issue. Stressing the importance of doing a thorough and systematic assessment of each individual case to find the causes behind the school absenteeism (Heyne, Gren-Landell, Melvin, & Gentle-Genetty, 2019) (Ingul, Havik, & Heyne, 2019).

The second research question was to investigate any sociodemographic differences in ratings of domains. Skilled workers rated peer domain significantly higher than both teachers and "others" did. Most of the group "others" identified themselves as teachers in "leading positions". The similarity between teachers and "others" might therefore be expected. Skilled workers also rated the individual domain significantly higher than teachers did. Skilled workers in Norway are often used as teachers' "arm extension", providing an extra pair of hands and eyes, monitoring the classroom, and the social interactions in school hours and recess and providing help to students with special needs. This makes the skilled workers' position closer

to the students than the teachers, possibly giving greater insight in how individual factors and social factors interact and contribute to absenteeism.

Special education teachers rated school domain significantly higher than ordinary teachers did. Special education teachers often work in close relation to students needing adjustments to curriculum, or the school day. It is well known that students with neurodevelopmental disorders like ADHD, Autism Spectrum Disorder, and similar conditions have a higher risk of problematic school absenteeism (Munkhaugen, 2018). With potentially more in-depth knowledge of individual challenges and school factors from training and education, a special education teacher might be in a better position to identify school-related factors. This finding is in line with those of (Gren-Landell, Allvin, Bradley, Andersson, & Andersson, 2015) who also found that special education teachers rated school factors higher than regular teachers did.

An overall decline in the importance of the peer domain by the responders' 'years' was found both for the responders' age and their years of experience. But this result needs more research to be confirmed. A limitation with the present study is that only seven respondents were 61 yr or older. Further, age was grouped in quite coarse intervals. A similar result was identified in Sweden, where people working less than five years rated peer factors as being more important than those with 11–15 years of experience did (Gren-Landell, Allvin, Bradley, Andersson, & Andersson, 2015). This could mean that younger professionals have better insight into the lives of young people or being more updated because of more recent studies on the universities.

Professionals working in the upper primary school (5<sup>th</sup>–7<sup>th</sup> grade) the last five years, reported peer domain significantly higher than professionals working in secondary school did. The peer factor with highest score was “bullying, victimisation”, and there is strong evidence of a declining trend of bullying as the age of the child increases (Wendelborg, 2021), raising the question why teachers at lower primary school did not report bullying even higher. The answer could be related to the main question of this research. There could be more bullying in lower grades, but school workers do not see it as a contributing factor, as school absenteeism increases by age, and bullying decreases.

Professionals working in 7<sup>th</sup> level reported individual domain higher than professionals working in 9<sup>th</sup> grade did. All factors linked to the individual domain have possible connections to bullying, either as executor or consequences. School workers' view on reasons for school

absenteeism is an under-researched topic, and further research is needed explore why this result was identified.

On average the professionals had encountered seven children with problematic school absenteeism during the last five years. 21 responders (8%) reported 0 students. Norway do not have a central database for absenteeism, prevalence is therefore based on estimates. But research done in 2016–2017 estimates that 3.7% of all school children have more than 10% absence (Holterman, 2018). A survey in Sweden showed responders on average having met 17 students (Gren-Landell, Allvin, Bradley, Andersson, & Andersson, 2015).

## **Limitations**

This study represents the view of 266 teachers, special education teachers, relevant bachelor, skilled workers, and “others”. At the time of this survey, the total population consisted of 69 361 teachers, and 21 445 registered assistant/others (Utdanningsdirektoratet, 2021). Some of them were not eligible to participate as they had worked less than 2 years. One of the limitations is therefore linked to the low number of participants relative to the total eligible population, and distribution among subgroups.

The questionnaire, or researchers, had no control of whether the participating respondents fulfilled the inclusion criteria. The questionnaire did not measure whether the respondents were working full time or part time.

The participants were self-selected, which may introduce a bias. It is conceivable that teachers being familiar with problematic absenteeism felt that the study was more relevant and thus were motivated to take part in the study than the average school worker. In particular, professionals at 9<sup>th</sup> and 10<sup>th</sup> grade together accounted for 31% of the participants, being more than their proportion. Problematic absenteeism increases with students’ age (St. Meld. 6 (2019-2020)), and this may explain the high participation of these.

When factors are collected in domains, it is assumed that the participants’ use and understanding of each factor is equal to theory. The open questions suggest that interpretation could have other possible outcomes. In answers, factors related to “Autism/Asperger diagnosis, and lack in teacher’s knowledge of neurodevelopmental disorders, and how it affects students in school” were mentioned several times. Some teachers could identify anxiety or Asperger diagnosis as an individual trait, but if asked in an interview, label it as lack in school’s

knowledge and adaptation to the student's needs, making it a school factor. The same goes with the factor "antisocial behaviour" as some responders stated that "student does not feel safe in school due to antisocial behaviour by others". By not knowing whether the professional's rate this as an individual or school related issue, the splitting in individual, family, peer, or school domain done by the researcher opens for an unprecise conclusion on domain level. To explore this, responders could identify each factor into multiple domains like "How much do you see this as: a) an individual factor (score 1-5) b) family factor (score 1-5) c) social factor (1-5) or d) school factor (1-5).

This study used four contributing factors for each domain. One of the school-related factors was changed from "organisational difficulties" in a former study (Gren-Lendell et al. 20\_\_ ) to "lack of emotional and professional support from the teacher". That may have contributed to a lower score on school domain. In particular, on the open questions several answers included organisational difficulties as a factor missing from the measures.

This research took place in October/November 2020, a year filled with news concerning Covid-19. At the time of the survey, Norway was mostly open due to low numbers of infections, but the pandemic may still have influenced the study.

## **Implications**

The results above suggest that despite seeing school absenteeism a cross factorial issue, professionals working in schools have trouble identifying school-based reasons for problematic absenteeism. To deal with students with emerging school refusal, researchers suggest establishing a school-based attendance team (Ingul, Havik, & Heyne, 2019). But the results here show that an attendance team should consider providing support on a broader definition of the terms linked to absenteeism. School workers are likely to have trouble identifying the category of absenteeism the student presents. The school based team could provide support by using methods like "SNACK" (School Non-Attendance ChecKlist) (Heyne, Gren-Landell, Melvin, & Gentle-Genetty, 2019) to differentiate among types of absenteeism. By using research-based approaches provided by Kearney, or the procedures and instruments mentioned in the table of the article "emerging school refusal" (Ingul, Havik, & Heyne, 2019), school professionals can ensure the right method is used to intervene. A school-based framework with a dedicated attendance team could provide crucial support and knowledge to school personnel, parents, and students, enabling them to differ the reasons of absenteeism, provide

counselling and appropriate tools, and support the teachers in when to call on external resources.

## **Conclusions**

Professionals in school see school absenteeism as a multicausal problem but emphasise individual and family domain as the primary reasons for absenteeism. In particular, they rank issues related to mental health and bullying/peer related reasons as four out of the top five contributing factors for problematic school absenteeism. Research shows us that the school plays a significant role in preventing absenteeism. This point to the importance of school to work systematically to enhance peer relations among students and using research-based programs for anti-bullying, and promotion of good mental health, to prevent problematic absenteeism.

It may be that professionals underestimate the role of school related factors. The school should therefore be aware of, and always consider, school reasons when a student has an increase in absence. A school-based framework with a dedicated attendance team could possibly be a way forward, but research on how to implement this is needed.

## **Acknowledgements**

This work is part of a master education in special pedagogics and has not received any funding.

I am grateful to Gren-Landell for providing access to the original questionnaire, and to professor Göran Söderlund for assistance in working out a Norwegian version of the questionnaire. To the administrators of the Facebook group, granting me permission to post the survey. And last, but not least, a thanks to my tutor, who has given invaluable advice and support throughout this project.

## **Declaration of interest statement**

The author declares no conflict of interest.

## References

- Bromfenbrenner, U. (1986). Ecology of the family as context for human development: research perspectives. *American Psychologist*, *32*, pp. 513-531.
- Brouwer-Borhuis, M., Sauter, F., Heyne, D., & Scholte, R. (2019). The link: An alternative educational program in the netherlands to reengage school-refusing adolescents with school. *Cognitive and behavioural practice*. *26*(1), pp. 75-91.
- Cunningham, J., & Suldo, S. (2014, April 4). Accuracy of teachers in identifying elementary school students who report at-risk levels of anxiety and depression. *School mental health*, pp. 237-250. doi:DOI 10.1007/s12310-014-9125-9
- Dannow, M., Esbjørg, B., & Risom, S. (2018, jun 18). The perceptions of anxiety-related school absenteeism in youth: a qualitative study involving youth, mother and father. *Scandinavian journal of educational research* *64*, pp. 22-36.  
doi:<https://doi.org/10.1080/00313831.2018.1479302>
- Den nasjonale forskningsetiske komite for samfunnsvitenskap og humaniora (NESH). (2021, januar 27). *Forskningsetikk.no*. Retrieved from Forskningsetiske retningslinjer for samfunnsvitenskap, humaniora, juss og teologi:  
<https://www.forskningsetikk.no/retningslinjer/hum-sam/forskningsetiske-retningslinjer-for-samfunnsvitenskap-humaniora-juss-og-teologi/>
- Egger, H., Costello, J., & Angold, A. (2003, Jul). School refusal and psychiatric disorders: A community study. *Journal of the american academy of child & adolescent psychiatry*, *42*, pp. 797-807.  
doi:[org/10.1097/01.CHI.0000046865.56865.79](https://doi.org/10.1097/01.CHI.0000046865.56865.79)
- Filippello, P., Buzzai, C., Messina, G., Mafodda, A., & Sorrenti, L. (2019, jun 16). School refusal in students with low academic performances and specific learning disorder. The role of self-esteem and perceived parental psychological control. *International journal of disability, development and education* *67*, pp. 592-607.  
doi:<https://doi.org/10.1080/1034912X.2019.1626006>
- Gaffney, H., Ttofi, M., & Farrington, D. (2019). Evaluating the effectiveness of schoolbullying prevention programs: An updated meta-analytical review. *Agression and violent behaviour*, pp. 111-133. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.avb.2018.07.001>

- Gregory, I., & Purcell, A. (2014). Extended school non-attenders' views: developing best practice. *Educational psychology in practice* 30, pp. 37-50. doi:  
<https://doi.org/10.1080/02667363.2013.869489>
- Gren-Landell, M., Allvin, C. E., Bradley, M., Andersson, M., & Andersson, G. (2015). Teachers' view on risk factors for problematic school absenteeism in Swedish primary school students. *Educational Psychology in practice* 31:1,, pp. 412-423. doi:<https://doi-org.galanga.hvl.no/10.1080/02667363.2015.1086726>
- Gubbels, J., van der Put, C., & Assink, M. (2019, July 15). Risk factors for school absenteeism and dropout: A meta-analytic review. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, pp. 1637-1667. Retrieved from <https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s10964-019-01072-5#citeas>
- Havik, T. (2018). *Skolefravær å forstå og handtere skolefravær og skolevegring*. Oslo: Gyldendal Akademisk.
- Havik, T., Bru, E., & Ertesvåg, S. (2015). School factors associated with school refusal- and truancy related reasons for school non-attendance. *Social Psychology of Education*, 18(2), pp. 221 - 240. Retrieved from <https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s11218-015-9293-y>
- Havik, T., Bru, E., & Ertesvåg, S. (2015a). Assessing Reasons for School Non-attendance. *Scandinavian journal of educational research Vol 59, No 3,*, pp. 316-336.  
 doi:<https://doi.org/10.1080/00313831.2014.904424>
- Havik, T., Edvin, B., & Sigrun K., E. (2014). Parental perspectives of the role of school factors in school refusal,. *Emotional and Behavioural Difficulties*, 19:2,, pp. 131-153.  
 doi:<https://doi.org/10.1080/13632752.2013.816199>
- Heyne, D., Gren-Landell, M., Melvin, G., & Gentle-Genetty, C. (2019). Differentiation Between School Attendance Problems: Why and How? *Cognitive and Behavioural Practice* 26, pp. 8-34.  
 doi:[10.1016/j.cbpra.2018.03.006](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cbpra.2018.03.006)
- Heyne, D., Sauter, F., & Maynard, B. (2015). Moderators and mediators of treatments for youth with school refusal or truancy. In M. Maric, P. Prins, & T. Ollendick (Eds.), *Moderators and Mediators of Youth Treatment Outcomes* (pp. 230-266). New York: Oxford University Press.  
 doi:<https://doi.org/10.1093/med:psych/9780199360345.003.0010>
- Holden, B., & Sällman, J.-I. (2010). *Skolenekting Årsaker, kartlegging og behandling*. Oslo: Kommuneforlaget.

- Holterman, S. (2018). *22 000 skolebarn er borte minst en måned*. Retrieved 10 03, 2020, from Utdanningsnytt.no: <https://www.utdanningsnytt.no/barneskole-fagartikkel-fravaer/22-000-skolebarn-er-borte-i-minst-en-maned/171035>
- Ingul, J., & Nordahl, H. (2013). Anxiety as a risk factor for school absenteeism: What differentiates anxious school attenders from non-attenders? *Annals of General Psychiatry* 3, p. 12:25. doi:10.1186/1744-859X-12-25
- Ingul, J., Havik, T., & Heyne, D. (2019, februar 1). Emerging School Refusal: A School-Based Framework for Identifying Early Signs and Risk Factors. *Cognitive and Behavioral Practice* 26., pp. 42-62. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cbpra.2018.03.005>
- Ingul, J., Klöckner, C., Silverman, W., & Nordahl, H. (2012). Adolescent school absenteeism: modelling social and individual risk factors. *Child and adolescent Mental Health volume 17, No. 2*, pp. 93-100. doi: doi: 10.1111/j.1475-3588.2011.00615.x
- Jones, A., & Suveg, C. (2015, April 2). Flying under the radar: School reluctance in anxious youth. *School Mental Health* 7, pp. 212-223. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1007/s12310-015-9148-x>
- Kearney, C. (2008). School absenteeism and school refusal behaviour in youth: A contemporary review. *Clinical Psychology review*, 28(3), pp. 451-471. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cpr.2007.07.012>
- Kearney, C. (2008a). An interdisciplinary model of school absenteeism in youth to inform professional practice and public policy. *Educational psychology review*, pp. 257-282. doi:10.1007/s10648-008-9078-3
- Kearney, C. (2018). *Helping school refusing children and their parents*. New York: Oxford university press.
- Kearney, C. (2018a). School refusal behaviour and absenteeism. In R. Levenesque (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of Adolescence*. New York: Springer Cham. doi:DOI: [https://doi-org.galanga.hvl.no/10.1007/978-3-319-33228-4\\_236](https://doi-org.galanga.hvl.no/10.1007/978-3-319-33228-4_236)
- Munkhaugen, E. K. (2018, 12). *School refusal behaviour in students with autism spectrum disorder. An exploratory study of frequency and associated factors*. Oslo. Retrieved from <https://www.duo.uio.no/handle/10852/68503>
- Sauder, D., & Demars, C. (2019, March 1). An updated recommendation for Multiple Comparisons. *Advances in Methods and Practices in Psychological science vol: 2,1*, pp. 26-44. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1177/2515245918808784>

- St. Meld. 6 (2019-2020). (n.d.). Retrieved from Tett på - tidling innsats og inkluderende fellesskap i barnehage, skole og SFO: <https://www.regjeringen.no/no/dokumenter/meld.-st.-6-20192020/id2677025/?ch=1>
- Thambirajah, M., Grandison, K., & De-Hayes, L. (2008). *Understanding school refusal*. London: Jessica Kingsley Publishers.
- The Education Act. (1998, 07 17). Act relating to Primary and Secondary Education and Training. Retrieved from Lovdata.no: <https://lovdata.no/dokument/NLE/lov/1998-07-17-61>
- Tonge, B., & Silverman, W. (2019, Jan 06). Reflections on the field of School Attendance Problems: For times They Are a-changing? *Cognitive and Behavioural Practice*(26), pp. 119-126.
- Utdanningsdirektoratet. (2021, 02 09). *Grunnskolen informasjonssystem*. Retrieved from Grunnskole 2020-21 C. Årsverk og ansatte: <https://gsi.udir.no/app/#!/view/units/collectionset/1/collection/88/unit/1/>
- Van Eck, K., Johnson, S., Bettencourt, A., & Johnson, S. L. (2017, April). How school climate relates to chronic avsence: A multi-level latent profile analysis. *Journal og School Psychology* 61, pp. 89-102. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jsp.2016.10.001>
- Wendelborg, C. (2021). *Mobbing og arbeidsro i skolen 2020 analyse av elevundersøkelsen 2020/2021*. Trondheim: NTNU samfunnsforskning.
- Wood, J., Langer, D., Clark, S., Lynne-Landsman, S., Wood, P., & Eddy, J. (2012, Feb). School attendance problems and youth psychopathology: Structural cross-lagged regression models in three longitudinal data sets. *Child Development*, pp. 351-366. doi:DOI: 10.1111/j.1467-8624.2011.01677.x

## Appendices

### Meldeskjema NSD

Henta frå <https://meldeskjema.nsd.no/eksport/5e3a9447-aa5f-4a6a-9a2a-7aee149bd6a9>

05.04.2021

-----  
Meldeskjema 374272

Skriv ut

#### Sist oppdatert

02.06.2020

#### *Hvilke personopplysninger skal du behandle*

##### *Type opplysninge*

Skal du behandle særlige kategorier personopplysninger eller personopplysninger om straffedommer eller lovovertrедelser?

Nei

#### *Prosjektinformasjon*

##### **Prosjekttittel**

Kva meiner lærarar er dei viktigaste faktorane som bidreg til problematisk skulefråvær

##### **Prosjektbeskrivelse**

Prosjektet ønsker å finne ut kva lærarar på 1. til 10 trinn meiner er dei viktigaste bidragsfaktorane til problematisk skulefråvær. Gjennom ei elektronisk administrert spørjeundersøking, vil eg be lærarar om å vurdere i kor stor grad ei rekke ulike faktorar bidreg. Deretter ber eg dei om å rangere dei 4 eller 5 viktigaste. Tidlegare forskning har vist at foreldre som blir spurt om kva som er dei viktigaste faktorane som bidreg til problematisk skulefråvær, peikar på skulerelaterte faktorar. Anna forskning indikerar at lærarar som vert spurt om det same peikar på Individuelle og familiefaktorar som dei viktigaste bidragsfaktorane til skulevegving. Eg vil undersøkje om min forskning viser det same.

##### **Begrunn behovet for å behandle personopplysningene**

Slik det ser ut etter justeringar, så handterar eg ingen personopplysningar.

##### **Ekstern finansiering**

##### **Type prosjekt**

Studentprosjekt, masterstudium

##### **Kontaktinformasjon, student**

Bjørn Arvid Garpestad, 238898@stud.hvl.no, tlf: 90177936

**Behandlingsansvar****Behandlingsansvarlig institusjon**

Høgskulen på Vestlandet / Fakultet for lærerutdanning, kultur og idrett / Institutt for pedagogikk, religion og samfunnsfag

**Prosjektansvarlig (vitenskapelig ansatt/veileder eller stipendiat)**

Jon Ingulf Medbø, Jon.Ingulf.Medbo@hvl.no, tlf: 4757677648

**Skal behandlingsansvaret deles med andre institusjoner (felles behandlingsansvarlige)?**

Nei

**Utvalg 1**

---

**Beskriv utvalget**

Lærere som underviser på 1. til 10 trinn.

**Rekruttering eller trekking av utvalget**

Bekvemmelighetsutvalg. Rekruttering gjennom annonser i fagtidsskrift, sosiale media, og gjennom personlege kontakter.

**Alder**

20 - 70

**Inngår det voksne (18 år +) i utvalget som ikke kan samtykke selv?**

Nei

**Personopplysninger for utvalg 1****Hvordan samler du inn data fra utvalg 1?****Elektronisk spørreskjema****Vedlegg**

spørsmål spørreundersøkelse.pdf

**Grunnlag for å behandle alminnelige kategorier av personopplysninger**

Samtykke (art. 6 nr. 1 bokstav a)

**Informasjon for utvalg 1****Informerer du utvalget om behandlingen av opplysningene?**

Ja

**Hvordan?**

Skriftlig informasjon (papir eller elektronisk)

**Informasjonsskriv**

Informasjonsskiv undersøkelse.pdf

### ***Tredjepersoner***

#### **Skal du behandle personopplysninger om tredjepersoner?**

Nei

### ***Dokumentasjon***

#### **Hvordan dokumenteres samtykkene?**

- Elektronisk (e-post, e-skjema, digital signatur)

#### **Hvordan kan samtykket trekkes tilbake?**

I surveyexact kan personar fjernes fra lista, og svara deira vil forsvinne. Viser ellers til informasjonsskrivet.

#### **Hvordan kan de registrerte få innsyn, rettet eller slettet opplysninger om seg selv?**

Det er ikkje tale om registrering av kjenslevare opplysningar osv. Alle deltakarane sender inn all infomrasjon sjølv gjennom spørjeskjema. viser ellers til punktet over knytta til tilbaketrekking av samtykke. Viser ellers til informasjonsskrivet.

#### **Totalt antall registrerte i prosjektet**

100-999

### ***Tillatelser***

#### **Skal du innhente følgende godkjenninger eller tillatelser for prosjektet?**

### ***Behandling***

#### **Hvor behandles opplysningene?**

- Maskinvare tilhørende behandlingsansvarlig institusjon

#### **Hvem behandler/har tilgang til opplysningene?**

- Student (studentprosjekt)
- Prosjektansvarlig
- Databehandler

#### **Hvilken databehandler har tilgang til opplysningene?**

Ramboll, driftern av suveyexact, under innsamling.

#### **Tilgjengeliggjøres opplysningene utenfor EU/EØS til en tredjestat eller internasjonal organisasjon?**

Nei

**Sikkerhet**

**Oppbevares personopplysningene atskilt fra øvrige data (koblingsnøkkel)?**

Ja

**Hvilke tekniske og fysiske tiltak sikrer personopplysningene?**

- Opplysningene anonymiseres fortløpende
- Flerfaktorautentisering

**Varighet**

**Prosjektperiode**

01.08.2020 - 30.06.2021

**Skal data med personopplysninger oppbevares utover prosjektperioden?**

Nei, data vil bli oppbevart uten personopplysninger (anonymisering)

**Hvilke anonymiseringstiltak vil bli foretatt?**

- Koblingsnøkkelen slettes

**Vil de registrerte kunne identifiseres (direkte eller indirekte) i oppgave/avhandling/øvrige publikasjoner fra prosjektet?**

Nei

**Tilleggsopplysninger**

## Godkjenning NSD

---

### Melding

02.06.2020 11:05

Det innsendte meldeskjemaet med referansekode 374272 er nå vurdert av NSD.

Følgende vurdering er gitt:

Det er vår vurdering at det ikke skal behandles direkte eller indirekte opplysninger som kan identifisere enkeltpersoner i dette prosjektet, så fremt den gjennomføres i tråd med det som er dokumentert i meldeskjemaet den 02.06.2020 med vedlegg, samt i meldingsdialogen mellom innmelder og NSD. Prosjektet trenger derfor ikke en vurdering fra NSD.

**HVA MÅ DU GJØRE DERSOM DU LIKEVEL SKAL BEHANDLE PERSONOPPLYSNINGER?**

Dersom prosjektopplegget endres og det likevel blir aktuelt å behandle personopplysninger må du melde dette til NSD ved å oppdatere meldeskjemaet. Vent på svar før du setter i gang med behandlingen av personopplysninger.

**VI AVSLUTTER OPPFØLGING AV PROSJEKTET**

Siden prosjektet ikke behandler personopplysninger avslutter vi all videre oppfølging.

Lykke til med prosjektet!

Kontaktperson hos NSD: Simon Gogl

Tlf. Personverntjenester: 55 58 21 17 (tast 1)

---

## Godkjenning Gren-landell.

Korrespondansen er noe redusert.

Hei.

Mit navn er Bjørn Arvid Garpestad.

I kontakt med Trude Havik fikk jeg tips om artikkelen "Teachers' view on risk factors for problematic school absenteeism in Swedish primary school students". Og i samtale med min studieleder, har vi kommet frem til at det hadde vært spennende å gjennomføre hele, eller deler av, undersøkelsen som ligger bak artikkelen, i Norge.

Jeg lurte derfor på om jeg kan få tilgang til spørreskjemaet som dere brukte i undersøkelsen. Oversette dette til Norsk, å bruke det i en undersøkelse som skal dekke grunnlaget for en min Masteroppgave. Ellers vil jeg også være glad for eventuell annen informasjon som dere måtte ønske å dele, som kan bidra til gjennomføringen.

Målet vil være å gjøre en replikasjon av studien i Norge.

Tidspunkt for innlevering av Masteroppgaven er Mai 2021.

Tror du dette vil være mulig?

MVH

Bjørn Arvid Garpestad.

---

Frå Gren Landell 05.11.2019

Kära Björn,

Ledsen att jag inte har svarat!

Jag hittar inte frågorna.... Det var länge sedan jag använde dem. Men jag ska höra med en av medförfattarna.

Återkommer förhoppningsvis med svar, snart!

-----  
Hej igen!

Kom på att frågorna finns i uppsatserna som mina studenter skrev 😊

Du får gärna använda dem om du har nytta av dem!

Skicka gärna ditt examensarbete när du är klar.

Bästa hälsningar,

Malin Gren Landell

[www.grenlandelliskolan.se](http://www.grenlandelliskolan.se)

**INSA**  
International Network  
for School Attendance

[www.insa.network](http://www.insa.network)

## Informasjon gitt i epost, og facebookinnlegg for rekruttering.

Hei.

I forbindelse med masterprosjekt i spesialpedagogikk har eg laga ei spørjeundersøking som eg ønsker at **alle som arbeider med elevar ved skular i norge** kan svare på.

Eg ynskjer at alle som har arbeidd med elevar i minst 2 år i grunnskulen skal svare. Dette inkluderer; lærarar, miljøterapeuter, assistenter, fagarbeidere, og andre som kan være aktuelle.

Undersøkelsen tar mellom 10- 15 min å gjennomføre. Den er fullstendig anonym. Og spør ikkje om personlege emner.

Her er lenka som kan brukast, den har og meir utfyllande informasjon.

Link distribuert via mail.

<https://www.survey-xact.dk/LinkCollector?key=4TCXVD4KU115>

Link distribuert via facebook.

<https://www.survey-xact.dk/LinkCollector?key=ATAUVD4NS21N>

**Table 1.**Demographic data of participants total ( $n=266$ ) and social media ( $n=206$ )

Background variables		Total	Social m.
		<i>n</i> (%)	<i>n</i> (%)
Male		34 (13)	19 (9)
Female		232 (87)	187 (91)
Age			
	21-30	36 (14)	24 (12)
	31-40	82 (31)	65 (32)
	41-50	95 (36)	76 (37)
	51-60	46 (17)	37 (18)
	61-	7 (3)	4 (2)
Occupation*			
	Teacher	208 (78)	166 (81)
	Spec. ed. teacher	20 (8)	17 (8)
	Relevant Bachelor	9 (3)	3 (2)
	Skilled worker	14 (5)	7 (3)
	Other**	13 (5)	11 (5)
Teaching grade			
	1 – 4 <sup>th</sup> grade	61 (23)	43 (21)
	5 – 7 <sup>th</sup> grade	95 (36)	70 (34)
	8 – 10 <sup>th</sup> grade	110 (41)	93 (45)
Main level of teaching last 5 yr***			
	Lower primary	55 (21)	35 (17)
	Upper primary	98 (37)	77 (37)
	Lower secondary	113 (43)	94 (46)
Experience			
	less than 5 yr	37 (14)	29 (14)
	6 – 10 yr	68 (26)	47 (23)
	11 – 15 yr	56 (21)	45 (22)
	16 – 20 yr	49 (18)	40 (19)
	21+ yr	56 (21)	45 (22)
Type of school			
	State funded	247 (93)	194 (94)
	Private	19 (7)	12 (6)

\* Due to low number, assistants were grouped in "other".

\*\* Among these were: 1. Headmaster teaching at 5<sup>th</sup>, 7 team leaders, 3 spec. education/counsellors, 3 using different synonyms for teacher, and 2 assistants.

\*\*\*The teaching levels in Norwegian mandatory school are Lower primary level grades 1 – 4 (age 6 – 10 yr), upper primary level grades 5 – 7 (age 10 – 13 yr), lower secondary grades 8 – 10 (age 13 – 16 yr).

**Table 2.**

Rating of contributing factors to problematic school absenteeism (left columns score 1–5), and ranking of five most contributing factors (right columns).

Proposed factors	<i>n</i> = 266	Rating of factor		Five most common causes	
		M	SD	Frequency	Rank
Nervousness, anxiety, worry (I)		3.98	0.75	186	1
Adverse home situation (F)		3.83	0.82	140	3
Bullying, victimisation (P)		3.81	0.90	165	2
Low mood, or depression (I)		3.71	0.79	123	5
Peer problems (P)		3.62	0.79	99	7
Parental permissive style (F)		3.61	1.02	123	5
Somatic complaints (I)		3.56	0.89	127	4
Parental mental illness and/or alcohol/drug abuse (F)		3.30	0.91	72	8
Lack of emotional and professional support from teacher (S)		3.26	0.98	53	9
Education is not adapted to learning difficulties (S)		3.06	0.98	50	10
Students perceived level of education (S)		3.01	0.97	41	13
Antisocial behaviour (I)		2.99	0.89	42	12
Lack of support or involvement in schoolwork from parents (F)		2.98	0.93	41	13
Enticing activities outside school (P)		2.86	0.93	50	10
School's lack of attention to presence, and little consequences for absenteeism (S)		2.56	1.05	13	15
Peer influences to stay away from school (P)		2.10	0.77	5	16
Sum				1330	

The data in the two leftmost columns are mean and SD on the question "To what extent do you think XX contributes to problematic school absenteeism" scored on a Likert-type scale 1–5 (1 = not at all; 2 = a little; 3 = moderately; 4 = quite much; 5 = much). The data in the two rightmost columns are number of times the factor in question was mentioned on the question "Choose the 5 most important causes for problematic school absenteeism", and the ranks of these ratings. The proposed causes are given in descending order of the answer to the first question. (I)=Individual domain; (F)=Family domain (P)=Peer domain (S)= School domain

**Table 3.**

Domains by ranking order from test 1 with Mean and SD. Frequency from test 2.

Domains	Test 1		Test 2
	M	SD	Pooled frequency*
Individual	14,2	2,1	478
Family	13,7	2,7	376
Peers	12,4	2,1	319
School	12,0	2,8	157

Range M= 4-20

\*Sum= 1330

**Table 4.**

Significant differences identified in domain ratings between groups

Analysis based on	Domain	variable	M	SD	Variable	M	SD	Mean dif.	Sig.
Profession	Individual	Teacher	14.1	2.1	Skilled W.	15.7	1.7	1.6	0.045*
	Peer	Teacher	12.3	2.0	Skilled W.	14.5	2.1	2.2	0.002*
	Peer	Others	11.2	2.6	Skilled W.	14.5	2.1	3.3	<0.001*
	School	Teacher	11.6	2.7	Spes. Edu	13.8	2.3	2.2	0.008*
Teaching grade	Individual	7 <sup>th</sup>	15.2	1.5	9 <sup>th</sup>	13.5	2.1	-1.7	0.006**
Age	Peer	21–30 yr	13.4	2.2	41–50 yr	12.2	2.8	-1.2	0.045**
Teaching lvl. last 5 yr	Peer	U. Pri- mary	12.9	2.0	Secondary	12.0	2.1	-0.9	0.005**

No. of professions: Teacher ( $n = 206$ ), Others ( $n = 15$ ), Skilled Workers ( $n = 14$ ), Special education teachers ( $n = 20$ ). No. of teaching grade: 7<sup>th</sup> grade ( $n = 29$ ), 9<sup>th</sup> grade ( $n = 42$ ). No. of ages: 21–30 yr ( $n = 36$ ), 41–50 yr ( $n = 95$ ). No. of teaching level last 5 yr: Upper primary school ( $n = 29$ ), Secondary school ( $n = 113$ )

The data are mean  $\pm$  SD for scores on a scale 4–20.

\*ANOVA and multiple comparison with Sidak correction.

\*\* Post Hoc: Homogeneity not met. Games-Howell - Equal variances not assumed

Only significant findings are listed

## Forfatterveiledning

This article is written using the format-free submission option as opted for in the Instruction for authors. <https://www.tandfonline.com/action/authorSubmission?show=instructions&journalCode=CSJE>

Main points:

Your paper should be compiled in the following order: title page; abstract; keywords; main text introduction, materials and methods, results, discussion; acknowledgments; declaration of interest statement; references; appendices (as appropriate); table(s) with caption(s) (on individual pages); figures; figure captions (as a list).

Wordcount, between 6000-8000 words including abstract, tables, references, figure captions, footnotes, and endnotes.

Title page, -including authors full name and affiliation.

Abstract, Unstructured, 150 words.

Keywords, 5-8

Founding details.

## Spørreskjema

### Har du arbeidd på barne eller ungdomstrinnet i minst 2 år?

Da er du invitert til å bli med på denne undersøkelsen om problematisk skolefravær. Og jeg håper at du kan avse litt tid i en travel hverdag, til å hjelpe meg med å finne ut noe mer om problematisk skolefravær.

Omfattende skolefravær er et aktuelt problem som kan lede til negative og kostbare konsekvenser for både individ og samfunn.

De siste årene har en gjennom ulike forskning sett på skolefravær fra ulike innfallsvinkler. Og i denne undersøkelsen ønsker jeg å se nærmere på den gruppen med personer som møter elevene til daglig i skolen. Denne undersøkelsen er derfor rettet mot dere som jobber i grunnskolen, og som daglig er sammen med elevene. Målet er at jeg gjennom denne undersøkelsen kan bidra til økt kunnskap om problematisk skolefravær.

Undersøkelsen er en elektronisk spørreundersøkelse der dere vil bli bedt om å gradere i hvilken grad dere mener at forskjellige påstander bidrar til problematisk skolefravær.

Undersøkelsen er en del av et Mastergradsprosjekt i Spesialpedagogikk ved Høgskulen Vestlandet Campus Sogndal.

Kontaktinformasjon : Student: Bjørn Arvid Garpestad 238898@stud.hvl.no  
Veileder: Jon Ingulf Medbø Jon.Ingulf.Medbo@hvl.no

### Definisjon

Denne undersøkelsen undersøker "problematisk skolefravær".

Med dette mener jeg å inkludere alt fravær som kan lede til negative konsekvenser knyttet til å oppnå vitnemål, sosial tilhørighet, og psykisk helse. Problematikken inkluderer også ulike andre begrep som "skulk", "skoleangst" og "skolevegring".

**Problematisk skolefravær inkluderer både dokumentert og udokumentert fravær. Altså alt fravær som kan lede til betydelige negative konsekvenser.**

### Personvern:

**Data blir samlet inn gjennom bruk av spørreskjemaet surveyexact.**

**Undersøkelsen er anonym. Det vil si at det ikke er mulig å hente ut svarene dine**

**Det er frivillig å delta. Ved å svare på denne undersøkelsen, samtykker du til å bli med**

**Siden undersøkelsen er helt anonym, er det ikke mulig å trekke deg fra undersøkelsen etter at den er levert.**



### 1. Kjønn

- (1)  Mann
- (2)  Kvinne

### 2. Alder

- (1)  21-30 år
- (2)  31-40 år
- (3)  41-50 år
- (4)  51-60 år
- (5)  61 år eller eldre

### 3. Hva er din stilling i skolen?

- (1)  Lærer ( herunder adjunkt, Lektor, og liknande)
- (2)  Spesialpedagog/ spesiallærer
- (3)  Miljøterapeut ( herunder relevant 3- årig helse og sosialfaglig utdanning)
- (4)  Fagarbeider ( Fagbrev i relevant helse og/eller sosialfaglig utdanning)
- (5)  Assistent
- (6)  Annet \_\_\_\_\_

### 4. Hvilket klassenivå har du mesteparten av din undervisning?

- (1)  1
- (2)  2
- (3)  3
- (4)  4
- (5)  5
- (6)  6

- (7)  7
- (8)  8
- (9)  9
- (10)  10

### 5. Antall år i yrket:

- (1)  Mindre enn 5 år
- (2)  6-10 år
- (3)  11-15 år
- (4)  16-20 år
- (5)  21 år eller mer

### 6. Hva slags skole arbeider du på?

- (1)  Privat
- (2)  Offentlig

### I hvilket fylke arbeider du?

- (1)  Troms og Finmark
- (2)  Nordland
- (3)  Trøndelag
- (4)  Møre og Romsdal
- (5)  Innlandet
- (6)  Oslo
- (7)  Viken
- (8)  Vestland
- (9)  Vestfold og Telemark
- (10)  Rogaland
- (11)  Agder

7. Omtrent hvor mange elever går det på skolen der du jobber? (Hvis du jobber flere steder, bruk den skolen der du har den største stillingsprosenten)

\_\_\_\_\_

8. Hva tror du er den vanligste årsaken til problematisk skolefravær? (angi gjerne flere)

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

9. Omtrent hvor mange elever med problematisk skolefravær har du møtt de siste 5 årene?  
(Angi en omtrentlig siffer)

\_\_\_\_\_

10. Hvor har du jobbet mest i løpet av de siste 5 årene? ( De som har jobbet færre, svarer der de har vært mest.)

- (1)  Småskolen
- (2)  Mellomtrinnet
- (3)  Ungdomsskuletrinnet

**11 a. I hvilken grad tror du nervøsitet, uro, og/eller angst hos eleven bidrar til et problematisk skolefravær?**

- (1)  Ikke i det hele tatt
- (2)  Lite
- (3)  Moderat
- (4)  Ganske mye
- (5)  Svært mye

**11 b. Har du erfart at en eller flere elever har hatt problematisk skolefravær med denne årsaken?**

- (1)  Nei, ikke i det hele tatt
- (2)  Ja, 1-2 ganger
- (3)  Ja, flere ganger

**12 a. I hvilken grad tror du at gruppepress om å være borte fra skolen bidrar til problematisk skolefravær?**

- (1)  Ikke i det hele tatt
- (2)  Lite
- (3)  Moderat
- (4)  Ganske mye
- (5)  Svært mye

**12 b. Har du erfart at en eller flere elever har hatt problematisk skolefravær med denne årsaken?**

- (1)  Nei, ikke i det hele tatt
- (2)  Ja, 1-2 ganger
- (3)  Ja, flere ganger

**13 a. Hvor mye tror du at en ustabil hjemmesituasjon (skilsmisse, flytting, konflikter, vold, misbruk eller lignende) kan bidra til et problematisk skolefravær?**

- (1)  Ikke i det hele tatt
- (2)  Lite
- (3)  Moderat
- (4)  Ganske mye
- (5)  Svært mye

**13 b. Har du erfart at en eller flere elever har hatt problematisk skolefravær med denne årsaken?**

- (1)  Nei, ikke i det hele tatt
- (2)  Ja, 1-2 ganger
- (3)  Ja, flere ganger

**14 a. I hvilken grad tror du at elevens opplevde nivå av klasseundervisningen (eksempelvis om eleven opplever undervisningen som for lett eller for vanskelig) bidrar til problematisk skolefravær?**

- (1)  Ikke i det hele tatt
- (2)  Lite
- (3)  Moderat
- (4)  Ganske mye
- (5)  Svært mye

**14 b. Har du erfart at en eller flere elever har hatt problematisk skolefravær med denne årsaken?**

- (1)  Nei, ikke i det hele tatt

- (2)  Ja, 1-2 ganger
- (3)  Ja, flere ganger

**15 a. I hvilken grad tror du at nedstemthet og/eller depresjon bidrar til problematisk skolefravær?**

- (1)  Ikke i det hele tatt
- (2)  Lite
- (3)  Moderat
- (4)  Ganske mye
- (5)  Svært mye

**15 b. Har du erfart at en eller flere elever har hatt problematisk skolefravær med denne årsaken?**

- (1)  Nei, ikke i det hele tatt
- (2)  Ja, 1-2 ganger
- (3)  Ja, flere ganger

**16 a. I hvilken grad tror du at mobbing eller annen krenkende adferd fra medelever bidrar til problematisk skolefravær?**

- (1)  Ikke i det hele tatt
- (2)  Lite
- (3)  Moderat
- (4)  Ganske mye
- (5)  Svært mye

**16 b. Har du erfart at en eller flere elever har hatt problematisk skolefravær med denne årsaken?**

- (1)  Nei, ikke i det hele tatt
- (2)  Ja, 1-2 ganger
- (3)  Ja, flere ganger

**17 a. I hvilken grad tror du at manglende støtte/engasjement i skolearbeidet hjemmefra (eksempelvis hjelp med lekser eller skoleaktiviteter) bidrar til problematisk skolefravær?**

- (1)  Ikke i det hele tatt
- (2)  Lite
- (3)  Moderat
- (4)  Ganske mye
- (5)  Svært mye

**17 b. Har du erfart at en eller flere elever har hatt problematisk skolefravær med denne årsaken?**

- (1)  Nei, ikke i det hele tatt
- (2)  Ja, 1-2 ganger
- (3)  Ja, flere ganger

**18 a. I hvilken grad tror du at skolen sin manglende kontroll på fravær, med få eller ingen konsekvenser av fraværet, bidrar til problematisk skolefravær?**

- (1)  Ikke i det hele tatt
- (2)  Lite
- (3)  Moderat
- (4)  Ganske mye
- (5)  Svært mye

**18 b. Har du erfart at en eller flere elever har hatt problematisk skolefravær med denne årsaken?**

- (1)  Nei, ikke i det hele tatt
- (2)  Ja, 1-2 ganger
- (3)  Ja, flere ganger

**19 a. I hvilken grad tror du at normbrytende adferd (eksempelvis verbal eller fysisk utagering) bidrar til problematisk skolefravær?**

- (1)  Ikke i det hele tatt
- (2)  Lite
- (3)  Moderat
- (4)  Ganske mye
- (5)  Svært mye

**19 b. Har du erfart at en eller flere elever har hatt problematisk skolefravær med denne årsaken?**

- (1)  Nei, ikke i det hele tatt
- (2)  Ja, 1-2 ganger
- (3)  Ja, flere ganger

**20 a. I hvilken grad tror du at lokkende aktiviteter utenfor skolen (eksempelvis fritidsinteresser som dataspill eller idrett) bidrar til problematisk skolefravær?**

- (1)  Ikke i det hele tatt
- (2)  Lite
- (3)  Moderat grad
- (4)  Ganske mye

- (5)  Svært mye

**20 b. Har du erfart at en eller flere elever har hatt problematisk skolefravær med denne årsaken?**

- (1)  Nei, ikke i det hele tatt  
(2)  Ja, 1-2 ganger  
(3)  Ja, flere ganger

**21 a. I hvilken grad tror du at psykisk sykdom og/eller misbruk av rusmidler hos foreldre bidrar til problematisk skolefravær?**

- (1)  Ikke i det hele tatt  
(2)  Lite  
(3)  Moderat  
(4)  Ganske mye  
(5)  Svært mye

**21 b. Har du erfart at en eller flere elever har hatt problematisk skolefravær med denne årsaken?**

- (1)  Nei, ikke i det hele tatt  
(2)  Ja, 1-2 ganger  
(3)  Ja, flere ganger

**22 a. I hvilken grad tror du at manglende emosjonell og faglig støtte fra lærer bidrar til problematisk skolefravær?**

- (1)  Ikke i det hele tatt  
(2)  Lite  
(3)  Moderat

- (4)  Ganske mye
- (5)  Svært mye

**22 b. Har du erfart at en eller flere elever har hatt problematisk skolefravær med denne årsaken?**

- (1)  Nei, ikke i det hele tatt
- (2)  Ja, 1-2 ganger
- (3)  Ja, flere ganger

**23 a. I hvilken grad tror du at somatisk sykdom hos eleven (her inkluderer jeg alt fra "undefinerbare vondt i magen, hodepine, til mer alvorlige tilstander som for eksempel kreft) bidrar til problematisk skolefravær?**

- (1)  Ikke i det hele tatt
- (2)  Lite
- (3)  Moderat
- (4)  Ganske mye
- (5)  Svært mye

**23 b. Har du erfart at en eller flere elever har hatt problematisk skolefravær med denne årsaken?**

- (1)  Nei, ikke i det hele tatt
- (2)  Ja, 1-2 ganger
- (3)  Ja, flere ganger

**24 a. I hvilken grad tror du at relasjonsvansker til medelever bidrar til problematisk skolefravær?**

- (1)  Ikke i det hele tatt

- (2)  Lite
- (3)  Moderat
- (4)  Ganske mye
- (5)  Svært mye

**24 b. Har du erfart at en eller flere elever har hatt problematisk skolefravær med denne årsaken?**

- (1)  Nei, ikke i det hele tatt
- (2)  Ja, 1-2 ganger
- (3)  Ja, flere ganger

**25 a. I hvilken grad tror du at ettergivende foreldrestil (eksempelvis at eleven for lett får lov til å bli hjemme) bidrar til problematisk skolefravær?**

- (1)  Ikke i det hele tatt
- (2)  Lite
- (3)  Moderat
- (4)  Ganske mye
- (5)  Svært mye

**25 b. Har du erfart at en eller flere elever har hatt problematisk skolefravær med denne årsaken?**

- (1)  Nei, ikke i det hele tatt
- (2)  Ja, 1-2 ganger
- (3)  Ja, flere ganger

**26 a. i hvilken grad tror du manglende tilpasning av undervisningen**

**(eksempelvis på grunn av lese-/skrivevansker eller konsentrasjonsproblemer) bidrar til problematisk skolefravær?**

- (1)  Ikke i det hele tatt
- (2)  Lite
- (3)  Moderat
- (4)  Ganske mye
- (5)  Svært mye

**26 b. Har du erfart at en eller flere elever har hatt problematisk skolefravær med denne årsaken?**

- (1)  Nei, ikke i det hele tatt
- (2)  Ja, 1-2 ganger
- (3)  Ja, flere ganger

**27. Synes du jeg mangler noen viktige forklarende årsaker til skolefravær i denne spørreundersøkelsen, I så fall, hvilke?**

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

**28. Velg ut de fem årsakene du mener bidrar mest til problematisk skolefravær.**

- (1)  Nervøsitet, uro og/eller angst hos eleven
- (2)  Gruppepress om å være borte fra skolen

- (3)  En ustabil hjemmesituasjon (skilsmisse, flytting, konflikter, vold eller lignende)
- (4)  Elevens opplevde nivå av klasseundervisningen (eksempelvis om undervisningen oppleves som for lett eller for vanskelig)
- (5)  Nedstemthet og/eller depresjon
- (6)  Mobbing eller annen krenkende adferd fra medelever
- (7)  Manglende støtte/engasjement i skolearbeidet hjemmefra (eksempelvis hjelp med lekser eller skoleaktiviteter)
- (8)  Skolen sin manglende kontroll på fravær, med få eller ingen konsekvenser av fraværet
- (9)  Normbrytende adferd (eksempelvis verbal eller fysisk utagering)
- (10)  Lokkende aktiviteter utenfor skolen (eksempelvis fritidsinteresser som dataspill eller idrett)
- (11)  Psykisk sykdom og/eller misbruk av rusmiddel hos foreldre
- (12)  Manglende emosjonell og faglig støtte fra lærer
- (13)  Somatisk sykdom hos eleven (her inkluderer jeg alt fra "undefinerbare vondt i magen, hodepine, til mer alvorlige tilstander som for eksempel kreft)
- (14)  Relasjonsvansker til medelever
- (15)  Ettergivende foreldrestil (eksempelvis at eleven for lett får lov til å bli hjemme)
- (16)  Manglende tilpasning av undervisningen (eller eksempelvis på grunn av lese/skrive -vansker eller konsentrasjonsproblemer)

**29. Har du kjennskap til din skoles retningslinjer for håndtering av uønsket fravær?**

- (1)  Ja
- (2)  Nei, men det finnes retningslinjer.
- (3)  Nei, det finnes ingen retningslinjer.

**30. Ut fra din skoles retningslinjer, kjenner du til hvordan du skal gå frem når du ser en elev med problematisk skolefravær?**

- (1)  Nei
- (2)  Delvis
- (3)  Ja

**31. Hvordan fikk du vite om denne undersøkelsen?**

- (1)  Annonse
- (2)  Sosiale medier
- (3)  Kollega
- (4)  Annet

**Kommentar:**

---

Takk for at du deltok!

Med vennlig hilsen  
Bjørn Arvid Garpestad