

**3**



## **○ Four (Cyber)Mobbing Case Stories**

**3.1 The (Cyber)Mobbing Case of "Mika"**

**3.2 The (Cyber)Mobbing Case of "Mr. Beutelsbacher"**

**3.3 The (Cyber)Mobbing Case of "Sabahat"**

**3.4 The (Cyber)Mobbing Case of "Ahmet"**

**3.5 Overview of the (Cyber)Mobbing Case Examples with their Similarities and Differences**

- 1 Introduction
- 2 From Mobbing to (Cyber)Mobbing
- 3 Four (Cyber)Mobbing Case Stories**
- 4 Intervention Methods

- 5 Systemic Conflict Management
- 6 Nele – A Case Study
- 7 Pedagogical Conduct
- 8 Projects in Practice

---

### 3. Four (Cyber)Mobbing Case Stories

Now that Chapter 2 has clarified definitions and discussed the course of events in (cyber)mobbing in terms of social psychology, the following four actual cases will demonstrate (cyber)mobbing situations as they occur daily in schools. They were all addressed with the methods of Systemic Conflict Management and were all de-fused, using the means explained in Chapters 4 and 5. All four cases are described briefly and clearly so that they can serve as an introduction to the two theoretical chapters that will follow.

A fifth true case (“Nele – A Case Study”) will then be presented in Chapter 6. The case itself and the approach taken to it through Systemic Conflict Management are depicted in great detail. It is recommended that readers familiarize themselves thoroughly with the fundamentals of SCM (Chapter 5) and with its methods (Chapter 4), so that they can return to Nele’s case repeatedly with newly acquired practical tools. At the end of this chapter (section 3.5) you will find an overview of the five cases listing their similarities and differences.

3

1 Introduction

2 From Mobbing to (Cyber)Mobbing

**3 Four (Cyber)Mobbing Case Stories**

4 Intervention Methods

5 Systemic Conflict Management

6 Nele – A Case Study

7 Pedagogical Conduct

8 Projects in Practice

### 3.1 The (Cyber)Mobbing Case of “Mika”

#### *Mika wants to see Sebastian’s brain splatter*

Mika is in the sixth grade at a middle school. He enjoys a dominant position in the class and high prestige among the boys as well as the girls – a sort of class ‘boss’. Using a photo of his classmate Sebastian (one of the typical, normal boys in the class) Mika has constructed a photo collage. He has copied Sebastian’s portrait off Instagram and mounted a heap of excrement on the head. Underneath, he has written “ha, ha, ha – I’m laughing myself sick!”, then posted the photo in the class chat on WhatsApp. On the same evening, he also posted an audio message saying, “Basti you are such a miserable spastic! I’m warning you. I really, really hate your guts. If you say one more time that I am mobbing you, I’m gonna take your head and bash it against a radiator so hard that your brain splatters and the classroom is covered in your blood!” Several classmates give the photo and the audio clip a ‘like’ or post a comment with “ha, ha, ha” and a smiley laughing itself to tears. The next day, Sebastian doesn’t want to go to school, and he shows his mother the photo and the audio message. His mother realizes how frightened he is and allows him to stay home from school. In the afternoon, she calls the homeroom teacher. The teacher, Ms. Bogen, then confers with the school social worker (in his role as conflict mediator and manager) and the headmaster. This team decides on a strategy for action and plans how to proceed. Although the team does not yet have all the details on what has transpired, it assumes that this is a threatening situation which calls for immediate intervention. Under no circumstances should the incident be made light of (as in “Pull yourself together, it’s not the end of the world”) – which, unfortunately, can happen all too easily.

#### **Intervention Addressing the Threat**

In a first step, it is examined whether the threat is substantial. Ms. Bogen asks the mother to document the chat as a means of proof. Then the headmaster, together with the school social worker, asks Mika about what happened. They want to find out what the relationship between Mika and Sebastian is like (interpersonally) and whether Mika is feeling some severe inner grievance (intrapersonally) that could give rise to a murder threat. According to Mika, his relationship with Sebastian is perfectly OK. The headmaster responds to this denial strategy by showing Mika the proof. “It wasn’t meant that way”, says Mika in an attempt to trivialize what he did. The headmaster and school social worker ask him if he is willing to refrain completely from any use of force. He agrees and this is formalized in a written deposition renouncing the use of force. The school social worker begins documenting the case.

The headmaster now informs Sebastian’s mother and offers a school escort to her son. Sebastian accepts the suggestion – meaning, for example, that the next day he spends his recess time in a protected area of the school building. The following day, he realizes that he is no longer acutely threatened by Mika and resumes the usual pattern of his school day. Now, Mika is told that he must spend all his recess time during the next two weeks in the protected zone.

---

### Regulating the Conflict

The team consisting of headmaster, homeroom teacher Ms. Bogen, and school social worker now analyze the conflict in detail. On what level should the conflict process be addressed? In this case, the conflict levels are: intrapersonal – inner grievances of the offender and the victim; interpersonal – between the conflicting parties; institutional – between the school and the offender, since he has committed a prosecutable offense and disturbed the school community; systemic – since members of the class participated actively; and on the level of the partners responsible for education and up-bringing – in particular, the parents.

The team decides to approach the process primarily on the systemic and interpersonal levels. Within the class group, a Systemic Brief Intervention SBI is conducted (see Chapter 4.4). On the interpersonal level, an exchange between the conflicting parties is arranged (see chart *Support on the interpersonal level*). In the presence of a mediator – in this case, the school social worker who is trained in this field – Mika declares that he did not really mean it seriously, that he is sorry, and that he will not do it again: essentially, he repeats what he said in the deposition renouncing the use of force. Sebastian accepts Mika's apology.

In his audio message, Mika had threatened his classmate with murder or at least aggravated assault. It has to be made clear to Mika, that this is a serious violation of norms. The headmaster offers him the option of making reparation to the school community to "set right" this norm violation through responsible behavior on his own part. On the one hand, he is to do twelve hours of voluntary work for the school custodian. On the other, he is to present to his class a written and oral apology for having committed an offense and, in doing so, endangered the social cohesion of the class. (Should Mika decide against these measures, the headmaster will suspend him from school for one week.) All of the measures are discussed with the parents, both Mika's and Sebastian's.

### Follow-up

After about a week, it is ascertained in the course of a talk held by the school social worker with Mika and Sebastian that in recent days there have, in fact, not been any altercations between the two. After another week or two, the students who had been chosen during the SBI as human rights observers are asked how the class group has been conducting itself with regard to such conflicts. As far as anyone knows, all the members of the class have abided by the voluntary declaration of commitment they had made. There have been no further cyber attacks – this included the class chat.

1	Introduction
2	From Mobbing to (Cyber)Mobbing
3	<b>Four (Cyber)Mobbing Case Stories</b>
4	Intervention Methods

5	Systemic Conflict Management
6	Nele – A Case Study
7	Pedagogical Conduct
8	Projects in Practice

### 3.2 The (Cyber)Mobbing Case of “Mr. Beutelsbacher”

#### *Mr. Beutelsbacher is exposed to ridicule via a fake account*

Mr. Beutelsbacher has been a chemistry teacher at an academic high school for the last 30 years. In his field, he is unsurpassable, but his style of instruction is not exactly modern. He has increasing difficulty in asserting himself during lessons, particularly in the more lively class groups.

David, Luca, and John are in a seventh grade class where Mr. Beutelsbacher teaches chemistry. They like to fool around during class, and their grades show it. One rainy Sunday afternoon, they get together at Luca’s house and watch videos they made secretly during chemistry class. They also show them to Luca’s mother, trying to prove to her that, with such instruction, no one could possibly get good chemistry grades. She is indignant about Mr. Beutelsbacher – no wonder her son is getting such bad marks! She considers making a complaint to the school in the near future. That puts Luca and his friends in a good mood. They spontaneously decide to do Mr. Beutelsbacher a “favor” by creating a fake Facebook account for him. Onto it, they upload one of their videos.

In the next few days, several classmates discover the Facebook account and tell the others about it. Everybody has a good laugh. A couple of students are skeptical that Mr. Beutelsbacher could have created this account. Various parents also take note of the Facebook page and inform the teacher. Mr. Beutelsbacher is appalled. He feels that he is being exposed to ridicule and his honor is slighted. He demands that the headmaster levy severe consequences. The headmaster suggests addressing the conflict process by means of Systemic Conflict Intervention. First, what exactly happened will be clarified, and right away on the next afternoon there will be a case conference among colleagues to discuss further steps.

The school social worker is experienced at diagnosing conflicts. He explains to the team consisting of the headmaster, the homeroom teacher, and Mr. Beutelsbacher (see also Chapter 5.4.3) that recording the video and publishing it was a violation of the privacy of the spoken word (§ 201 German Penal Code) and of universal personal rights. These were not simply copyright violations. Moreover, creating the fake Facebook account was slanderous and also violated personality rights. The social cohesion of the school and the class group have been grievously disturbed.

In addressing the conflict process, the team distinguishes two areas of conflict: a) the conflict area of living together (the video recording, fake account, and publication) and b) the conflict area of working together (the old-fashioned style of teaching) – see also Chapter 2.1.1. Each of these conflict areas is to be addressed separately. Mr. Beutelsbacher is still hesitant: on the one hand, he would like to say “forget it, no hard feelings!”, but on the other, he would like to see the boys punished. He is concerned that, in either case, he has been damaged by the incident. The outcome of the team consultation convinces him in the end, and he agrees to proceed together as planned.

The conflict event itself is quickly clarified – how it happened. As a conflict in the area of living together, the team assesses the students’ action as (cyber)mobbing in the testing stage. The team presumes that there could be quite a few classmates who sympathize with the behavior of David, Luca, and John. This assessment implies that intervening quickly and systemically in the class group would be well-advised. In a first step, Mr. Beutelsbacher will submit an urgent request to Facebook that the account be terminated immediately. Also, addressing the institutional conflict will in this case not – as is otherwise usual – begin with an exchange between the school administration and the group of boys. Nor will the interpersonal conflict (between the three boys and Mr. Beutelsbacher) be taken up immediately. Instead, the team will first address the systemic conflict between the formal framework of values and norms applying to the school (penal code, school and house statutes) and the informal value framework within the

class which is very apparently in contradiction to the formal framework, and the team will do this on the systemic level by working with the entire class. The task is now to activate, among the classmates, feelings of concern and compassion for Mr. Beutelsbacher, and to motivate them to respect the formal framework of values and norms. As soon as that has been achieved, the institutional conflict will be taken up between the school administration and the group of boys, with their parents participating. In another step, the interpersonal conflict between Mr. Beutelsbacher and the three boys will then be addressed. Were the institutional conflict treated first, there would be the risk that the offenders could morph into “martyrs” and their classmates into “victims” of Mr. Beutelsbacher’s supposedly unsatisfactory teaching. That might indeed damage Mr. Beutelsbacher even more, and many members of the class might just end up thinking that the boys’ behavior was courageous and it was a shame that they got caught.

At the request of the headmaster and in the presence of the homeroom teacher, the school social worker now conducts an SBI (Systemic Brief Intervention, Chapter 4.4). Its aim is to have the class distance itself from the behavior of the three boys and disavow such behavior for the future – no matter whom it might be directed toward. The class group needs to be won over to respecting the formal value framework, making it their own, and confirming that by writing individual declarations of their commitment to maintain it (see Chapter 4.4).

With this foundation set out, the headmaster and homeroom teacher can approach the institutional conflict more successfully, with the systemic level factored in. The school social worker moderates a session in which the homeroom teacher gives the students a “chance to be honest” and asks who among them has ever done anything similar (without singling out the group of boys). The three students then admit what they did. The headmaster and the homeroom teacher take advantage of the opportunity to praise them for being honest and offer them help in making reparation. If the students now agree to offer restitution for the deed and the damage done, the

headmaster tells them, then he will refrain from other punitive measures (such as suspension). Reparation toward the school community would involve voluntary work at the school and a letter of apology read to the class (as in case 1); loss adjustment for the personal damage done would take the form of a personal meeting with Mr. Beutelsbacher, mediated by the school social worker.

Needless to say, the parents are also informed. At first, they argue that the “bad teaching” of Mr. Beutelsbacher was the catalyst: anyone would understand why the kids put up resistance, and the Facebook account was just a boyish prank. The headmaster elucidates for the parents the distinction between conflicts in the area of living together and those in the area of working together. He explains that the two conflict areas are being treated and regulated separately. On issues of living together, the educational approaches will be discussed collaboratively with the parents and then decided upon in mutual agreement. The parents respond with relief and are satisfied to see that the school is giving attention and priority to the personality development of their children.

The conflict area of working together is being approached by implementing structured rounds of feedback. The dissatisfied students will provide their feedback to Mr. Beutelsbacher in a standardized form managed by the school social worker. The chemistry teacher, in turn, will articulate for the students his wishes regarding their behavior in class. The headmaster suggests that he himself also be involved in this exchange of feedback. Mr. Beutelsbacher agrees. The parents also agree to proceeding as suggested.

After a few weeks, it can be observed that in Mr. Beutelsbacher’s lessons, things are more relaxed. The joking around has quieted down, and Mr. Beutelsbacher’s “old-fashioned” teaching style is being accepted more readily by the students. Regulating the conflict in the area of living together has also facilitated the de-escalation of conflicts in working together.

- 1 Introduction
- 2 From Mobbing to (Cyber)Mobbing
- 3 Four (Cyber)Mobbing Case Stories**
- 4 Intervention Methods

- 5 Systemic Conflict Management
- 6 Nele – A Case Study
- 7 Pedagogical Conduct
- 8 Projects in Practice

### 3.3 The (Cyber)Mobbing Case of “Sabahat”

#### *Sabahat gets into a panic*

Sabahat is 16 years old, has Turkish roots, and attends the ninth grade at a vocational school. She likes to dress well; looking attractive means a lot to her. And the boys think she is classy. However, her “style” often leads to strain with her traditionally oriented Muslim family.

Among the other girls her age at the school, it is in vogue to take daring photos of themselves in erotic poses wearing only lingerie – that is, not entirely nude. Their faces are cleverly concealed from the camera. Sabahat also took such pictures and uploaded them onto her Instagram account, which she manages under a nickname that nobody knows. Without revealing her identity, she invited three of the boys from her school to express their opinion of the photos on Tellonym (see *Explanatory Note*).

Mohammad, a fourth boy who also comes from a Turkish family, mentions the pictures to her the next day at school. Does she need the kick of posting pictures like that? he barks at her, and asks her, outraged, why she would do something like that. Sabahat suspects that the photos are circulating and panics over the idea that her family might see them. She turns to the school social worker, Ms. Ahrendt. “How did Mohammad get to see those pictures? How does he know that it’s me? Is he going to show them to my older brother?”

After Sabahat has told her what has happened, Ms. Ahrendt promises to handle the matter with discretion (which is her legal obligation in accord with § 203 German Penal Code). In this first consultation, she asks Sabahat about her own needs. “I don’t want my parents to see the pictures, not under any circumstances. And not my older brother either. That would be terrible!” The school social worker offers to coach the girl. The aim is to stabilize Sabahat; instead of panicking she can, with this support, recover her capability to act. Ms. Ahrendt

advises the girl to delete the Instagram account right away. Then she should speak individually with each of the three boys to make certain that they delete the pictures on their smartphones immediately and not forward them to anyone. Ms. Ahrendt offers to be present as a mediator for these conversations. But Sabahat herself has to do the talking.

The talks with the three boys to whom Sabahat had sent the Tellonym link take place on that same day. One of them admits that he had made a screenshot of the pictures and shown it to Mohammad, mentioning that he thought it might be Sabahat. Sabahat appeals to the compassion of the boys and asks them not to talk about the pictures any more. “Do you know what my brother would do to me if he thought that was me in the pictures?” She leaves the question unanswered. Sabahat demands of each boy that he show her his photo folder on the mobile. The boy who had made the screenshot deletes the images as she watches; the other two hadn’t made screenshots.

At this point, Ms. Ahrendt makes an entry into the conservation. She wants the boys, too, to be strengthened in their pro-social competence by having resolved this conflict. She makes it clear that, should the boys assert publicly that these were pictures of Sabahat, they would be damaging Sabahat, and it could be interpreted as slander or libel – prosecutable offenses. The school social worker also points it out to the boy who had made the screenshot that, legally speaking, he was not allowed to take possession of the pictures, let alone show them to someone else. Technically, Sabahat could even bring charges against him.

The next conversation to take place will be between Sabahat and Mohammad. The girl is to make it clear to Mohammad what her brother would surely do to her if he learned about the pictures. The aim is to induce a change of perspective and to awaken his compassion (on compassion and the prospect of sanctions, see Chapter 7.2.7). Also, Sabahat should threaten to bring libel charges against him.

The conversation takes place, again with the school social worker present as a mediator. Sabahat conducts the conversation with admirable self-confidence. She actually achieves the desired change of perspective in Mohammad and evokes his compassion. In this encounter, she does not reveal that she is in fact the person in the pictures, instead using the subjunctive (“what if my brother believed that it had been me in the pictures?”). Mohammad finally promises that he won’t “tip off” the brother about his suspicion.

The school social worker makes note of the outcomes of all four conversations, always in the presence of the boy. Each of them signs a personal declaration of commitment, which further emphasizes the binding effect of the agreements reached. In addition, Ms. Ahrendt arranges a second set of talks between the individual boys and Sabahat two weeks later, in order to check on their compliance to the agreements.

In a final consultation, Ms. Ahrendt requests that Sabahat inform her immediately if the family somehow hears about the pictures – since an acute crisis might then arise (for example, the danger of an act of violence on the part of the family). In such a situation, Ms. Ahrendt would have to shift the focus of her efforts from conflict support to the field of child protection (see also Positioning in Systemic Conflict Management, Chapter 5.5.1).

**Explanatory Note:**

Tellonym is a platform on the web. It is designed for posting statements people wouldn’t make face-to-face. The service presents itself as a platform for people who want to know what others really think of them – and is often used by adolescents for negative or insulting remarks. A person creating a Tellonym account is given an individual link that can be sent to acquaintances. Anyone who has this link can send anonymous messages to the account, even without registering.

3



1 Introduction  
 2 From Mobbing to (Cyber)Mobbing  
**3 Four (Cyber)Mobbing Case Stories**  
 4 Intervention Methods

5 Systemic Conflict Management  
 6 Nele – A Case Study  
 7 Pedagogical Conduct  
 8 Projects in Practice

### 3.4 The (Cyber)Mobbing Case of “Ahmet”

#### *The anti-Ahmet group*

Leon is in the fifth grade at middle school. He is very popular in his class and has a solid social status. His classmate Uwe has invited him to a chat group that Uwe started up together with Lars and Andreas. Leon grasps immediately that the chat group has a right-wing slant: the group symbol is a swastika. They call themselves “AAG – Anti-Ahmet Group” and are out to get Ahmet, who is a classmate of Leon’s with Turkish roots.

Leon doesn’t approve of the group. Three days before summer vacation starts, he talks to his mother about it. He tells her that, in the group, there is a lot of talk about Hitler and the Wehrmacht (armed forces of the Third Reich). Besides, they’re badmouthing Ahmet all the time: he stinks like Turkey, he can’t even speak German properly, and his parents only put him into the world to collect German family benefits. Leon also relates that he saw Uwe and Lars giving one another the Nazi salute during recess. Leon’s mother is shocked. She reinforces her son in his feeling that something is wrong here, and asks him to inform his teacher, Ms. Winkler, so that she can do something about it.

Leon feels a bit queasy. On the one hand, he doesn’t want to tattle on his classmates, but on the other hand he thinks it’s lousy that Ahmet should be the target of racist rantings. He wants to make sure that no other classmates get into this chat. So he takes heart and shows Ms. Winkler the chat.

Ms. Winkler gets very upset while reading the chat. She has long suspected that Uwe and Lars have a right-wing mind cast. Both of them bring up xenophobic and racist talking points during lessons, and they often dress in ‘military’ look. She cannot quite wrap her head around the fact that such young pupils can already spout extremist slogans and be so biased. She also has another suspicion: at the last parents’ evening, Uwe’s father had given her the impression that he could be a right-wing conservative or even extremist.

Personally, Ms. Winkler’s spontaneous reaction might be an official complaint to the police, but as a teacher she knows that a productive educational response to this will depend on careful consideration and a thorough assessment of the situation. First, she wants to consult with the headmaster and the school social worker. She asks Leon to go with her to see the social worker, that very same day.

Mr. Heiber, the school social worker, impresses Leon as friendly. He listens calmly to what Leon says and then remarks that he could help the class to avoiding drifting off into right-wing radicalism. But he would need help from Leon and the whole class; and, by the way, Leon’s name wouldn’t have to be mentioned. One thing he would definitely need is the back record of the chat. He also wants to find out who already knows about this chat group. Maybe the other classmates and Ahmet haven’t even heard of the AAG yet.

Leon is all for it. Mr. Heiber loads the chat from Leon’s smartphone onto his own PC and starts checking out the content. But before the others go, he doesn’t forget to ask the homeroom teacher to call Leon’s mother, tell her how things have proceeded, and ask her for her ideas on mutual steps to be taken. It’s important in such a situation, he says, that no one act all on his own.

The chat is very revealing. Alongside unlawful content (such as swastikas) there are war-glorifying YouTube links that relate to the Wehrmacht and the SS. Also, scenes from video games come up, taken from an online game about an SS tank division. One image shows Europe after the German attack on the Soviet Union, with a comment from Uwe that says, "very successful". Lars writes in the chat that he has a "dago problem and no gas". He asks what he should do, and Andreas answers, "get a knife and stab!", while Uwe seconds with "Stab in the neck and yank around until it breaks!" An animated clip shows a Black African, and the members of the group comment on it with disgusted facial expressions and "bah".

For the next morning, Mr. Heiber invites the homeroom teacher Ms. Winkler and the headmaster to the planned case consultation. It is the second-to-last day of school before the summer. Mr. Heiber explains that his first analysis has uncovered an alarming degree of hostility and hate. Since it was not yet known to what extent this hate has been directed toward Ahmet in everyday contact, Mr. Heiber had called Ahmet at home the previous afternoon and cautiously inquired whether Ahmet had heard that he was being ostracized in a chat group, and how things were generally going in the class group. In fact, Ahmet had heard that there was a chat called Anti-Ahmet-Group. He suspected that Uwe and Lars were behind it because they kept calling him dago, but they didn't mean it seriously. He didn't think that was great, but he also didn't believe that it was really malicious. In the class group he was doing fine, he had friends and felt pretty good.

School social worker Heiber evaluates these statements as reassuring, for a start; at the moment Ahmet does not seem to be in duress. Nonetheless, the risk of escalation has to be considered carefully.

Up to now, the potential for violence on the part of Uwe, Lars, and Andreas cannot be reliably estimated. How seriously should these fantasies of violence be taken ("yank it around til the neck breaks")? There are also other unanswered questions: Were other classmates besides Leon invited to the chat? What does the rest of the class know about it? What is the overall attitude in the class toward right-wing radicalism, racism, and xenophobia? What do the parents of Uwe, Lars, and Andreas know? It will hardly be possible to answer all these questions before vacation starts. But as much as possible has to be clarified, and above all, the parents of all the conflict participants shouldn't be in the dark when they start their vacation.

School social worker, homeroom teacher, and headmaster agree on the following procedure:

1. In the context of a threat intervention, tomorrow (the last school day before summer break!) confrontative interviews (see Chapter 5.4.2) will be conducted with Uwe, Lars, and Andreas in order to begin assessing how severe their grievances are on the intrapersonal level.
2. Already today, this evening, the parents of the three students will be informed by the headmaster that their sons have been posting illegal content on the chat and demeaning a classmate. The headmaster would like to persuade the parents to collaborate with the school in bringing the conflict to a satisfactory closure and seeing that restitution is made. Before the summer holidays begin, the school will demand that the three boys make a commitment to refrain from the use of force and will suggest ways in which they can make reparation. The parents will be asked to see to it that the AAG is deleted and terminated. This is meant to ensure that no further criminal offenses will be committed by the students during vacation. Should the parents be uncooperative, the headmaster will begin with regulatory measures and possibly make an official complaint to the police. School social worker Heiber will ask Ahmet to participate in efforts at damage adjustment when school is back in session, even though Ahmet is not yet feeling very much damage at the moment.

1 Introduction

2 From Mobbing to (Cyber)Mobbing

**3 Four (Cyber)Mobbing Case Stories**

4 Intervention Methods

5 Systemic Conflict Management

6 Nele – A Case Study

7 Pedagogical Conduct

8 Projects in Practice

3. That Leon was invited to join the chat group is regarded as an attempt by its members to gradually establish a mobbing system in the class. Fortunately, Leon adheres to pro-social norms and values, and did not allow himself to be taken in. Instead, he demonstrated civil courage. Ms. Winkler thinks that Uwe, Lars, and Andreas are not the ones setting the tone for the atmosphere in class; nonetheless, it has to be prevented that right-wing opinions, racism, and xenophobia get a foothold in the class or are given any recognition. School social worker Heiber offers to conduct a two-day social training as soon as school is back in session, as a way of fortifying the framework of values and norms. The social training could also provide more diagnostic input on the group dynamics within the class and help to prevent mobbing. The headmaster and Ms. Winkler gladly accept this offer, and a date is set for the training.

The parents of Uwe, Lars, and Andreas respond cooperatively. They agree with the headmaster that their sons' behavior was not correct. On the last day of school and in the presence of his parents, each of the three students pledges to make restitution and accept support from the school social worker in doing so. The AAG chat group is terminated.

Three weeks into the new school year, the school social worker holds the two-day social training. It emerges that the homeroom teacher was right: the class has not yet been influenced by racist, xenophobic thinking, no mobbing is in course. During the training, the three offenders make use of the opportunity to be honest and admit to the class what they had done.

The class is shocked to hear about the chat group. Many students show compassion. It is easy, then, to field the idea of signing individual declarations of commitment to human rights, relating them to the conflict events at hand. Every student signs his or her own "contract with oneself", pledging to respect the human rights and personality rights of every member of the class, and to be courageous in speaking out against racist statements, xenophobia, and hate speech. Spontaneously, during the social training, Andreas and Lars apologize to Ahmet.

Uwe, Lars and Andreas, together with their parents, had agreed before the summer break to make restitution for the deed and the damage done. In the course of the social training, they boys receive help in developing a declaration to cease and desist, in which they pledge to refrain from racist and xenophobic acts in the future.

The day after the social training, the headmaster visits the class. He says he is proud of the group and their personal declarations of commitment. If the class succeeds in consistently observing human rights until the end of the school year, he will nominate the group for a prize the school can award against racism and for tolerant co-existence.

During the social training, Uwe's body language suggests a posture of resistance. He has a hard time bringing himself to sign the "contract with oneself". As a justification, he says he doesn't want make a promise he is not entirely sure he can keep. It is thus unsurprising that in Uwe's case, the efforts at reparation for the deed are unsuccessful. He doesn't come regularly to the preparatory meetings or, after the training, to the voluntary work assignments. (The headmaster later decides to suspend him from school for one week. An additional outcome of Uwe's behavior is that, among the classmates, he is now isolated.)

---

The class group now chooses human rights observers (HROs). The students follow their intuition and elect Leon with the highest number of votes. Ahmet is also elected. The task of the HROs during the next half year will be to monitor adherence to the “contracts with oneself”. Mr. Heiber will coach the HROs, three girls and three boys who are excused from class once a week to confer with him.

Mr. Heiber arranges with the homeroom teacher that he will visit the class once every three or four weeks for a 90-minute session re-iterating some of the elements of the social training. This is intended to reinforce the work on democracy education begun during the two-day training.

1 Introduction  
 2 From Mobbing to (Cyber)Mobbing  
**3 Four (Cyber)Mobbing Case Stories**  
 4 Intervention Methods

5 Systemic Conflict Management  
 6 Nele – A Case Study  
 7 Pedagogical Conduct  
 8 Projects in Practice

### 3.5 Overview of the (Cyber)Mobbing Case Examples with their Similarities and Differences

In working to overcome cyber attacks and (cyber)mobbing, no one case is quite like another. If the efforts to deal with them are systematic, based on careful diagnosis, and conducted in the sense of Systemic Conflict Management (see Chapter 5), considerable differences will emerge concerning the approach to be taken, the conflict levels, and the methods. The following chart gives an overview of the five actual cases presented in this handbook.

case name	conflict event(s)	conflict parties	conflict levels (Chapters 2.1.2 and 5.4.4)
case 1: Mika (Chapter 3)	brutal threat via chat that receives 'likes' from some members of the class	"boss of the class" and the class group ↕ one member of the class	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ intrapersonal</li> <li>■ interpersonal</li> <li>■ institutional</li> <li>■ systemic</li> <li>■ educational partnership</li> </ul>
case 2: Herr Beutelsbacher (Chapter 3)	video recording of the teacher during class, upload of the video creation of a fake Facebook account	three students ↕ teacher	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ interpersonal</li> <li>■ institutional</li> <li>■ systemic</li> <li>■ educational partnership</li> </ul>
case 3: Sabahat (Chapter 3)	sexting risk that Muslim family will hear about erotic photos of daughter	girl of Turkish origin ↕ boy of Turkish origin	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ intrapersonal</li> <li>■ interpersonal</li> </ul>
case 4: Ahmet (Chapter 3)	chat indicating radicalization and displaying right-wing extremist, racist, and xenophobic content	three students and claqueurs from their class ↕ boy of Turkish origin and one supporter from the class	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ intrapersonal</li> <li>■ interpersonal</li> <li>■ institutional</li> <li>■ systemic</li> <li>■ educational partnership</li> </ul>
case 5: Nele (Chapter 6)	sexting publication of nude photos of former girlfriend that were circulated widely throughout the entire school	girl ↕ boy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ intrapersonal</li> <li>■ interpersonal</li> <li>■ institutional</li> <li>■ systemic</li> <li>■ educational partnership</li> </ul>

<b>timeline for intervention</b> (Chapter 5.5)	<b>methods applied</b> (Chapter 5.4.4)
Threatening situation! Begin by intervening in the threat, since there may be acute danger	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ for diagnosis: interview with person seeking conflict support, confrontative interview with offender due to threatening situation</li> <li>■ agreement on a commitment to refrain from use of force</li> <li>■ school escort</li> <li>■ Systemic Brief Intervention (SBI)</li> <li>■ three-way talks</li> <li>■ adjustment for deed and damage done</li> <li>■ cooperative participatory talks</li> <li>■ follow-up rituals (coaching of HROs, chance for offender)</li> </ul>
No acute endangerment. First, systemic intervention on the class level, then treatment of the case on the institutional level, in the educational partnership, and on the intrapersonal level	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ for diagnosis: interview with person seeking conflict support, confrontative interview with person suspected of offending</li> <li>■ Systemic Brief Intervention (SBI)</li> <li>■ adjustment for deed and damage done</li> <li>■ cooperative participatory talks</li> <li>■ follow-up rituals (coaching of HROs, chance for offender)</li> </ul>
No acute endangerment. No conflict on systemic and institutional levels or in the educational partnership. Particular responsibility to observe discretion. First intrapersonal, then interpersonal work on the case	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ counseling and coaching</li> <li>■ three-way talks</li> </ul>
Threatening situation! First, intervene in threat, then address case on institutional level, in educational partnership, finally in class group and on interpersonal level	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ for diagnosis: interview with person seeking support, confrontative interview due to threatening situation</li> <li>■ declaration of commitment to refrain from use of force</li> <li>■ cooperative participatory talks</li> <li>■ two-day social training with follow-up</li> <li>■ adjustment for deed and damage done</li> </ul>
Endangerment, therefore crisis intervention, since victim is badly damaged	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ for diagnosis: interview with a traumatized person seeking conflict support confrontative interviews with suspected offender and with observers</li> <li>■ Systemic Brief Intervention (SBI)</li> <li>■ adjustment for deed and damage done</li> <li>■ cooperative participatory talks</li> <li>■ educative and regulatory measures, follow-up rituals (coaching of HROs, chance for offender)</li> </ul>