

The Role and Meaning of School Counseling when Dealing with Peer Violence

Marija Javornik Krečič¹, Suzana Kovše¹ and Mateja Ploj Vrtič²

¹Faculty of Arts, University of Maribor

²Faculty of Natural Sciences and Mathematics

Abstract

The subject of discussion is peer violence and the role of school counselors when dealing with this problem. The first part of the article gives a definition of peer violence as it applies to the role of the school counselor when dealing with peer violence. The second part of the article shows the results of empirical research which took place in March and April of 2010 on a sample of 428 students from Slovene schools. The fundamental objective of this research was to determine the actual state of this problem in practice: determining the role of school counseling in discovering and solving problems concerning peer violence; finding out whether students trust school counselors, whether they turn to them when in trouble, whether they cooperate with school counselors and if school counseling also works preventively.

Key words: *bullying; peer violence; preventive work; school counseling.*

Introduction

Peer violence is not a new phenomenon. Although it has existed for a long time, it has not been spoken about until recently. Because peer violence is becoming an increasingly serious problem, schools are trying to reduce it. This is where school counselors play an important role: they are often the first people to whom victims of peer violence go for help. Therefore, the article researches the role and meaning of school counseling in dealing with peer violence in primary and high schools.

Theoretical Framework

The term bullying is the most specific and most often used expression when discussing certain forms of violence between peers in school. The term peer victimization

(bullying) is used to describe a situation when a child becomes a victim of repetitive or ongoing ill treatment by another child or a group of children. Peer violence is the deliberate act of causing mental trauma, physical pain, injury or discomfort (Mikuš Kos, 1996, pp. 62–63). Zabukovec Kerin (2002, p. 105) defines peer violence as the deliberate, repetitive use of physical, psychological or economic violence by an instigator against other children or youth of similar age. The purpose of peer violence is to scare or hurt the victim and to increase the instigator's feeling of power.

Peer violence occurs when a child or a group of children tease another child, use inappropriate words, beat or kick them, destroy their belongings, defame them (gossiping) or exclude them from peer groups. Such actions make them suffer, and they cannot defend themselves (Habbe, 2000, pp. 44–45). We cannot speak of peer violence in the case of a fight between two equal children or groups of children (Habbe, 2000, p. 44). Moreover, Dekleva (1997, p. 53) thinks that we cannot speak of maltreatment when several children, equal in power (mental and physical) and status, get into a fight. A characteristic of real maltreatment is when there is an imbalance of power, because the weaker children have a hard time defending themselves in comparison with their attackers.

We can conclude with Puškin's list (1999, p. 34) of some common characteristics shared by different definitions of peer violence:

- maltreatment is the kind of violence that goes on for a longer period of time;
- it can be verbal, psychical or physical;
- it involves an imbalance of power between the victim and the attacker;
- the victim cannot defend himself or herself and feels powerless and fearful.

As mentioned in the introductory part of the article, schools are aware of the consequences of peer violence; therefore, school management considers this problem as a very important one. One very crucial step that schools have taken against peer violence is to seek professional help. In Slovenia, that kind of help is mainly provided by the school counselors who are employed in every school (according to the size of the school, there can be several school counselors employed forming a "counseling team"). Their fundamental goal is to optimize a child's development, regardless of their gender, cultural or social origin, religion, nationality, or physical and mental abilities (Programske smernice - Program Guidelines, 2008, p. 5). Bor et al. (2002, p. 15) have defined school counseling as follows: "Counseling is an interaction in a therapeutic setting, focusing primarily on a conversation about relationships, beliefs and behavior (including feelings), throughout which the child's perceived problem is elucidated and framed or reframed in a fitting or useful way, and in which new solutions are generated so that the problem takes on a new meaning." The authors (ibid) list the following functions of school counseling:

- to examine the difficulties or problems they are experiencing and gain insight into what factors maintain these difficulties;
- to facilitate decision making;
- to discuss difficulties in relationships and how to cope with these;

- to identify useful coping strategies that the child already has and enhance these;
- to identify existing sources of support;
- to gain insight into practical techniques that can be used to deal with problems;
- to explore and challenge the perceptions of negative self-image and low self-esteem (ibid, pp. 15-16).

With the cooperation of the entire school and the above listed roles and tasks, school counselors can be more aware of the fundamental concerns for the school, especially when intimidation is involved. Therefore, their role in treating peer violence is of essential importance. Often school counselors are the first ones that those in the educational process can go to in the case of peer violence. School counselors are qualified to deal with conflicting situations and can provide individual or group counseling. These special skills give school counselors fundamental abilities in finding preventive and curative activities that deal with problems of peer violence (Swearer et al. 2008 p. 673).

The task of a school counselor is not only to stop violence, but also to help victims of violence overcome their feelings of powerlessness and despair. The whole school community is responsible for creating a safe learning environment and school counselors play the leading role in accepting and carrying out this process (Cunningham & Sandhu, 2000; as cited in Hernández & Seem, 2004). Knowledge in counseling, classroom management, consultation, and synchronization of services give school counselors the role of an effective supporter of system changes in school. Research has shown that comprehensive school counseling programs have an impact on the school climate (Gysbers, Hughey, Starr & Lapan, 1992; as cited in Hernández & Seem, 2004). A study completed by Lapan, Gysbers & Sun (1997; as cited in Hernández & Seem, 2004) analyzed the connection between the entire performance of a school-counseling program and a student's cognition of a positive school climate. They determined that students have more positive experiences in schools which perform a whole school-counseling program. Students expressed a conviction that the school suitably prepared them to cope with problems and that their peers behaved better in school. Students also expressed their feeling of belonging and safety. Nims (2000; as cited in Hernández & Seem, 2004) emphasizes that a complete development of school counseling in school is a necessary part of all efforts for safety in schools.

One of the ways to handle school violence is by developing programs for character education and statements of values (Peterson & Skiba, 2001; as cited in Hernández & Seem, 2004). Character education is a way of providing provocative guidelines to help teach students about positive behavior and values that should be a part of everyone's education. The statements on values are devoted to ensuring the intended actions for the whole school. These statements make up a list of positive characteristics that can be accepted by schools as desirable goals for students.

School counselors can also support the development of school rituals and traditions (Peterson and Deal, 1998; as cited in Hernández & Seem, 2004) by synchronizing and carrying out various activities that encourage school cohesion. Clarke and Kiselica (1997;

as cited in Hernández & Seem, 2004) suggest educational training on the socialization of gender roles, which can strengthen the awareness of psychological abuse. The authors claim that socialization of gender roles can also mislead people into subtle forms of violence. At the same time they warn that school counselors should only begin such training with the explicit support of the administration.

Riley and McDonald (2000; as cited in Hernández & Seem, 2004) emphasized that school counselors can contribute to a safer school by working with children, teachers and parents, as well as the school in its wider community. Counseling for students (personal or group) consists of addressing personal, professional and social needs. Directing activities in the classroom can become an effective tool for recognizing behavioral problems. School counselors can also coordinate mentoring programs, expediting programs that help teach students to face their peers and anger, and to organize regular discussion groups dealing with the school rules that concern behavior and discipline.

It is important that school counselors train students and other school staff in the skill of empathy and encourage the use of trust and respect as an effective way of solving potentially violent behavior by students (Nims, 2000; as cited in Hernández & Seem, 2004). When working with parents, school counselors can provide resources and training in the field of working with stubborn children and children with behavioral problems, while at the same time helping in directing them to suitable, out-of-school specialists.

School counselors can also function as epicenters of change for individual students, as well as the entire school and community of systems. Because of their knowledge and training, school counselors can play a leading role in the effort to change the school climate, even though everyone is responsible for making it a reality (e.g. Bečaj 1998; Hargreaves & Fullan 2000; Prosser, 1999). As initiators of school safety, school counselors can supervise and harmonize the efforts of the entire school community when planning, and they can take on the leading role in considering these efforts. This puts them in a key position for communicating with students, teachers, and other school staff, administration, parents and the wider community. As Davies and Ellison (1997) emphasize, 90 % of work quality depends on the work of the school and its teachers, while only 10 % of work quality depends on external factors (intervention). Therefore, the authors emphasize the importance of developing a good school culture.

Despite the importance of school counselors in forming a positive school culture, numerous studies have shown, as specified by Unnever and Cornell (2004; as cited in Jacobsen & Bauman, 2007), that students who are victims of peer violence often do not seek help. The most frequent reasons for this are shame and doubt that the conversation with a school counselor will solve their problem. In the continuation of this article, the authors will present the results of a similar research carried out in Slovene schools.

Research

The research was carried out in April 2010 using the empirical research method. The authors aimed at determining the role of school counseling in determining and solving

the problem of peer violence, more precisely: Do students trust school counselors? Do they turn to them when in trouble? Do they cooperate with school counseling, and do school counselors cooperate preventively with students.

Based on these questions, we sought to determine if there exists a significant difference between the three types of schools in Slovenia¹.

Method

The study is based on a descriptive and causal, non-experimental method of empirical pedagogical research (Sagadin, 1993).

The sample included 425 students from the three types of schools. About one third of the students come from primary schools, 155 or 36.5 %. Another 133 or 31.3 % of the students attend vocational high schools, while 137 or 32.2 % students attend high schools.

The data was collected with using an anonymous, two-part pool questionnaire for students. The first part consisted of questions regarding objective facts, i.e. gender, type of school, and grades. The second part consisted of a grading-scale of four choices: always, frequently, sometimes, never. This section applied to school counselors, more precisely, how students evaluate their role in dealing with peer violence.

The results were first weighted: numerical values were given to the descriptive levels: “always” was given the value 1, frequently = 2, sometimes = 3, never = 4. The analysis (in which the SPSS statistical program package, version 12, was used) was performed by means of the Kruskal-Wallis test for testing the differences between groups (primary school, vocational school and high school) on individual items (evaluation scale).

Results

The results are shown in the table below. The individual statements have been grouped into two segments based on the content: the first seven statements (or evaluations) apply to the general relation of school counselors to the students; the remaining statements show the role that school counselors play in the problem of peer violence, according to the students’ evaluation.

¹ We will be comparing the situations in primary schools, vocational high schools and high schools.

Primary school in Slovenia is a mandatory nine-year school, which includes pupils from the ages of 6 to 15 (pupils in their final grades of primary school 14 and 15 year-olds participated in our research).

Vocational high schools are three-year schools (accessible after finishing primary school) that prepare students for a profession (for example sewing, hair dressing or secretarial work ...). Students from the first year of vocational school, 16 year-olds, participated in our research.

High school is a four-year general education school (accessible after finishing primary school) that prepares students for study at a university. Students from the first year of high school, 16-year-olds, participated in our research.

Table 1: *The analysis of differences relating to the type of school*

		Type of school	n	Mean Rank*	Z	P
1	I have good experiences with school counselors.	Primary school	155	227.65	z = 3.842	P = 0.146
		Vocational high school	133	205.76		
		High school	137	203.46		
2	I trust the school counselors.	Primary school	155	220.00	z = 6.166	P = 0.046
		Vocational high school	133	192.07		
		High school	137	225.40		
3	I avoid school counselors.	Primary school	155	190.75	z = 10.081	P = 0.006
		Vocational high school	133	226.30		
		High school	137	225.26		
		Vocational high school	133	192.00		
		High school	137	231.47		
4	I have willingly made contact with school counselors.	Primary school	155	221.02	z = 4.182	P = 0.124
		Vocational high school	133	197.74		
		High school	137	218.74		
5	School counselors have helped me through problems.	Primary school	155	190.72	z = 28.669	P = 0.000
		Vocational high school	133	193.53		
		High school	137	257.11		
6	I can freely express my thoughts with school counselors.	Primary school	155	228.84	z = 11.179	P = 0.004
		Vocational high school	133	184.91		
		High school	137	222.35		
7	The atmosphere in school counseling is pleasant.	Primary school	155	244.66	z = 26.809	P = 0.000
		Vocational high school	133	172.24		
		High school	137	216.76		
8	I can talk with the school counselor about peer violence.	Primary school	155	213.08	z = 0.724	P = 0.696
		Vocational high school	133	206.83		
		High school	137	218.90		
9	The school counselor informs us about the seriousness of peer violence.	Primary school	155	183.50	z = 27.250	P = 0.000
		Vocational high school	133	200.55		
		High school	137	258.46		
10	The school counselor takes measures in cases of peer violence.	Primary school	155	203.20	z = 2.929	P = 0.231
		Vocational high school	133	210.44		
		High school	137	226.57		
11	The school counselor talks with the aggressor.	Primary school	155	175.65	z = 25.489	P = 0.000
		Vocational high school	133	227.68		
		High school	137	241.01		
12	The school counselor talks with the victim.	Primary school	155	188.68	z = 12.208	P = 0.002
		Vocational high school	133	217.76		
		High school	137	235.90		
13	The school counselor accepts peer violence as something normal.	Primary school	155	192.72	z = 20.814	P = 0.000
		Vocational high school	133	200.14		
		High school	137	248.43		

14	The school counselor controls the school during break times.	Primary school	155	169.74	z = 46.112	P = 0.000
		Vocational high school	133	214.30		
		High school	137	260.68		
15	The school counselor encourages nonviolent solutions to conflicts.	Primary school	155	212.58	z = 0.427	P = 0.808
		Vocational high school	133	217.98		
		High school	137	208.65		
16	The school counselor prepares workshops on peer violence for students.	Primary school	155	200.66	z = 17.302	P = 0.000
		Vocational high school	133	193.29		
		High school	137	246.09		
17	The school counselor organizes meetings on peer violence for students, teachers and parents.	Primary school	155	192.65	z = 28.224	P = 0.000
		Vocational high school	133	192.17		
		High school	137	256.25		

* A lower value for the Average Rank represents the frequent occurrence of individual characteristics.

In this study we were interested in what experiences students have, in general, with school counselors. The Kruskal-Wallis test ($P=0.146$) showed no statistically significant difference between schools, therefore the results are interesting only for the sample. High school students had the most positive experiences with school counselors, followed by students from vocational high schools, and primary school students showed the least positive response to counseling. These results are surprising because primary school students represent the youngest children and a school counselor's work when dealing with them should be much more directive than it is in high schools. On the other hand, the result can also be understood as reflecting that primary school students have less contact with school counselors because there are not yet as many problems as there are in the other two types of schools.

We were also interested in whether students trust school counselors. The Kruskal-Wallis test shows a statistically significant difference between the schools ($P=0.046$). According to the Mean Ranks we can say that school counselors are the most trusted in vocational high schools, and the least in high schools (Mean Rank = 225.40). This result was not anticipated. We had predicted that school counselors would be trusted the most by primary school students and the least by vocational high school students. School counselors in primary schools have the most frequent contact with students. They organize regular workshops, lectures and meetings where they can make personal contact with students. School counselors in high schools dedicate a large part of their attention to enrolling students in school and giving them professional advice and therefore often run out of time for making personal contact with their students. Some students from high school expressed disappointment that they did not have enough contact with school counselors and therefore had no trust in them.

We also studied whether students avoid school counseling. The Kruskal-Wallis test shows a statistically significant difference between schools ($P=0.006$). According to the Mean Ranks, primary school students avoid school counselors the most and vocational high school students the least. This result was unexpected because we had predicted

the opposite—that primary school students would trust school counselors the most and high school students the least.

There was no statistically significant difference according to the type of school for the statement about whether students willingly make contact with school counselors on their own ($P=0.124$). According to the sample, the students from vocational high schools are most willing to make contact, while students from primary school are willing.

We wanted to know if school counselors help students when they are in trouble. The Kruskal-Wallis test shows statistically significant differences between schools ($P=0.000$). Primary school students agree with this statement the most and high school students the least. The reason for this can be found in the level of the students' development. High school students are at the age of adolescence and therefore they prefer to seek help elsewhere (friends, school mates, or the Internet).

We also wanted to establish whether students feel free to express their thoughts to school counselors. The Kruskal-Wallis test showed a statistically significant difference between schools ($P=0.004$). Students from vocational high schools agreed the most that they can freely express their thoughts to school counselors, while primary school students were least in agreement with this statement. The result can possibly be explained by the fact that primary school students often visit school counselors regarding learning difficulties, too. In that case school counselors help them with learning, which is quite a directed or planned activity.

Lastly, we wanted to determine if their school counseling office has a pleasant atmosphere. Based on the Kruskal-Wallis test, there is a statistically significant difference between schools ($P=0.004$). The atmosphere at the school counseling office is the most comfortable for vocational high school students and the least for primary school students. This result is in accordance with our previous findings, which showed that students from vocational high schools report the most willingness to visit school counselors while students from primary school show the least inclination to do so. This willingness to approach counseling on one's own accord is definitely connected with their feelings during the counseling process.

The rest of the statements in the table (8–17) apply to the role of the counselor when dealing with peer violence. Firstly, we wanted to know if students are able to talk to school counselors about peer violence. Based on Kruskal-Wallis we can see that there is no statistically significant difference for this statement ($P=0.696$). Nor is there any statistically significant difference between schools for the statement about how school counselors act in cases of peer violence ($P=0.231$), or for the statement about school counselors encouraging non-violent communication ($P=0.808$).

Statistically significant differences do exist for the remaining statements. School counselors in primary school most often inform students about the seriousness of peer violence and communicate with the victims as well as the perpetrators. Counselors do this the least in high schools. These results can be explained by the fact that there are less peer violence problems in high schools.

We also investigated whether students think that school counselors find peer violence as being something normal. The Kruskal-Wallis test showed a statistically significant difference between schools ($P=0.000$). Primary school students agreed most with this statement (Mean Rank=192.72), followed by students from vocational high schools (Mean Rank=200.14), while high school students agree the least with this statement (Mean Rank=248.43). The results were not expected. We had thought that school counselors would not have accepted peer violence as something normal, which would have made the Mean Ranks higher. If school counselors accept peer violence as an everyday phenomenon, they are not investing enough effort into preventing or reducing it. It should be emphasized that any form of violence must not be tolerated at all.

For the statement on controlling school rooms during break time, the Kruskal-Wallis test showed a statistically significant difference between schools ($P=0.000$). We found that primary school students evaluated this statement the highest (Mean Rank=169.74), followed by students from vocational high schools (Mean Rank=214.30) and the lowest evaluation by high school students (Mean Rank=260.68). This outcome was expected because in primary school considerable attention is dedicated to preventing peer violence, which often happens during break times.

Following are the results of student-evaluations of workshops and meetings on peer violence. According to the Kruskal-Wallis test, there is a statistically significant difference between schools. Vocational high school students evaluated school counselors the highest (Mean Rank=193.29), followed by primary school students (Mean Rank=200.66), while the lowest evaluation was given by high school students (Mean Rank=246.09). This result was not expected as we had predicted that school counselors would receive the highest evaluations from primary school students. High school students considerably disagreed with this statement, which means that there is a lack of workshops on peer violence for high school students.

The Kruskal-Wallis test also showed a statistically significant difference between schools in the evaluation of workshops for parents on peer violence. School counselors received the highest evaluations from primary school students (Mean Rank=196.30), followed by students from vocational high schools (Mean Rank=202.64), and the lowest evaluation was given by high school students (Mean Rank=241.95). This outcome was expected, but we must point out the large difference between the average ranks of high school students compared to those of primary school students and vocational high school students. This brings us to the conclusion that high schools either do not have enough workshops for parents on peer violence, or do not have any at all.

Lastly, we examined students' evaluation of meetings for students, teachers and parents concerning peer violence. The Kruskal-Wallis test showed a statistically significant difference. School counselors were evaluated most positively by vocational high school students (Mean Rank=192.17), a little lower by primary school students (Mean Rank=192.65), and the least positively by high school students (Mean Rank=256.25). This result was not expected as we had predicted that primary school students'

evaluation of school counselors would be the highest. Additionally, it is noticeable that there was quite a low evaluation for this statement by high school students, which means that there is a lack of meetings on peer violence for students, teachers and parents.

Conclusion

Peer violence is increasingly becoming a serious problem. Therefore, it should get more attention. Many definitions exist on what peer violence is, but all of them have these two elements in common: repetitive or ongoing violence inflicted on a child by another child; situation where there is an obvious difference in physical and psychological power between the aggressor and the victim. Children who are victims of peer violence suffer from distress and the negative consequences of such actions; while for bullies, violence is a means of reinforcing an unsuitable model for solving their own problems. Therefore, we all have to make an effort to prevent violence, to recognize and handle this violence in its early stages, to protect victims and find suitable treatment for bullies.

School counselors are the first to whom victims of peer violence usually go for help. It is therefore very important that school counselors obtain suitable knowledge on how to act in the case of peer violence. In the process of preventing and reducing the level of violence it is necessary to include all the people involved in the educational process. If we summarize the empirical results of our research, we can say that most students have good experiences with school counselors, most notably high school students. This can be explained by two factors: firstly, high school students mostly emphasize good learning results, and secondly, those who enroll in high schools are students who will continue on to study at a university, therefore they are motivated to learn. This explanation was proven by the results of the second part of our empirical data, namely that in high schools less attention is given to such problems than in the other two types of schools. High schools also have the least amount of workshops and organized meetings regarding this topic.

The debate about the contribution of school counseling can be concluded with the verified fact that school counseling is a necessity in preventing peer violence. School counselors must endeavor to maintain good relations with students, to listen to them when they are in trouble and to help them. School counselors have to be highly sensitive when dealing with peer violence and to take appropriate measures. In the process of preventing peer violence in schools, school counselors must include students, teachers, parents and the entire school staff. Preventive workshops, meetings and lectures on peer violence should be organized so that school counselors along with all the participants in the educational process, can be educated on this topic. The seriousness of this problem is increasing, as are the consequences for the victims and the aggressors. It is especially necessary to show that peer violence will not be tolerated. Furthermore, we need to invest the necessary effort so it can be prevented and stopped.

References

- Bečaj, J. (1998). Ustvarjalnost storilnost in naša šola: ustvarjalnost v naši šoli [Creativity, Achievement and Our School]. *Vzgoja in izobraževanje*, 25(3), 3–9.
- Bor, R., Ebner-Landy, J., Gill, S. & Brace, C. (2002). *Counselling in Schools*. London. New Delhi: Thousand Oaks, SAGE.
- Davies, B. & Ellison, L. (1997). *School Leadership for the 21st Century*. London: Routledge.
- Dekleva, D. (1997). Nasilje med učenci. [Violence among Pupils] *Šolsko svetovalno delo*, 2 (2), 53–56.
- Hargreaves, A. & Fullan, M. (2000). *Zakaj se je vredno boriti v vaši šoli? [What's Worth Fighting for in Your School]*. Ljubljana: Zavod RS za šolstvo.
- Habbe, J. (2000). *Nasilje in varnost otrok v šolah: nasveti za ravnatelje, učitelje, starše in vse, ki skrbijo za varnost o osnovnih in srednjih šolah [Violence and Safety of Children in Schools: advice for principals, teachers, parents and all who take care for safety in primary and high schools]*. Ljubljana: Lisac & Lisac.
- Hernández, T. J. & Seem, S. R. (2004). A Safe School Climate: A Systemic Approach and the School Counselor. *Professional School Counseling /online/*. Retrieved on 12 July 2010 from <http://www.schoolcounselor.org/files/7-4-256%20Hernandez.pdf>
- Hoover J. H. & Oliver, R. (1996). *A Guide for Principals, Teachers, and Counselors*. Bloomington: National Educational Service.
- Jacobsen, K. E., Bauman, S. (2007). Bullying in schools: school counselors' responses to three types of bullying incidents. *Professional school counseling /online/*. Retrieved on 24 July 2010 from http://findarticles.com/p/articles/mi_m0KOC/is_1_11/ai_n21093605/pg_2/?tag=content;coll
- Mikuš Kos, A. (1997). Psihosocialni vidiki trpinčenja otrok. In: *Trpinčen otrok: kako prepoznati in preprečevati fizično in duševno trpinčenje otrok. [Abused child: how to recognize and prevent the physical and mental abuse of children]*. Ljubljana: Meridiana, 52–89.
- Programske smernice. Svetovalna služba v osnovni šoli, v gimnazijah, nižjih in srednjih poklicnih šolah ter strokovnih šolah in v dijaških domovih [Program guidelines. School Counseling in Primary Schools, High Schools, Vocational and Professional schools, and High School Dormitories]* (2008). Ljubljana: Zavod Republike Slovenije za šolstvo.
- Prosser, J. (1999). *School Culture*. London: Paul Chapman Publishing.
- Pušnik, M. (1999). *Vrstniško nasilje v šolah [Peer Violence in Schools]*. Ljubljana: Zavod Republike Slovenije za šolstvo.
- Sagadin, J. (1993). *Poglavja iz metodologije pedagoškega raziskovanja [Chapters from the pedagogical research methodology]*. Ljubljana: Zavod Republike Slovenije za šolstvo in šport.
- Swearer, S. M., Buhs E. S., Siebecker A. B., Brey Love K. & Miller, C. K. (2008). Bullying and peer victimization. In: H. L. K. Coleman & C. Yeh (Eds). *Handbook of school counseling* New York, London: Routledge, 673–692.
- Zabukovec Kerin, K. (2002). Vrstniško nasilje v šoli. In: D. Lešnik Mugnaioni (Ed.). *Nasilje – nenasilje [Violence – Nonviolence]*. Ljubljana, 12, 103–121.

Marija Javornik Krečič

Faculty of Arts, University of Maribor
Koroška cesta 160, 2000 Maribor, Slovenia
marija.javornik@uni-mb.si

Suzana Kovše

Faculty of Arts, University of Maribor
Koroška cesta 160, 2000 Maribor, Slovenia
suzanakovse@gmail.com

Mateja Ploj Virtič Mail

Faculty of Natural Sciences and Mathematics, University of
Maribor
Koroška cesta 160, 2000 Maribor, Slovenia
mateja.ploj-virtic@uni-mb.si

Uloga i značenje školskog savjetovanja u slučaju vršnjačkog nasilja

Sažetak

Tema ovoga rada je vršnjačko nasilje te uloga koju školski savjetnici imaju kada se suočavaju sa spomenutim problemom. Uvodni dio rada definira pojam vršnjačkog nasilja te način na koji ono utječe na rad školskog savjetnika kada se suočava s tim problemom. Drugi dio rada prikazuje rezultate empirijskog istraživanja koje je provedeno u ožujku i travnju 2010. na uzorku od 428 učenika iz slovenskih škola. Glavna svrha ovog istraživanja bila je ustanoviti stvarno stanje tog problema u praksi: odrediti ulogu školskog savjetovanja u pronalaženju i rješavanju problema vezanih uz vršnjačko nasilje; otkriti vjeruju li učenici školskim savjetnicima, obraćaju li im se kada imaju problem, odnosno surađuju li s njima, te djeluju li školski savjetnici preventivno.

Ključne riječi: *nasilje (engl. bullying); preventivni rad; školsko savjetovanje; vršnjačko nasilje*

Uvod

Vršnjačko nasilje nije novina. Iako je prisutno duže vrijeme, tek nedavno je postalo aktualno. Zato što vršnjačko nasilje postaje sve ozbiljniji problem škole ga nastoje suzbiti. U tom procesu školski savjetnici imaju važnu ulogu: oni su obično prvi kojima se žrtve vršnjačkog nasilja obraćaju za pomoć. Iz tog razloga, članak proučava ulogu i značenje školskog savjetovanja u slučaju vršnjačkog nasilja u osnovnim i srednjim školama.

Teorijski okvir

Engleski izraz *bullying* vrlo je specifičan i najčešće korišten izraz kada razgovaramo o određenim vrstama nasilja među školskim vršnjacima. Izraz vršnjačko žrtvovanje (engl. *bullying*) koristi se kako bi se opisala situacija u kojoj dijete postaje žrtvom ponavljajućeg i učestaloga lošeg postupanja od strane drugog djeteta ili skupine djece. Vršnjačko je nasilje namjeran čin zadavanja mentalne traume, fizičke boli, ozljede ili neudobnosti (Mikuš Kos, 1996: 62–63). Zabukovec Kerin (2002: 105) definira vršnjačko nasilje kao namjerno, učestalo korištenje fizičkog, psihološkog i financijskog

nasilja podbadača nad drugom djecom ili mladima istih godina. Svrha je vršnjačkog nasilja uplašiti ili nauditi žrtvi te povećati podbadačev osjećaj moći.

Vršnjačko nasilje događa se kada učenik ili skupina učenika počne zadirkivati drugog učenika i pri tome se koriste neprimjerenim riječima, udaraju ga ili tuku, uništavaju njegovu imovinu, klevetaju ga (ogovaraju) ili isključuju iz vršnjačkih skupina. Rezultat je takvih postupaka patnja i nemogućnost samoobrane (Habbe, 2000: 44–45). Vršnjačko nasilje ne podrazumijeva svađu između dva učenika ili dvije skupine učenika (Habbe, 2000: 44). Štoviše, Dekleva (1997: 53) smatra da ne možemo govoriti o nasilju kada nekoliko učenika jednakih moći (mentalnih i fizičkih) i statusa započnu tučnjavu. Obilježje pravog maltretiranja nejednak je omjer moći jer slabija se djeca puno teže mogu obraniti u odnosu na napadače.

Koristeći Puškinov popis (1999: 34) nekih zajedničkih karakteristika koje proizlaze iz različitih definicija vršnjačkog nasilja možemo zaključiti:

- Maltretiranje je vrsta nasilja koje traje duži vremenski period
- Može biti verbalno, fizičko ili psihičko
- Podrazumijeva neuravnoteženost u omjeru snaga između žrtve i napadača
- Žrtva se ne može obraniti te se osjeća nemoćno i zastrašeno

Kao što je rečeno u uvodnom dijelu članka, škole su svjesne posljedica vršnjačkog nasilja i zbog toga rukovodstvo škole taj problem smatra iznimno ozbiljnim. Jedan je od bitnih koraka u suzbijanju vršnjačkog nasilja traženje profesionalne pomoći. U Sloveniji ova pomoć dolazi od strane školskog savjetnika kojega svaka škola ima (s obzirom na veličinu škole, ona može imati i više savjetnika koji onda čine tim savjetnika). Njihov osnovni cilj je optimizirati djetetov razvoj bez obzira na spol, kulturno i društveno porijeklo, religiju, nacionalnost, fizičke ili mentalne mogućnosti (Programske smernice - Program Guidelines, 2008: 5). Bor i suradnici (2002: 15) definiraju školsko savjetovanje na sljedeći način: „Savjetovanje je interakcija u terapijskom okruženju koje se usredotočuje primarno na razgovor o odnosima, vjerovanjima i ponašanju (uključujući osjećaje) kroz koji djetetov problem postaje razjašnjen te stavljen u okvir na prikladan i koristan način, te u kojem se pronalaze nova rješenja kako bi problem poprimio neko novo značenje.” Autori (ibid.) predlažu sljedeće funkcije školskog savjetovanja:

- Proučiti teškoće ili probleme s kojima se suočavaju i steći uvid u faktore koji te probleme održavaju
- Poticanje donošenja odluka
- Razgovor o poteškoćama u odnosima te kako se nositi s njima
- Pronalaženje korisnih strategija za suočavanje koje dijete već posjeduje i načine na koji se oni mogu učvrstiti
- Identificirati postojeće izvore potpore
- Steći uvid u praktične metode koje se mogu koristiti u rješavanju problema
- Izvidjeti i preispitati percepcije negativne slike o sebi i niske razine samopoštovanja (ibid.: 15–16)

U suradnji s cijelom školom, te prema gore navedenim ulogama i zadaćama, školski savjetnici mogu postati osvješteniji o osnovnim problemima škole, posebice kada se radi o zastrašivanju. Prema tome, njihova je uloga u rješavanju problema vršnjačkog nasilja od iznimne važnosti. Često su upravo školski savjetnici prvi kojima se oni uključeni u obrazovni sustav mogu obratiti a vezano je uz vršnjačko nasilje. Školski savjetnici kvalificirani su za rad vezan uz konfliktne situacije te mogu osigurati individualno ili skupno savjetovanje. Te posebne vještine daju školskim savjetnicima osnovne mogućnosti za pronalaženje preventivnih i pomažućih aktivnosti koje se bave problemima vršnjačkog nasilja (Swearer, Buhs, Siebecker, Brey Love i Miller, 2008: 673).

Zadaća školskog savjetnika nije samo zaustavljanje nasilja, već i pomoć žrtvama nasilja da prebrode osjećaje nemoći i očaja. Cijela školska zajednica odgovorna je za stvaranje sigurnog okruženja za učenje, a školski savjetnici imaju glavnu ulogu u prihvaćanju i izvršavanju toga procesa. (Cunningham i Sandhu, 2000; prema Hernández i Seem, 2004). Znanje o savjetovanju, rukovođenje razredom, sinkronizacija usluga koje nude školski savjetnici doprinosi njihovoj ulozi učinkovitih pristalica sustavnih promjena u školama. Istraživanja su pokazala da sveobuhvatni programi za školsko savjetovanje imaju utjecaj na školsku klimu (Gysbers, Hughey, Starr i Lapan, 1992; prema Hernández i Seem, 2004). Studija koju su proveli Lapan, Gysbers i Sun (1997; prema Hernández i Seem, 2004) analizirala je povezanost između sveukupnog dostignuća programa školskog savjetovanja i učenikova poimanja pozitivnog školskog ozračja. Ustanovili su da učenici imaju više pozitivnih iskustava u školama koje provode program sveobuhvatnog školskog savjetovanja. Učenici su izrazili uvjerenje da ih je škola primjereno pripremila za suočavanje s problemima i da se njihovi vršnjaci u školi ponašaju bolje. Učenici su također izrazili osjećaje pripadanja i sigurnosti. Nims (2000; prema Hernández i Seem, 2004) naglašava da je cjelokupni razvoj školskog savjetovanja u školi neizostavan dio svih nastojanja da školu učinimo sigurnom.

Jedan od načina za suočavanje sa školskim nasiljem razvijanje je programa za obrazovanje karaktera i vrijednosnih tvrdnji (Peterson i Skiba, 2001; prema Hernández i Seem, 2004). Obrazovanje karaktera je način kojim se dobivaju provokativne smjernice koje pomažu u poučavanju učenika o pozitivnom ponašanju i vrijednostima koje bi trebali biti dio obrazovanja za svakoga. Vrijednosne tvrdnje posvećene su zajamčivanju onih aktivnosti koje su učenicima i namijenjene. Te tvrdnje čine popis pozitivnih karakteristika koje škole mogu prihvatiti kao željene ciljeve za svoje učenike.

Školski savjetnici također mogu podržavati razvoj školskih rituala i tradicija (Peterson i Deal, 1998; prema Hernández i Seem, 2004) na način da sinkroniziraju i realiziraju razne aktivnosti koje promiču povezanost na razini škole. Clarke i Kiselica (1997; prema Hernández i Seem, 2004) predlažu edukacijski trening na temu socijalizacije rodnih uloga koje mogu poboljšati osviještenost o psihičkom zlostavljanju. Autori tvrde da socijalizacija rodnih uloga također može zavesti ljude u suptilne oblike nasilja, a u isto vrijeme one upozoravaju školske savjetnike da takav oblik treninga mogu provoditi samo uz eksplicitnu podršku uprave.

Riley i McDonald (2000, prema Hernández i Seem, 2004) naglašavaju kako školski savjetnici mogu doprinijeti sigurnijoj školi radeći s učenicima, nastavnicima i roditeljima kao i sa školom u široj zajednici. Savjetovanje za učenike (osobno ili skupno) sastoji se od osvrtnja na osobne, profesionalne i društvene potrebe. Usmjeravanje aktivnosti u razredu može postati učinkovito sredstvo za prepoznavanje problema u ponašanju. Školski savjetnici također mogu koordinirati programe mentorstva, ubrzati programe koji pomažu učenicima u suočavanju s njihovim vršnjacima i njihovim ljutnjama te mogu organizirati uobičajene skupne razgovore koji se dotiču školskih pravila vezanih uz ponašanje i disciplinu.

Važno je da školski savjetnici uvježbaju učenike i ostalo školsko osoblje u vještini empatije te ih potaknu da kroz povjerenje i poštovanje pronađu učinkovit način rješavanja potencijalno nasilnih ponašanja od strane učenika (Nims, 2000; prema Hernández i Seem, 2004). Kada surađuju s roditeljima, školski savjetnici mogu osigurati izvore i omogućiti obuku u području rada s tvrdoglavom djecom i djecom s problemima u ponašanju dok im istovremeno mogu pomoći i usmjeriti ih odgovarajućem izvanškolskom specijalistu.

Školski savjetnici također mogu funkcionirati kao epicentri promjena za neke učenike kao i za čitavu školu i zajednicu. Zbog njihova znanja i obuke, školski savjetnici mogu imati vodeću ulogu u nastojanjima da promijene školsko ozračje iako su svi dionici odgovorni u njegovoj realizaciji (prim. Bečaj 1998, Hargreaves i Fullan, 2000, Prosser, 1999). Kao stvaraoci sigurnosti u školi, školski savjetnici mogu nadzirati i usklađivati nastojanja cijele školske zajednice u tome, te preuzeti vodeću ulogu u razmatranju tih nastojanja. To ih stavlja na ključni položaj za komunikaciju s učenicima, ostalim zaposlenicima škole, administracijom, roditeljima i širom zajednicom. Kao što Davies i Ellison (1997) ističu, 90 % kvalitetnog rada ovisno je o školi i nastavnicima, dok je samo 10 % kvalitetnog rada ovisno o vanjskim faktorima (intervenciji). Upravo zbog toga autori ističu važnost razvijanja dobrog školskog ozračja.

Unatoč bitnoj ulozi školskih savjetnika u stvaranju pozitivne školske kulture, mnoga istraživanja prema Unnever i Cornell (2004; prema Jacobsen i Bauman, 2007) pokazala su da učenici koji su žrtve vršnjačkog nasilja često ne traže pomoć. Najčešći razlozi za to su sram i sumnja da će razgovor sa školskim savjetnikom riješiti problem kojega imaju. U nastavku ovoga rada, autori će prikazati rezultate sličnog istraživanja provedenog u školama u Sloveniji.

Istraživanje

Istraživanje je provedeno u travnju 2010. metodama empirijskog istraživanja. Autorima je cilj bio istražiti ulogu školskog savjetnika u prepoznavanju i rješavanju problema vršnjačkog nasilja, tj. provjeriti: Vjeruju li učenici školskim savjetnicima? Obraćaju li im se kada imaju problem? Surađuju li sa školskim savjetnicima i surađuju li savjetnici na preventivan način s učenicima?

Na osnovu tih pitanja željeli smo odrediti postoji li značajna razlika između tri vrste škola u Sloveniji².

Metodologija

Istraživanje je rađeno deskriptivnim i slučajnim, neeksperimentalnim metodama empirijskog istraživanja u području pedagogije (Sagadin, 1993).

Uzorak se sastojao od 425 učenika iz tri vrste škola. Otprilike jedna trećina, 155 ili 36,5% učenika bila je iz osnovnih škola. Drugih 133 učenika, odnosno 31,3% polazila je strukovnu srednju školu, dok je 137, odnosno 37,2% učenika polazilo srednju školu.

Podaci su bili prikupljeni anonimnim upitnikom za učenike, koji se sastojao od dva dijela. Prvi dio sastojao se od pitanja vezanih uz činjenice kao što su rod, vrsta škole, ocjene. Drugi dio sastojao se od ljestvice sa četiri izbora: uvijek, često, ponekad, nikada. Ovaj se dio upitnika odnosio na školske savjetnike, točnije, kako učenici procjenjuju ulogu školskih savjetnika u suočavanju s vršnjačkim nasiljem.

Rezultati su prvo brojačno označeni: numeričke vrijednosti dane su opisanim razinama: uvijek = 1, često = 2, ponekad = 3, nikada = 4. Analiza (u kojoj je korišten statistički programski paket SPSS inačica 12) provedena je Kruskal-Wallisovim testom kako bi se provjerile razlike među skupinama (osnovna škola, strukovna škola, srednja škola) u odnosu na individualne predmete (ljestvica procjene).

Rezultati

Rezultati su prikazani u niže navedenoj tablici. Individualne tvrdnje grupirane su u dva segmenta s obzirom na sadržaj: prvih sedam tvrdnji (ili procjena) odnose se općenito na odnose školskih savjetnika s učenicima; ostale tvrdnje pokazuju ulogu koju školski savjetnici imaju kada se dotiču problema vršnjačkog nasilja prema procjeni učenika.

U ovom istraživanju zanimalo nas je općenito kakva iskustva učenici imaju sa školskim savjetnicima. Kruskal-Wallisov test ($P = 0,146$) pokazao je da nema statistički značajnih razlika među školama pa su prema tome rezultati interesantni samo za uzorak. Učenici srednjih škola imali su najpozitivnija iskustva sa školskim savjetnicima, a nakon njih učenici strukovnih srednjih škola pa učenici osnovnih škola, koji su pokazali najmanje pozitivan odziv na savjetovanje. Ti rezultati su iznenađujući jer učenici osnovnih škola predstavljaju najmlađu djecu, a rad školskog savjetnika s

²Uspoređivat ćemo situacije u osnovnim školama, strukovnim srednjim školama i srednjim školama.

Osnovna škola u Sloveniji obvezatna je i traje devet godina, a koju pohađaju je učenici u dobi od 6 do 15 godina (učenici završnih razreda osnovne škole u dobi od 14 i 15 -godinašnjaci sudjelovali su u ovome istraživanju).

Strukovne srednje škole su trogodišnje škole (upisuju ih učenici nakon završene osnovne škole) koje pripremaju učenike za profesiju (npr. švelja, frizer, tajnički posao...). Učenici prvih razreda strukovne škole, šesnaesto-16-godišnjaci, sudjelovali su u ovoeme istraživanju.

Srednja škola je četverogodišnja škola u kojoj se stječe opće obrazovanje (upisuje se nakon završene osnovne škole) i koja priprema učenike za studij na fakultetu. Učenici u prvim razredima srednje škole, šesnaesto-16-godišnjaci, sudjelovali su u ovoeme istraživanju.

njima trebao bi biti puno usmjereniji nego rad s učenicima srednjih škola. S druge strane, takav se rezultat može interpretirati kao odraz toga da učenici osnovnih škola imaju manje kontakta sa školskim savjetnikom jer nemaju toliko problema kao učenici drugih dviju vrsta škola.

Također smo htjeli saznati vjeruju li učenici školskim savjetnicima. Kruskal-Wallisov test pokazao je statistički značajnu razliku među školama ($P = 0,046$). Prema srednjim vrijednostima možemo reći da učenici najviše vjeruju savjetnicima strukovnih srednjih škola a najmanje u srednjim školama (razina srednje vrijednosti = 225,40). Taj rezultat nije bio očekivan. Pretpostavili smo da će školskim savjetnicima najviše vjerovati učenici osnovnih škola, a najmanje učenici strukovnih srednjih škola. Savjetnici u osnovnim školama najčešće kontaktiraju s učenicima. Redovno organiziraju radionice, predavanja i sastanke gdje mogu ostvariti osobni kontakt s učenicima. Savjetnici u srednjim školama većinu svoje pozornosti posvećuju na upisivanje učenika u školu i na davanje profesionalnih savjeta što često uzrokuje nedostatak vremena za osobni kontakt s njihovim učenicima. Neki učenici srednjih škola izrazili su razočaranje zbog prerijetkog kontakta sa školskim savjetnicima pa im sukladno tome ne mogu iskazati povjerenje.

Također smo proučavali izbjegavaju li učenici školsko savjetovanje. Kruskal-Wallisov test pokazao je statistički značajnu razliku među školama ($P = 0,006$). Prema razinama srednje vrijednosti, učenici osnovnih škola najčešće izbjegavaju školske savjetnike dok to najrjeđe čine učenici strukovnih srednjih škola. Ovaj je rezultat neočekivan s obzirom da je bilo očekivano upravo suprotno: učenici osnovnih škola najviše vjeruju školskim savjetnicima dok učenici srednjih škola najmanje vjeruju školskim savjetnicima.

Statistički značajne razlike među školama nije bilo vezano uz tvrdnju da učenici samovoljno kontaktiraju školskog savjetnika ($P = 0,124$). Prema uzorku, učenici srednjih strukovnih škola pokazuju najviše volje u kontaktiraju savjetnika, dok su učenici osnovnih škola pokazali samo volju.

Htjeli smo saznati pomažu li školski savjetnici učenicima kada imaju probleme. Kruskal-Wallisov test pokazao je statistički značajne razlike među školama ($P = 0,000$). Učenici osnovnih škola najviše se slažu s ovom tvrdnjom. Razlog tome možemo pronaći u razini razvoja učenika. Učenici srednjih škola u adolescentskoj su dobi i zbog toga radije traže pomoć na drugom mjestu (prijatelji, školski prijatelji, ili internet).

Također smo htjeli utvrditi osjećaju li učenici slobodu prenijeti svoja razmišljanja školskim savjetnicima. Kruskal-Wallisov test pokazao je statistički značajnu razliku među školama ($P = 0,004$). Učenici srednjih strukovnih škola najviše su se složili s tvrdnjom da slobodno mogu reći svoja razmišljanja školskim savjetnicima, dok su se učenici osnovnih škola u najmanjoj mjeri složili s tom tvrdnjom. Taj se rezultat može objasniti činjenicom da učenici osnovnih škola često posjećuju školske savjetnike vezano uz poteškoće u učenju. U tom slučaju školski savjetnici pomažu im s učenjem što je prilično usmjerena ili planirana aktivnost.

Naposljetku, htjeli smo odrediti osjeća li se u uredu školskog savjetnika pozitivna atmosfera. Na osnovu Kruskal-Willisova testa, utvrdili smo da postoji statistički značajna razlika među školama ($P = 0,004$). Atmosfera u uredima školskih savjetnika bila je najugodnija za učenike srednjih strukovnih škola a najmanje ugodna za učenike osnovnih škola. Taj je rezultat sukladan našim prethodnim rezultatima koji su pokazali da učenici srednjih strukovnih škola najčešće posjećuju školske savjetnike dok učenici osnovnih škola pokazuju najmanji interes za to. Ta samovolja u pristupanju savjetovanju svakako je povezana s osjećajima koji se javljaju tijekom procesa savjetovanja.

Ostale tvrdnje u tablici (8 – 17) odnose se na ulogu savjetnika kada se radi o vršnjačkom nasilju. Prije svega htjeli smo saznati mogu li učenici razgovarati sa savjetnicima o vršnjačkom nasilju. Kruskal-Willisov test pokazao je da ne postoji statistički značajna razlika za tu tvrdnju ($P = 0,696$). Također ne postoji statistički značajna razlika među školama za tvrdnju o ponašanju savjetnika u slučaju vršnjačkog nasilja ($P = 0,231$), ili za tvrdnju o promidžbi nenasilne komunikacije od strane školskog savjetnika ($P = 0,808$).

Statistički značajne razlike pojavljuju se za preostale tvrdnje. Školski savjetnici u osnovnim školama najčešće informiraju učenike o ozbiljnosti vršnjačkog nasilja i komuniciraju sa žrtvama kao i s počiniteljima. Savjetnici to najrjeđe rade u srednjim školama. Ti se rezultati mogu objasniti činjenicom da u srednjim školama problem vršnjačkog nasilja nije toliko čest.

Također smo istražili misle li učenici da školski savjetnici doživljavaju vršnjačko nasilje kao nešto normalno. Kruskal-Wallisov test ukazao je na statistički značajnu razliku među školama ($P = 0,000$). Učenici osnovnih škola u najvećoj mjeri složili su se s tom tvrdnjom (srednja vrijednost = 192,72), a iza njih odmah su bili učenici srednjih strukovnih škola (srednja vrijednost = 200,14). Učenici srednjih škola najmanje su se složili s tom tvrdnjom (srednja vrijednost = 248,43). Ti rezultati nisu bili očekivani. Očekivali smo da školski savjetnici neće vršnjačko nasilje smatrati nečim normalnim što bi se odrazilo na povećanu razinu srednjih vrijednosti. Ako školski savjetnici doživljavaju vršnjačko nasilje kao svakodnevicu, onda ne pokazuju adekvatno nastojanje za prevenciju ili smanjenje istoga. Moramo stoga naglasiti da bilo koji oblik nasilja ne smije biti dozvoljen.

Za tvrdnju o praćenju razreda u vrijeme odmora, Kruskal-Wallisov test ukazao je na statistički značajnu razliku među školama ($P = 0,000$). Sznali smo da su učenici osnovnih škola ocijenili tu tvrdnju najvećom ocjenom (srednja vrijednost = 169,74), zatim učenici srednjih strukovnih škola (srednja vrijednost = 214,30) a najmanju ocjenu dali su učenici srednjih škola. Taj ishod bio je očekivan jer se u osnovnim školama puno pozornosti posvećuje preveniranju vršnjačkog nasilja koje se često dešava upravo u vrijeme odmora.

Slijede rezultati učeničkih procjena radionica i sastanaka s temom vršnjačkog nasilja. Prema Kruskal-Wallisovu testu, postoji statistički značajna razlika među školama.

Srednje strukovne škole procijenile su školske savjetnike najvišom ocjenom (srednja vrijednost = 193,29), zatim učenici osnovnih škola (srednja vrijednost = 200,66), dok je najmanja procjena bila od strane učenika srednjih škola (srednja vrijednost = 246,09). Taj rezultat bio je neočekivan. Očekivali smo da će savjetnici dobiti najviše procjene od strane učenika osnovnih škola. Učenici srednjih škola uglavnom se nisu složili s tom tvrdnjom što znači da radionice s temom vršnjačkog nasilja nedostaju.

Kruskal-Wallisov test pokazao je statistički značajnu razliku među školama vezano uz procjenu radionice za roditelje s temom vršnjačkog nasilja. Najbolje procijenjeni savjetnici bili su oni koje su procijenili učenici osnovnih škola (srednja vrijednost = 196,30), pa zatim učenici srednjih strukovnih škola (srednja vrijednost = 202,95). Najniže procijenjeni bili su od strane srednjoškolskih učenika (srednja vrijednost = 241,95). Taj je ishod bio očekivan iako moramo upozoriti na veliku razliku između srednjih vrijednosti učenika srednjih škola i onih učenika osnovnih i srednjih strukovnih škola. To nas dovodi do zaključka da srednje škole nemaju dovoljno radionica o temi vršnjačkog nasilja ili i nemaju uopće.

Naposljetku, istražili smo procjene učenika o sastancima s učenicima, nastavnicima i roditeljima vezanih uz vršnjačko nasilje. Kruskal-Wallisov test pokazao je statistički značajne razlike. Školski savjetnici bili su najpozitivnije procijenjeni od strane učenika srednjih strukovnih škola (srednja vrijednost = 192,17), malo manje od strane učenika osnovnih škola (srednja vrijednost = 192,65), te najmanje pozitivno od strane učenika srednjih (srednja vrijednost = 256,25). Taj rezultat potpuno je neočekivan. Predvidjeli smo da će učenici osnovnih škola procijeniti školske savjetnike s najvišim ocjenama vezano uz tu tvrdnju. Nadalje, vidljivo je da su učenici srednjih škola također dali relativno niske ocjene za tu tvrdnju, što znači da nedostaju sastanci s temom vršnjačkog nasilja za učenike, nastavnike i roditelje.

Zaključak

Nasilje među vršnjacima postaje sve veći i sve ozbiljniji problem. Iz tog razloga trebalo bi mu pridodati i veću pozornost. Iako postoje mnoge definicije vršnjačkog nasilja svima su zajednička dva elementa: učestalo i neprekidno nasilje nametnuto djetetu od drugog djeteta gdje postoji jasna razlika u fizičkoj i psihološkoj moći agresora nad žrtvom. Djeca koja su žrtve vršnjačkog nasilja potresena su i osjećaju negativne posljedice takvih radnji; dok je kod zadirkičavača nasilje način učvršćivanja neprihvatljivog modela u svrhu rješavanja vlastitih problema. Prema tome, svi moramo uložiti napor u sprječavanje nasilja, prepoznavanju i suočavanju s nasiljem u ranim stadijima, u zaštiti žrtava i pronalaženju prihvatljivog postupanja za zadirkičavače.

Školski su savjetnici prvi kojima žrtve vršnjačkog nasilja dolaze po pomoć. Iz tog razloga vrlo je važno da školski savjetnici imaju odgovarajuće znanje o tome kako se ponašati u slučaju vršnjačkog nasilja. U proces sprječavanja i smanjenja razine nasilja važno je uključiti sve ljude koji su dio obrazovnog sustava. Ako saberemo rezultate našeg empirijskog istraživanja, možemo reći da većina učenika ima dobra iskustva sa

školskim savjetnicima, a posebno učenici srednjih škola. To se može objasniti dvama faktorima: prvo, učenici srednjih škola navode i naglašavaju dobre rezultate učenja, a drugo, oni koji se upisuju u srednje škole uglavnom su učenici koji će nastaviti svoje obrazovanje na fakultetu pa su samim time i motivirani za učenje. To objašnjenje dokazano je rezultatima drugog dijela empirijskih podataka, posebno da se u srednjim školama manje pažnje pridodaje takvim problemima nego u drugim vrstama škola. Srednje škole također imaju najmanje radionica i organiziranih sastanaka na tu temu.

Debata o doprinosu školskog savjetovanja može biti zaključena s potvrđenom činjenicom da je školsko savjetovanje potreba u sprječavanju vršnjačkog nasilja. Školski savjetnici moraju nastojati održavati dobre odnose s učenicima, moraju ih slušati kada se nađu u problemu te im pomoći. Školski savjetnici moraju biti vrlo osjetljivi kada se suočavaju s vršnjačkim nasiljem te znati upotrijebiti primjerene mjere. U procesu sprječavanja vršnjačkog nasilja u školama, školski savjetnici moraju uključiti učenike, nastavnike, roditelje te cijelo školsko osoblje. Preventivne radionice, sastanci i predavanja o vršnjačkom nasilju morala bi biti organizirana tako da se školski savjetnici sa svim dionicima obrazovnog procesa mogu obrazovati na tu temu. Ozbilnost problema vršnjačkoga nasilja se povećava kao i posljedice za žrtve i agresore. Posebno je važno pokazati da se vršnjačko nasilje neće tolerirati, odnosno da ga moramo pokušati spriječiti.