

Špela Razpotnik in Jana Rapuš Pavel

Mladi, psihosocialne stiske in šola kot potencialni podporni dejavnik

Povzetek: Večja pojavnost psihosocialnih stisk je trend, ki se v ekonomsko razvitem sodobnem svetu stopnjuje, k temu pa je prispevala tudi nedavna epidemija. Psihosocialne stiske mladih postajajo bolj kompleksne, doživlja jih vse večje število mladih in posredno njihovih družin, skupin, tudi šolskih razredov, obenem pa se daljšajo čakalne vrste za dostopanje do podpore, viri podpore so zapolnjeni. Strokovnjaki s področja psihosocialnih stisk zato vse bolj poudarjajo, kako pomembno je angažirati tiste vire v skupnosti, ki zajamejo veliko večino mladih. Primer takega vira je vsekakor šolsko okolje. V članku se nasloniva na sodobne vire, ki povezujejo psihosocialne stiske in šolsko okolje. Predstaviva del nedavnega raziskovanja prvoosebne perspektive mladih z izkušnjo psihosocialnih stisk, pri čemer pozornost usmerjava v šolsko okolje. Na podlagi raziskovalnih izsledkov izriševa vizijo, kako bi to lahko delovalo kot bolj podporno za mlade v obdobju obremenjenosti za celo paleto psihosocialnih stisk, pri čemer je najin fokus prosocialna usmerjenost šolskega okolja, tako navznoter kot tudi navzven, torej v smislu povezanosti s skupnostjo. Socialna in varovalna dimenzija šole v primeru izkušanja psihosocialnih stisk je torej nekaj, kar pri pojmovanju šolskega prostora za mlade umanjka tudi zaradi postavljanja nasprotnih prioritet (tekmovalnosti, individualizma) v ospredje, ravno socialna in varovalna vloga šole pa je, kot želiva argumentirati, tista vloga, ki bi jo šola morala opraviti, če želi biti varovalni dejavnik za mlade.

Ključne besede: mladi, psihosocialne stiske, šola, skupnost

UDK: 37.015.4

Znanstveni prispevek

Dr. Špela Razpotnik, docentka, Univerza v Ljubljani, Pedagoška fakulteta, Oddelek za socialno pedagogiko, Kardeljeva ploščad 16, SI-1000 Ljubljana, Slovenija; e-naslov: spela.razpotnik@pef.uni-lj.si

Dr. Jana Rapuš Pavel, docentka, Univerza v Ljubljani, Pedagoška fakulteta, Oddelek za socialno pedagogiko, Kardeljeva ploščad 16, SI-1000 Ljubljana, Slovenija; e-naslov: jana.rapus@pef.uni-lj.si

Uvod

Na nedavnem strokovnem srečanju je ravnateljica ene od ljubljanskih šol uporabila besedno zvezo »otroci niso v redu«. Ta v sebi nosi zaskrbljenost ob opažanju, kaj se dogaja z mladimi v sodobni družbi, pri čemer odseva tudi ugotovitve raziskav glede povečevanja obsega psihosocialnih stisk mladih. Gre za trend, ki je obstajal že prej, med epidemijo pa se je še okrepil (npr. Schwartz idr. 2021; Hasking idr. 2021; Jeriček Klanšček idr. 2017; Lavrič idr. 2021; Cesar idr. 2021; McGorry idr. 2007). Da bi šole bolje opravljale svoje preventivne in podporne funkcije na področju psihosocialnega blagostanja otrok, je seveda najprej potreben razmislek o trenutnem stanju in prednostnih nalogah. Strokovna in splošna javnost soglašata, da so potrebne spremembe izobraževalnega sistema, ki se že dolgo ni bistveno spreminjal, okoliščine, v katere je vpet, pa se spreminjajo zelo hitro (npr. Čacinovič Vogrinčič 2008; Razpotnik in Tadič 2019; Reimagining ... 2021). V članku izhajava iz nedavne slovenske raziskave o prvoosebni perspektivah mladih z izkušnjo psihosocialnih stisk s poudarkom na šolskem okolju (Dekleva idr. 2018, 2021). Na podlagi izsledkov raziskave predstavlja vizijo, kako bi lahko to okolje delovalo bolj podporno za mlade, s poudarkom na prosocialni naravnosti šolskega okolja, tudi z vidika povezanosti s skupnostjo.

Vzpon psihosocialnih stisk med mladimi

Mikuš Kos (2017, 2019) pojasnjuje, da izraz psihosocialna stiska predpostavlja, da jo povzroča predvsem neugodno okolje, tj. dejavniki socialnega okolja, kot so ponavljajoči se stres, travmatične izkušnje, trajne neugodne družinske razmere ali vrstniško nasilje. Med duševnim zdravjem in duševnimi motnjami obstaja kontinuum pojavov in težav, ki so del življenja (krizna obdobja, žalovanje, čustvene stiske zaradi ljubezenskih razočaranj, stiske zaradi šolskega neuspeha itd.). Govorimo o čustvenih težavah, stiskah, kriznih situacijah, ki so prehodnega značaja in izzvenijo, ko ni več razloga za porušenje čustvenega ravnovesja (prav tam).

V članku uporabljava izraz psihosocialne stiske, ki je širši od pojma težave v duševnem zdravju, pokriva tudi subjektivno oceno lastnega stanja, predvsem pa zajema tudi socialni kontekst teh težav in obsega širši kontinuum, ne zgolj klinično diagnosticirane psihiatrične težave. V posameznih navedbah se pojavljajo drugi, sorodni izrazi, na primer težave v duševnem zdravju, duševne stiske in podobno.

Oglejmo si še nekaj podatkov, ki potrjujejo tezo, da so psihosocialne stiske med mladimi v vzponu. Po podatkih raziskave, ki jo je opravil Nacionalni inštitut za javno zdravje, se je prevalenca težav v duševnem zdravju pri mladih, mlajših od 18 let, v zadnjih 25 letih povečala za 64 % (Jeriček Klanšček idr. 2018). Ta trend je seveda povezan s kompleksnimi in raznolikimi družbenimi vidiki, med katerimi je zagotovo tudi povečana pozornost, ki jo temu področju namenjajo strokovnjaki. Prav tako je posledica tega, da so posamezniki bolj obveščeni o svojem psihosocialnem položaju in tako pri sebi kot pri drugih prepoznavajo širši nabor različnih stanj, kot je to veljalo v preteklosti. Collishaw (2015) poroča, da se je v zadnjih desetletjih v Združenem kraljestvu povečalo diagnosticiranje in zdravljenje duševnih motenj otrok in mladostnikov. McGorry idr. (2007) ugotavljajo, da 19 % mladih v Avstraliji med 13. in 17. letom poroča o težavah z duševnim zdravjem. V starostni skupini od 18 do 24 let se ta delež poveča na 27 %, kar pomeni, da se vsak četrti mladostnik sooča z zlorabo drog, depresijo ali anksioznostjo, najpogosteje pa s kombinacijo teh pojavov (prav tam). Tudi v Sloveniji so se tovrstne težave zaostriale med pandemijo, zaradi česar se je tema psihosocialnih stisk mladih trdno zasedrila tudi na javni agendi. Nacionalni inštitut za javno zdravje je na primer izvedel raziskavo (Cesar idr. 2021), ki je v javnost prinesla podatke o duševnih oziroma psihosocialnih stiskah študentske populacije. Za ponazoritev: pred pandemijo je pomoč zaradi duševnih stisk iskalo 32 % študentov, med pandemijo pa kar 56 % udeležencev raziskave, od tega jih je približno tretjina pomoč iskala pogosto. Raziskava *Slovenska mladina 2020* (Lavrič in Deželan 2021) prinaša ugotovitve, da so glavni napovedniki stiske med mladimi ženski spol, slabši odnosi s starši, več časa pred zasloni, slabša šolska klima in slabše finančno stanje družine. V kvalitativni študiji Nacionalnega inštituta za javno zdravje (Jeriček Klanšček 2016) so otroci in mladostniki sporočali svoje zaznave in ideje o duševnem zdravju. Mladi v raziskavi zaznavanje težav z duševnim zdravjem povezujejo predvsem s stresom v šoli zaradi različnih obveznosti, odnosov z učitelji in tudi odnosov z vrstniki. Rupnik Vec in Slivar (2019) sta ob preučevanju vpliva različnih dejavnikov na doživljanje in simptome stresa pri šolarjih ugotovila, da skoraj petina 10- in 13-letnih učencev doživlja visoko stopnjo stresa v povezavi s šolo. Jeriček Klanšček idr. (2019) poročajo tudi o mednarodni raziskavi z zdravjem povezanega vedenja, v kateri so sodelovali tudi slovenski otroci; v njej ugotavljajo, da manj kot tretjina 11-letnikov in manj kot sedmina 13-letnikov rada hodi v šolo.

V gospodarsko razvitem zahodnem svetu je kljub relativnemu materialnemu blagostanju vse več otrok in mladih, ki izražajo psihosocialne stiske ali iščejo oziroma poskušajo najti podporo na tem področju. Hkrati študije kažejo, da so storitve za duševno zdravje mladih neustrezne glede na potrebe na tem področju in deklarirano prednostno nalogo (gl. Klemenčič Mirazchijski 2017). Podobno

tudi drugi avtorji in avtorice opozarjajo na slabo medsektorsko povezovanje (Muijen 2015). Muijen (prav tam) v poročilu, ki analizira stanje v Sloveniji na tem področju, izpostavlja pretiran obseg bolnišnične in psihiatrične podpore, hkrati pa kot prednostno nalogo za Slovenijo poudarja pomanjkanja podpore v skupnosti.

Tekmovalnost nasproti sodelovalnosti

Ko razmišljamo o spremembah izobraževalnega sistema, moramo najprej preučiti različna merila za to, kaj je dober in uspešen izobraževalni sistem. Prvi vir meril so običajno mednarodne primerjave dosežkov učencev. Najbolj uveljavljen je sistem OECD (Program mednarodne primerjave dosežkov učencev PISA), ki razvršča države po od zunaj določenih merilih glede na to, kako dobro se učenci odrežejo na testih, zlasti pri naravoslovju, jeziku in matematiki. Vendar vse več kritikov (npr. Cefai in Cavioni 2015) opozarja, da sta izobraževalni sistem in njegovo poslanstvo mnogo več kot pridobivanje storilnostnih kompetenc in njihovo reproduciranje pri preizkusih znanja iz izbranih predmetov. Rovšek (2020) piše o razširitvi koncepta pravičnosti v šolah in postavlja vprašanje, kako bi se lahko šole ustrezneje odzvale na potrebe širšega kroga učencev, tudi tistih, ki so pogosto preprosto spregledani ali potisnjeni v segregirane oblike izobraževanja (npr. otroci s posebnimi potrebami, otroci iz romskih ali priseljskih družin, z nižjim socialno-ekonomskim statusom ali posebej obremenjujočim družinskim okoljem). Psihosocialno blagostanje otrok, ki je povezano s temo vse večjih stisk, s katerimi se soočajo mladi, je le eno od področij, ki v šolskem okolju niso dovolj prepoznana. Natančneje, avtorji kritizirajo tovrstni enodimenzionalni (na dosežkih temelječi) pristop zaradi njegove ozke osredotočenosti na omejen obseg izkazanih kognitivnih sposobnosti, kar naj bi spodbujalo zelo ozek pogled na izobraževanje, ki se osredotoča predvsem na pripravo učencev na trg dela (Cefai in Cavioni 2015). Avtorja se v svojem razmišljanju zavzemata za »širšo izobraževalno agendo«, ki po njunem mnenju pomeni ustvarjanje akademsko, pa tudi socialno in čustveno pismenih mladih, ki so dovolj sposobni in duševno odporni, da lahko krmarijo med negotovostmi, značilnimi za sodobno življenje (prav tam). Unescov dokument z naslovom *Reimagining our Futures Together: A New Social Contract for Education* (2021) se dotika tudi merjenja dosežkov. »Če rečemo, da nečesa ni mogoče kvantificirati, to še ne pomeni, da ni mogoče opaziti pomembnega napredka. Cilj sodelovanja je na primer mogoče empirično opazovati, ko skupina učencev krene skozi procese pogajanj, reševanja konfliktov in eksperimentiranja ter med tem procesom povečuje svoje sposobnosti poslušanja.« (Prav tam, str. 55) Avtorji dodajajo: »Učitelji bi morali imeti proste roke pri določanju, kdaj lahko s tekmovalnimi dejavnostmi dosegajo določene pedagoške cilje, namesto da se odzivajo na zunanje pritiske, ki se nanašajo na merila uspešnosti, ki so pogosto oddaljena in neznana.« Če pogledamo samo sistem ocen in kreditnih točk za napredovanje ter izbiro nadaljnjega izobraževanja na različnih stopnjah izobraževanja, vidimo, da je spodbujanje tekmovalnosti del socializacijskega procesa, ki učence pripravlja na poznejše vloge v družbenem življenju (Pergar Kuščer in Razdevšek Pučko

2005). Ocene naj bi odražale znanje, težava pa nastane, ko se tekmovanje za ocene spremeni v tekmovanje za visoke ocene namesto za poglobljeno znanje. Ta trend očitno nadomešča bolj sodelovalne oblike učenja (prav tam). Peklaj (2001) je pri raziskovanju sodelovalnega učenja ugotovila, da je to učinkovito z vidika poglobljanja znanja in razumevanja učnih vsebin, pomembno pa vpliva tudi na razvoj kritičnega mišljenja in kompleksnega sklepanja, prispeva k oblikovanju novih idej in rešitev ter je pomemben dejavnik pri razvoju skupinske povezanosti sodelujočih.

Na tem mestu lahko omenimo tudi Bečaja (2005), ki poudarja, da so družbene vrednote in šolska kultura tiste, ki določajo, kako šola opravlja svojo izobraževalno funkcijo. Kot pojasnjuje: »Šole bi rade imele otroke, ki so strpni, uživajo v življenju, so radovedni, se znajo vživeti v druge ljudi in so jim pripravljeni pomagati, vendar svoje učence nagrajujejo predvsem za učno uspešnost, trdo delo, disciplino in spoštovanje avtoritete. Kot ideal imajo en sistem vrednot, vendar v vsakdanjem življenju uporabljajo drug sistem vrednot. Tega razkoraka se ne zavedajo najbolje, kar je lahko velika težava.« (Prav tam, str. 18). Da bi lahko uveljavili zelene vrednote, bi morali najprej prepoznati značilnosti trenutne vrednotne naravnosti in njene posledice. Tipična storilnostna kultura s poudarjanjem učinkovitosti stopnjuje tekmovalnost in strah pred neuspehom ter načenja zaupanje vase. V učinkovitost usmerjena kultura samodejno razdeli posameznike na poražence in zmagovalce, pri čemer pa je zanimivo, da niti slednji nimajo nujno pozitivne samopodobe (Bečaj 2005). Čačinovič Vogrinčič (2008) opozarja, da se mora v šolskem okolju zgoditi paradigmataska sprememba, ki jo razume podobno kot Bečaj, med drugim pa se v svojih številnih empiričnih raziskavah usmeri k preizkušanju možnosti soustvarjalne kulture v šoli. Šola naj po njenem mnenju zagotavlja, da bo učenec soustvarjalec v projektu pomoči zanj. Šola naj tudi vedno znova spodbudi, strokovno podpre in zaveže vse odrasle, ki sooblikujejo otrokovo življenje v šoli, da svoje delo in sodelovanje utemeljijo na dialogu in sodelovanju ter da je tako učenec aktiven udeleženec učnega procesa in procesa pomoči, če pomoč potrebuje. Tudi omenjena avtorica vidi tekmovalno in storilnostno naravnost šolskega okolja kot oviro za doseganje opisanih ciljev.

Namen in kontekst raziskave

V prispevku se opirava na rezultate dveh študij, v katerih sva sodelovali (v eni ali obeh) kot raziskovalni sodelavki. Namen prve študije (Dekleva idr. 2018) z naslovom *Dostopnost organiziranih oblik podpore mladim v psihosocialnih in duševnih težavah in konteksti teh težav* je bil pridobiti okvirno oceno stanja sistemskih podpornih storitev za mlade ter njihove dostopnosti in prilagojenosti potrebam mladih v psihosocialnih stiskah ali njihovih družin. Študija se je pri tem osredotočila na perspektivo mladih. Med drugim nas je zanimalo, kako mladi v vzgojno-izobraževalnih ustanovah iščejo, dojemajo in ocenjujejo pomoč v primeru psihosocialne stiske. Še en namen te študije je bil pridobiti pogled strokovnih delavcev, ki delajo z mladimi v izobraževalnih okoljih, da bi raziskali njihove izkušnje

in pristope, ko se soočajo s stiskami mladih. Druga študija (Dekleva idr. 2021) z naslovom *Podporne mreže mladih v psihosocialnih stiskah* je na podlagi ugotovitev prve študije med drugim imela namen analizirati dejavnike, zaradi katerih mladi ob različnih psihosocialnih stiskah izpadejo iz delujočih podpornih mrež.

Pričujoči članek temelji na rezultatih in ugotovitvah kvalitativnega dela obeh študij v delih, ki so pomembni za vsebinski fokus tega članka. V obeh študijah je bil velik del posvečen raziskovanju dostopnosti podpore mladim, v tem članku pa analizirava šolsko okolje kot eno od ključnih okolij za mlade. Glede na namen prispevka sva določili naslednja raziskovalna vprašanja:

- Katere ovire mladi najpogosteje navajajo pri dostopanju do podpore v šolskem okolju?
- Kako mladi sami ocenjujejo podporne mehanizme in na drugi strani ogrožajoče dejavnike v zvezi s šolo?
- Kako lahko usmeritev šolske skupnosti razumemo kot podporno okolje za mlade?

Metodologija

V prispevku se opirava na del kvalitativnih rezultatov in ugotovitev obeh prej omenjenih študij, v katerih so bili uporabljeni različni raziskovalni pristopi (gl. Dekleva idr. 2018, 2021). Kvalitativna raziskava v obeh študijah se je osredotočila na uporabniško perspektivo, pri čemer je bilo upoštevano dejstvo, da lahko posameznik, ki je doživel psihosocialno stisko, najbolje oceni proces podpore in pri tem poleg golih simptomov razume tudi številne druge vidike svojega vsakdanjega življenja (gl. Bjønness idr. 2020). Pri izbiri uporabniške perspektive smo izhajali tudi iz koncepta socialnega okrevanja, ki poudarja vključenost posameznika v smiselne odnose in njegovo smiselno sodelovanje v družbi (gl. Dekleva idr. 2021).

Udeleženci v raziskavi

Iz prve študije (Dekleva idr. 2018) črpamo rezultate dveh delov kvalitativne raziskave: prvega dela (Dekleva in Tadič v Dekleva idr. 2018, str. 21–120), ki je vključeval vzorec 143 mladih, in drugega dela (Razpotnik v Dekleva idr. 2018, str. 121–139), ki se nanaša na ožji izbor 32 mladih z izraženimi večplastnimi in kompleksnimi težavami. Povprečna starost udeležencev v času intervjuja je bila 21,26 leta, psihosocialne in duševne stiske, o katerih so poročali, pa so se začele pojavljati pri povprečni starosti 12,6 leta. Vzorčenje je potekalo predvsem po načelih snežne kepe, torej oportunistično. Poleg pogledov udeležencev na lastno zgodovino stisk sta nas zanimala tudi njihov retrospektivni pogled na izkušnje z iskanjem podpore in subjektivna ocena te podpore v šolskem kontekstu. Iz druge študije (Dekleva idr. 2021) črpamo predstavitev rezultatov dela kvalitativne raziskave (Klemenčič Rozman in Simić v Dekleva idr. 2021, str. 348–364), ki vključuje osem šolskih svetovalnih delavk, izbranih na podlagi kriterija, da delavke same zaznavajo razvoj dobrih praks na področju obvladovanja psihosocialnih stisk mladih.

Zbiranje podatkov in etični vidik

V obeh študijah so bili za zbiranje podatkov uporabljeni polstrukturirani intervjuji. Za izvajanje intervjujev z mladimi smo usposobili študente in študentke višjih letnikov ali podiplomskega študija socialne pedagogike. Velik del tega usposabljanja, ki je trajalo približno 16 ur, je bil namenjen etičnim vprašanjem raziskave. Pripravili smo uvodno motivacijsko pismo za intervjuvance, letak z informacijami o raziskavi in obrazec za soglasje za izvedbo intervjuja z mladoletnikom ali mladoletnico. Vodje raziskave smo bili v času intervjujev na voljo izvajalcem intervjujev za posvetovanje. Za izvedbo intervjujev je bila pripravljena polstrukturirana shema intervjuja, v kateri so bila opisana tematska področja, ki naj bi jih intervjuji zajemali. S soglasjem intervjuvancev so bili intervjuji zvočno snemani. Po dobesednem prepisu so bili zvočni posnetki izbrisani. Prepisani intervjuji so bili anonimizirani, da bi se izognili tveganju identifikacije intervjuvancev (gl. Dekleva idr. 2018, 2021). Tako pridobljeno gradivo v obeh študijah je bilo nato kvalitativno obdelano z metodo vsebinske analize (gl. Silverman 2001).

Rezultati

V odgovorih na raziskovalna vprašanja, zastavljena v tem prispevku, prepletava rezultate in ključne ugotovitve prej omenjenih študij z na novo dodanimi vsebinskimi poudarki ter jih povezujeva z ugotovitvami sorodnih raziskav in razmisleki različnih avtorjev.

(Ne)dostopnost pomoči mladim v psihosocialni stiski v šolskem okolju

Dekleva in Tadič (v Dekleva idr. 2018, str. 53–120) sta v vsebinski analizi 143 transkriptov intervjujev z mladimi identificirala 183 citatov mladih, povezanih z dogodki v šolskem okolju, od katerih jih 58 zadeva izkušnje s šolsko svetovalno službo. Rezultati kažejo, da so izkušnje mladih s šolsko svetovalno službo mešane, tako pozitivne (22 citatov) kot negativne (36 citatov), vendar nekoliko pogosteje negativne. V analizi odgovorov raziskovalci ugotavljajo štiri vrste ovir, ki so vplivale na proces iskanja pomoči: (1) mladi se niso zavedali svojih težav in niso vedeli, kako poiskati pomoč; (2) šolske svetovalne službe so bile mladim nedostopne; (3) mladi so želeli prikriti svoje težave, ker so se bali ukrepov psihiatrije ali centrov za socialno delo; in (4) mladi so se zaradi razkritja svojih težav bali stigmatizacije in sramu. Slednje je bilo med intervjuvanimi mladimi najbolj izraženo (prav tam). Rezultati nakazujejo, da bi bila krepitev podporne, ne ozko izobraževalne vloge šol koristna za izboljšanje dostopa do pomoči za mlade v stiski, pri čemer je treba upoštevati tudi večplastno naravo pojma dostopa do pomoči. V intervjujih mladi običajno niso poročali, da jim pomoč v šoli ni bila na voljo zaradi odsotnosti svetovalne službe, temveč so poudarjali odnosni vidik ali subjektivno nedostopnost službe. Zadržki mladih glede njihove stigmatizacije jasno kažejo na potrebo po

destigmatizaciji stisk med mladimi in razvoju storitev z nestigmatizirajočim pristopom. Zaskrbljenost zaradi stigmatizacije je verjetno tesno prepletena tudi s poudarjanjem vidikov uspešnosti in produktivnosti mladih v šolskem prostoru ter diskurzom individualizma, v katerem je duševna stiska konceptualizirana kot osebni poraz.

Glede dostopnosti in iskanja podpore v šolskem okolju so mladi pripisali poseben pomen negativnim izkušnjam z vrstniki v šolskem okolju, ki jih šoli ni uspelo preprečiti. Takšne izkušnje lahko med mladimi povzročijo veliko stisko. V tem smislu je mogoče šolo obravnavati ne le kot pasivno v procesu iskanja pomoči, temveč tudi kot okolje, ki prispeva k nastanku stiske. Med negativnimi izkušnjami z vrstniki v šolskem okolju so intervjuvanci izpostavili izogibanje in izolacijo ter zaničevanje in stigmatizacijo. Odnos med izvajalcem pomoči in mladostnikom se je izkazal kot najpomembnejši dejavnik pri ocenjevanju prejete pomoči.

Rezultati obeh študij (Dekleva idr. 2018, 2021), ki temeljita na poročilih mladih, na splošno kažejo na precejšnjo odsotnost vloge šole pri iskanju pomoči za mlade v stiski. Šole običajno niso bile aktivne pobudnice iskanja pomoči mladim, čeprav so bili mladi običajno v stiski že dlje časa, preden so sploh začeli iskati pomoč. To kaže, da njihovih težav v šoli niso opazili ali prepoznali ali pa so jih preprosto prezrli. Šole niti niso bile prvi vir pomoči, ki so ga mladi običajno poiskali, čeprav so šolske svetovalne službe fizično najbližji, najlažje dostopni in na videz najlažje dosegljivi viri pomoči (Dekleva in Tadič v Dekleva idr. 2018, str. 69–70). To še posebej jasno kaže na ključno vlogo subjektivne dinamike dostopnosti pomoči.

Podporni in ogrožajoči vidiki šole

V naši študiji (Dekleva idr. 2018) pričevanja mladih kažejo obrise tekmovalnega, na uspešnosti temelječega pojmovanja izobraževanja, ki je z njihovega vidika dojet predvsem kot prostor za doseganje formalnih dosežkov in kompetenc, ki naj bi omogočali napredovanje po družbeni lestvici in s tem obetali dober družbeni status.

Naj to tezo nekoliko podrobneje pojasniva. Izmed vseh intervjujev smo jih v enem od poglavij (Razpotnik v Dekleva idr. 2018, str. 121–139) izbrali 32, po kriteriju, da se je v njih zgoščalo več vidikov ranljivosti, od obremenilnega družinskega okolja in šolskih težav do težav s telesnim in duševnim zdravjem. V posebni preglednici smo izločili vsako področje in iz intervjujev izbrali podperne in ogrožajoče dejavnike, ki so jih mladi izpostavili v povezavi z vsakim življenjskim kontekstom (družina, šola, vrstniška skupina, druge podperne službe itd.). V kontekstu »šole« sta bila opredeljena le dva podporna vidika, medtem ko je bilo odprtih kar devet vidikov, v katerih je bila šola z vidika mlade osebe v stiski umeščena kot ogrožajoč dejavnik.

Dejavniki v šoli	Vsebinske kategorije, opredeljene iz odgovorov mladih	Pogostost pojavljanja
Podporni	Izraziti osebni angažma koga od učiteljev oz. svetovalnih delavcev	Pogosto
	Prilagodljivost šole individualnim potrebam	Redko
Ogrožajoči	Občutek obsojanja, valjenja krivde na mladostnika v stiski	Pogosto
	Nezaupanje, nejevera in zanikanje stiske mladostnika	Pogosto
	Neinteres šolskih delavcev za stiske mladostnice	Pogosto
	Usmerjenost šolskega prostora zgolj na dosežke	Pogosto
	Vrstniško trpinčenje in ne(ustrezno) odzivanje šole nanj	Pogosto
	Žaljiv in omalovažujoč odnos nekaterih učiteljev	Redko
	Nediskretnost strokovne delavke glede zaupanih težav in zloraba zaupanja	Redko
	Nezaupanje šolskim službam	Pogosto
	Izključevanje iz šolskih programov ali grožnja z izključitvijo	Manj pogosto

Preglednica 1: Podporni in ogrožajoči dejavniki v šoli, ki so jih poudarili mladi z izraženo kompleksno in večplastno problematiko (gl. Razpotnik v Dekleva idr. 2018)

V Preglednici 1 so posamezni dejavniki (vsebinske kategorije) ocenjeni glede na to, kako pogosto se pojavljajo v 32 intervjujih, pri čemer »zelo pogosto« pomeni, da se pojavljajo v večini primerov, »pogosto«, da se pojavljajo vsaj v polovici primerov, »manj pogosto«, da se pojavljajo manj kot v polovici primerov, »redko« pa pomeni, da se pojavijo manj kot petkrat.

Med podpornimi vidiki je bila pogosto omenjena močna osebna vključenost šolske strokovne delavke, medtem ko je bilo prilagajanje šolskega okolja individualnim potrebam mladostnika omenjeno redkeje. Med ogrožajočimi vidiki so bili najpogosteje omenjeni občutek, da so mladi individualno obsojani in krivi za svojo stisko, nezaupanje in nejevera šolskih strokovnih delavcev glede njihove stiske, pomanjkanje zanimanja šolskih strokovnih delavcev za njihovo stisko itd. Manj pogosto ali redko so omenjali žaljiv ali omalovažujoč odnos šolskega osebja do njih in izključitev iz programov ali grožnje z izključitvijo. V širšem smislu je mogoče kot dejavnik, ki je oviral ustrezno podporo mladim, omeniti tudi nepovezanost in pomanjkanje usklajevanja med šolo in drugimi institucijami, npr. centri za socialno varstvo, zdravstvenimi in drugimi službami. Razprave vredna je tudi tema močne osebne vključenosti strokovnjaka kot najbolj podpornem vidiku šolskega okolja. Poudarek na osebni zavzetosti posameznih strokovnih delavcev je vsekakor zanimiva tema, vendar kaže tudi na širšo sliko, v kateri je vprašanje podpore prepuščeno zavzetosti posameznih strokovnih delavcev v današnjem šolskem sistemu. Iskanje rešitev za zaznane izzive je prepuščeno stroki na terenu: učiteljem in drugim šolskim strokovnim delavcem. V okviru naše raziskave Mikuš Kos (v Dekleva idr. 2021, str. 56–57) večkrat poudarja, da je šola prostor izjemnega pomena, saj zajema vse otroke. Zato je pomembneje razmišljati o njeni vrednosti v smislu zagotavljanja podpornega, zaščitnega okolja za vse in zagotavljanja zaščite

pred grožnjami, kot so posledice vojne, psihosocialne stiske, nasilje, medgeneracijski stresi, okoljske grožnje in revščina.

Odprtje šole v skupnost

Pri odgovoru na to raziskovalno vprašanje se opiramo na ugotovitve Klemenčič Rozman in Simič (v Dekleva idr. 2021, str. 348–364), ki sta analizirali dobre prakse v šolah pri obravnavi psihosocialnih stisk mladih. V tem delu raziskave je bila posebna pozornost namenjena tudi delovanju in usmerjenosti šole v prakse/dejavnosti, ki imajo širšo socialnointegracijsko funkcijo, saj omogočajo vključevanje mladih v določene zunanje strukture, kot so lokalna skupnost, projekti in druge organizacije. Osem sodelujočih šolskih svetovalnih delavk je bilo izbranih na podlagi merila, da po lastnem mnenju razvijajo dobre prakse na področju spoprijemanja s psihosocialnimi stiskami mladih.

Ugotovitve kažejo, da je za dobre prakse značilno razumevanje kontekstualnosti psihosocialne stiske. Predstavnice šolskih svetovalnih služb so izrazile tudi močno zaskrbljenost nad tem, da je pogosto treba strokovno presojeti o prioritetah in psihosocialno blagostanje mladih na podlagi tega neposredno konkurira nekaterim drugim ciljem, npr. ciljem šolske uspešnosti, ki naj bi jo bilo (v nasprotju s psihosocialnim blagostanjem mladih) mogoče podkrepiti z razmeroma hitro merljivimi rezultati. Študija dobrih praks v šolah je močno poudarila potrebo po dodatnem usposabljanju in veščinah šolskih svetovalnih delavk za prepoznavanje stiske učencev ter potrebo po ustvarjanju sodelovalnega vzdušja v razredu in splošni socialno vključujoči usmeritvi šole, ki jo je treba izvajati na način etosa šole in razvoja ustrezne šolske kulture. Intervjuji s šolskimi svetovalnimi delavci so razkrili tudi potrebo po depatologizaciji psihosocialnih stisk in po tem, da bi bila zunanja strokovna pomoč dostopnejša, kot je zdaj.

Vendar naše raziskovanje v celoti (gl. Dekleva idr. 2018, 2021) kaže, da so primeri razvoja dobrih praks na tem področju precej osamljeni poskusi, ki jih vodi močna strokovna in etična zagnanost posameznih akterjev in zato zahtevajo visoko stopnjo zavzetosti, ki pa običajno ni sistemsko podprta (gl. tudi Klemenčič Rozman in Dekleva 2019). Vse to govori v prid odpiranju šole skupnosti. Povezovanje šole z drugimi akterji v lokalni skupnosti raziskujejo in o njem pišejo tudi Kos idr. (2019). Sogovorniki v raziskavi (Klemenčič Rozman in Simič v Dekleva idr. 2021, str. 348–364), predstavniki šolskih svetovalnih služb, so poudarili pomen gradnje šolske skupnosti kot temelja za dobro psihosocialno klimo, ki bi lahko bila v podporo vsem mladim, vključenim v šolo.

Razprava

Šola ima lahko zaradi svojega velikega pomena dvorezno vlogo: čeprav je potencialno podporna, se lahko njena zaščitna vloga v kombinaciji z drugimi stresorji hitro umakne na stranski tir ali pa celo deluje kot dodaten dejavnik tveganja, kot

je razvidno iz analize podpornih in ogrožajočih dejavnikov, ki jih mladi zaznavajo v šoli.

Ena od temeljnih funkcij šole je zagotavljanje podpornega in spodbudnega okolja za vse. Iz naše raziskave (gl. Dekleva idr. 2018, 2021) je razvidno, da mladi, ki se soočajo s psihosocialno stisko, šolsko okolje dojemajo predvsem kot okolje, ki je usmerjeno k doseganju storilnostnih ciljev, tj. k omogočanju pridobivanja ocen, prevedljivih v kreditne točke, za katere vse bolj velja, da so nekaj, kar lahko mladim v prihodnosti omogoči napredovanje na zelene višje stopnje šolanja in s tem višji socialni status (Razpotnik in Tadič 2019; Ule 2011).

Ko poskušamo razumeti epidemično naraščanje psihosocialnih stisk, ki ga danes doživljamo v družbenem kontekstu, je ena od tem, ki jo avtorji navajajo kot ključno, pomanjkanje občutka povezanosti in sprejetosti v svojem okolju, s katerim živijo in odraščajo mlade generacije (Wilkinson in Pickett 2012; Verhaeghe 2014).

Psihiatrična stroka, ki je še posebej preobremenjena, ima še vedno primat na področju psihosocialnih stisk. Vendar je, kot je razvidno iz *Muijenovega poročila* (2015) za Slovenijo, pomoč zasnovana preozko, predvsem somatsko, pogosto z zdravili in ne celostno, pri čemer se ne upošteva »ekosistemski pogled« na človeka, kot ga je predstavil ključni avtor tega pristopa, psiholog Urie Bronfenbrenner (1979). Ko na podlagi dosedanje razprave razmišljamo o celostnejši podpori otrokom in mladostnikom, ki bi zagotavljala tako preprečevanje psihosocialnih stisk kot tudi zaščitno okolje, ko se te pojavijo, je eden od pomembnih sistemov, na katerega se lahko v prihodnosti zanesemo, šola (gl. tudi McGorry idr. 2014; Fjermestad idr. 2020; Kamody in Bloch 2022). Po mnenju šolskih svetovalnih delavcev, vključenih v našo študijo, lahko šole mobilizirajo dodatne vire podpore, tako formalne kot neformalne, in razširijo svoje mreže, kar lahko koristi vsem udeleženiim. Zlasti mladi intervjuvanci v študiji izražajo pomanjkanje razumevanja šole kot potencialno podpornega in varnega prostora. V primeru psihosocialnih stisk je torej socialna in zaščitna razsežnost šole nekaj, kar v pojmovanju šole z vidika naših sogovornikov manjka, prav to pa je po našem mnenju vloga, ki bi jo šola morala imeti, če želi biti zaščitni dejavnik za mlade v današnjem svetu. Ko se šola poveže s posamezniki in skupinami v skupnosti, to sodelovanje opolnomoči obe strani ter poveča trud in motivacijo za doseganje ciljev, ki jih posameznik sam ne bi mogel doseči. Partnerstvo med šolo in skupnostjo je še posebej pomembno za učence iz prikrajsanih okolij, tj. učence, ki se pogosteje soočajo s psihosocialnimi stiskami (Gregorčič Mrvar idr. 2016). Avtorji poudarjajo tudi koristi za šolske strokovne delavce: šolski delavci so lahko pri svojem delu toliko učinkovitejši, kolikor bolj poznajo posameznike in institucije v skupnosti, na katere lahko napotijo učence ali njihove starše, razvijajo veščine za delo s prostovoljci, mentorji ipd. Prav tako pridobijo znanje in uporabijo vire v skupnosti za svoje vzgojno-izobraževalno ali svetovalno delo (prav tam).

Ena od posledic pandemije je, da se otroci na ravni razredov ne povezujejo toliko kot v preteklosti. Starejši ko so, bolj je to izrazito (npr. Darmody idr. 2020; Doolan idr. 2020). Ne vedo, na koga se obrniti, in se med seboj ne poznajo zares; dejstvo, da so ustvarili skupine na družbenih omrežjih, jim ne daje nujno občutka varnosti ali pripadnosti, zlasti če ta nima predhodne realne podlage. Individua-

lizem, ki se je kot že obstoječa družbena težnja med pandemijo le še okreplil, ne popušča tako zlahka. Ni samoumevno, da bo do ponovne rasti ali okrepitve socialnih stikov prišlo samo od sebe, če ni spodbud, možnosti, modelov ali priložnosti.

West-Burnham (2011) trdi, da so šole produkt svojega okolja; uspešne so toliko, kolikor so uspešne skupnosti in družine, ki so vanje vključene. V številnih družbenih okoljih je tako samoumevno, da so šole osredotočene predvsem na akademske dosežke, pri čemer se njihova usmerjenost v skupnost zanemarja. Vendar pa ima skupnostni pristop šol velik potencial. Omogoča lahko izkoriščanje prednosti že obstoječih mrež v nekaterih skupnostih ali pa pomaga razpršeni skupnosti, da se začne povezovati in tako ustvarja nove socialne mreže, ki so bistveni del skupnega iskanja in načrtovanja odzivov (Kvaternik in Kodele 2010). Šolski prostor je idealno okolje za izvajanje preventivnih skupnostnih projektov.

Če želimo, da šole postanejo povezane skupnosti, je treba najprej in predvsem odpraviti notranje neenakosti, ki obstajajo v šolah, vključno z neenakostmi, s katerimi otroci vstopajo v šolo. V Sloveniji nas močan javni izobraževalni sistem (in drugi javni sistemi) vsekakor varuje pred potenciranjem neenakosti, žal pa ni zadostno varovalo pred trendi naraščanja neenakosti, ki se pojavljajo v vseh družbenih sferah po svetu (gl. Wilkinson in Pickett 2012). Medveš (2018) trdi, da se dandanes prevelik del finančne rasti usmerja v povečevanje zasebnega udobja namesto v družbeni razvoj. V takšnih razmerah je varčevalna naravnost državnih proračunov vedno v korist kapitala, medtem ko se socialne razlike povečujejo. Po njegovem mnenju je to značilno za sodobne procese globalizacije. Poleg ekonomske neenakosti, ki jo zaznavamo znotraj posameznih držav (Bauman 2014), je pomembna tema tudi globalna neenakost, vendar ta presega domet tega članka. Vsekakor pa je neenakost poleg odpiranja šole skupnosti tema, ki jo bo treba v prihodnosti postaviti na začetek agende.

Sklep

Na podlagi najinih raziskovalnih vprašanj lahko izpeljeva več sklepov. Obstajajo objektivne in subjektivne ovire za dostopnost podpore mladim, ki se soočajo s psihosocialno stisko. Bistveni oviri sta zagotovo patologizacija in medikalizacija, ki sta še vedno zelo prisotni v retoriki, povezani s stiskami. Potrebe mladih so kompleksne, zato morajo biti tudi odzivi na te potrebe kompleksni in kontekstualizirani. Šola je pomembno okolje, v katerem bi morala potekati normalizacija psihosocialnih stisk; zagotoviti bi morala varen prostor za odprt dialog o izzivih, s katerimi se soočajo mladi.

Z vidika mladih, ki se soočajo s psihosocialno stisko, je podporna vloga šole izrazito prešibka. To je še bolj poudarjeno, ko govorimo o mladih z bolj kompleksnimi potrebami, ko se pri njih prepletajo različne ranljivosti. Z vidika mladih in šolskih svetovalnih delavk je za zadovoljevanje potreb učencev, ki se soočajo s stiskami, potrebno dodatno angažiranje, kar kaže na to, da manjka bolj sistemsko zavedanje o podporni vlogi šole. Po mnenju učencev in strokovnih delavcev umanjka še en vidik, in sicer boljše sodelovanje med šolo in drugimi podpornimi

službami za mlade, ki se soočajo s psihosocialnimi stiskami. Šola bi pri tem lahko imela povezovalno vlogo, zlasti če bi svojo vlogo središča skupnosti jemala zares.

Šole, ki podpirajo mlade na psihosocialnem področju in so zanje varovale, so tiste, ki so občutljive, odprte za skupnost in delujejo prosocialno, tiste, ki spodbujajo in prakticirajo sočutje. Vprašanje je seveda, ali je to združljivo z izobraževalnim okoljem, ki je usmerjeno predvsem v učno uspešnost in kvantificirane rezultate. To je eno od vodilnih vprašanj tega razmisleka. Sklenemo lahko, da sta šola kot spodbudno in podporno okolje za vse in šola predvsem kot sredstvo pridobivanja točk vsaj do neke mere nezdržljivi perspektivi in da se pri razmišljanju o prihodnosti izobraževalnega sistema soočamo s pomembnim vprašanjem o prioritetah.

Ali je izobraževalni sistem sposoben tovrstne refleksije? Kar zadeva vizije njegovega razvoja, ne manjka modelov in idej, na katere se lahko opremo. Eden najnovejših primerov takšne vizije je obsežen Unescov dokument *Reimagining ...* (2021), ki močno poudarja eno od ključnih tem naše raziskave – odpiranje šol skupnosti – ter pedagogiko sodelovanja in solidarnosti, pa tudi okoljska vprašanja v povezavi z izobraževanjem. Glavno vlogo pedagoških delavcev vidi v tem, da si prizadevajo »zagotoviti sodelovanje učencev, zato morajo vzpostaviti odnose skrbi in zaupanja« (prav tam). S tem, ko se opirajo na ideje soustvarjanja, dialoga in ustvarjanja prostorov vzajemnega in problemskega učenja, predlogi v tem dokumentu spominjajo na nekatere starejše pedagoške poglede, zlasti na ideje radikalne in kritične pedagogike, ki je po svoji naravi transformativna. Pravzaprav je transformativna vloga šole v Unescovem dokumentu na prvem mestu: »Pedagogika bi morala temeljiti na sodelovanju in solidarnosti ter krepiti zmožnosti učencev in učiteljev, da v zaupanju sodelujejo pri preoblikovanju sveta« (prav tam, str. 50). V dokumentu je tudi močna komponenta solidarnosti s poudarkom na ustvarjanju pravičnejših razmerij moči. Poetičen podnaslov enega od poglavij je »Učenje zdravljenja ran nepravilnosti«, drugega pa »Učenje za odučevanje razdeljenosti«. Ideje transformativne pedagogike so z nami že desetletja in ne nazadnje nosijo drugačno epistemologijo od zahodne z njenimi idejami o rasti in nenehnem linearnem napredku.

Po najinem mnenju je torej način za spremembo paradigme odmik od retorike nenehnega linearnega napredka ter zbiranja in merjenja točk in kreditov kot glavne namena izobraževanja. Gre za obrat k razsežnostim odnosnosti, sodelovanja in odprtosti za izzive in vire skupnosti, k razmisleku o aktualnih, porajajočih se izzivih v šolskih skupnostih. Gre za avtonomijo pedagoškega poklica, da se odziva na aktualna družbena vprašanja tukaj in zdaj, na edinstven, lokaliziran način, ki pa kljub temu upošteva svojo vpetost v globalni sistem in se razume kot njegov neizogibni del. Tako se lahko šola v partnerstvu s skupnostjo bolje spopade z izzivi, kot so naraščanje psihosocialnih stisk med mladimi ter trenutno nezadovoljivi in preozko usmerjeni odzivi na ta vprašanja.

Literatura in viri

- Bauman, Z. (2014). *Does the richness of the few benefit us all?* Cambridge: Polity.
- Bečaj, J. (2005). Radi bi imeli strpne in solidarne učence, silimo jih pa v tekmovalnost in individualizem. *Vzgoja in izobraževanje*, 36, št. 6, str. 16–23.
- Bjønness, S., Viksveen, P., Johannessen, J. O. in Storm, M. (2020). User participation and shared decision-making in adolescent mental healthcare: a qualitative study of healthcare professionals' perspectives. *Child Adolesc Psychiatry Mental Health*, 14, št. 2, str. 2–9.
- Bronfenbrenner, U. (1979). *The ecology of human development: Experiments by nature and design*. London: Harvard University Press.
- Cefai, C. in Cavioni, V. (2015). Beyond PISA: Schools as contexts for the promotion of children's mental health and well-being. *Contemp School Psychol*, 19, št. 4, str. 233–242.
- Cesar, K., Crnkovič, N., Selak, Š., Šorgo, A. in Gabrovec, B. (2021). *Raziskava o doživljanju epidemije COVID-19 med študenti: poročilo o opravljeni raziskavi (med izrednimi študenti)*. Ljubljana: Nacionalni inštitut za javno zdravje. Dostopno na: https://www.nijz.si/sites/www.nijz.si/files/datoteke/raziskava_o_dozivljanju_epidemije_covid-19_med_studenti_medicine_in_zdravstvenih_ved.pdf (pridobljeno 27. 5. 2022).
- Collishaw, S. (2015). Annual research review: Secular trends in child and adolescent mental health. *Journal of a Child Psychol Psychiatry*, 56, št. 3, str. 370–393.
- Čačinovič Vogrinčič, G. (2008). *Soustvarjanje v šoli: učenje kot pogovor*. Ljubljana: Zavod Republike Slovenije za šolstvo.
- Darmody, M., Smyth, E. in Russell, H. (2020). *The implications of the COVID-19 pandemic for policy in relation to children and young people*. ESRI Surv. Stat. Rep. Ser. issue 94. Dostopno na: https://www.esri.ie/system/files/publications/SUSTAT94_3.pdf (pridobljeno 17. 9. 2021).
- Dekleva, B., Klemenčič Rozman M. M., Razpotnik Š., Sande M., Škraban J. in Tadič D. (2018). *Dostopnost organiziranih oblik podpore mladim v psihosocialnih in duševnih težavah in konteksti teh težav: preliminarna študija*. Raziskovalno poročilo. Ljubljana: Pedagoška fakulteta, Univerza v Ljubljani. Dostopno na: http://pefprints.pef.uni-lj.si/5010/1/Dekleva_Dostopnost.pdf (pridobljeno 3. 2. 2022).
- Dekleva, B., Grbec, H., Klemenčič Rozman, M. M., Lah, A., Leskošek, V., Mikuš-Kos, A., Polajžer, P., Rapuš-Pavel, J., Razpotnik, Š., Sande, M., Simič, S. in Tadič, D. (2021). *Podporne mreže mladih v psihosocialnih stiskah: zaključno poročilo ciljnega raziskovalnega projekta*. Ljubljana: UL, Fakulteta za socialno delo; UL, Pedagoška fakulteta. Dostopno na: <http://pefprints.pef.uni-lj.si/7047/> (pridobljeno 8. 12. 2021).
- Doolan, K., Barada, V., Burić, I., Krolo, K. in Tonković, Z. (2020). *Student life during the COVID-19 pandemic: Europe-wide insights*. European Students' Union. Dostopno na: https://www.esu-online.org/wp-content/uploads/2021/04/0010-ESU-SIderalCovid19_WEB.pdf (pridobljeno 14. 7. 2022).
- Fjermestad, K. W., Wergeland, G. J., Rogde, A., Bjaastad, J. F., Heiervang, E. in Haugland, B. S. (2020). School-based targeted prevention compared to specialist mental health treatment for youth anxiety. *Child and Adolescent Mental Health*, 25, št. 2, str. 102–109.
- Gregorčič Mrvar, P., Kalin, J., Mažgon, J. Muršak, J. in Šteh, B. (2016). *Skupnost in šola: vrata se odpirajo v obe smeri*. Ljubljana: Znanstvena založba Filozofske fakultete Univerze v Ljubljani.
- Hasking, P., Lewis, S. P., Bloom, E., Brausch, A., Kaess, M. in Robinson, K. (2021). Impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on students at elevated risk of self-injury: The importance of virtual and online resources. *School Psychology International*, 42, št. 1, str. 57–78.
- Jeriček Klanšček, H. (2016). *Mladostniki o duševnem zdravju*. Ljubljana: Nacionalni inštitut za javno zdravje.

- Jeriček Klanšček, H., Koprivnikar, H., Drev, A., Zupanič, T. in Hribar, K. (2017). Zdravje in vedenja slovenskih mladostnikov – rezultati mednarodne raziskave. *Iskanja*, 35, št. 55/56, str. 10–19.
- Jeriček Klanšček, H., Roškar, M., Drev, A., Pucelj, V., Koprivnikar, H., Zupanič, T. in Korošec, A. (2019). *Z zdravjem povezana vedenja v šolskem obdobju med mladostniki v Sloveniji*. Ljubljana: Nacionalni inštitut za javno zdravje.
- Jeriček Klanšček, H., Saška Roškar, S., Vinko, M. in Hočevar Grom, A. (2018). *Duševno zdravje otrok in mladostnikov v Sloveniji*. Ljubljana: Nacionalni inštitut za duševno zdravje.
- Kamody, R. C. in Bloch, M. H. (2022). Editorial: Schools on the frontline of suicide prevention. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry*, 63, št. 8, str. 833–835.
- Klemenčič Mirazchijski, E. (2017). *Razvoj modela nacionalne mreže služb za duševno zdravje otrok in mladostnikov*. Koper, CenterKontura: UP, Pedagoška fakulteta.
- Klemenčič Rozman, M. M. in Dekleva, B. (2019). Stališča šolskih delavk in modeli dobre prakse v šolah v zvezi z duševnimi stiskami mladih. *Socialna pedagogika*, 23, št. 3/4, str. 218–243.
- Kos, Ž., Tašner, V. in Gaber, S. (2019). Schools and the collaborative commons. *Teorija in praksa: revija za družbena vprašanja*, 56, št. 3, str. 896–910.
- Kvaternik, I. in Kodele, T. (2010). Sodelovanje in soustvarjanje: skupnostni projekt na področju preventive v šolskem okolju. *Socialna pedagogika*, 14, št. 3, str. 347–362.
- Lavrič, M. in Deželan, T. (ur.) (2021). *Mladina 2020: položaj mladih v Sloveniji*. Maribor: Univerza v Mariboru, Univerzitetna založba; Ljubljana: Založba Univerze v Ljubljani.
- McGorry, P. D., Goldstone, S. D., Parker, A. G., Rickwood, D. J. in Hickie, I. B. (2014). Cultures for mental health care of young people: an Australian blueprint for reform. *Lancet Psychiatry*, 7, št. 1, str. 559–568.
- McGorry, P. D., Purcell, R., Hickie, I. B. in Jorm, A. F. (2007). Investing in youth mental health is a best buy. *Medical Journal of Australia*, 187, št. 7, str. 5–7.
- Medveš, Z. (2018). Vzgoja med etičnim diskurzom in zdravo pametjo. *Sodobna pedagogika*, 69(135), št. 1, str. 44–69.
- Mikuš Kos, A. (2017). *Duševno zdravje otrok današnjega časa*. Radovljica: Didakta.
- Mikuš Kos, A. (2019). Duševne težave in motnje otrok ter mladostnikov – kako zmanjšati razkorak med potrebami in možnostmi pomoči. *Socialna pedagogika*, 23, št. 3/4, str. 273–299.
- Muijen, M. (2015). *Mental health Mission Slovenia, 19–21 April 2015*. Neobjavljeno poročilo. Ljubljana: WHO Regional Office for Europe.
- Pergar Kuščer, M. in Razdevšek Pučko, C. (2005). Sodelovanje in tekmovanje v šoli. *Sodobna pedagogika*, 56, št. 3, str. 98–109.
- Razpotnik, Š. in Tadič, D. (2019). Refleksija sodobnega šolskega prostora na Pedagoški fakulteti Univerze v Ljubljani. *Vzgoja in izobraževanje*, 50, št. 5/6, str. 30–38.
- Reimagining our futures together: a new social contract for education* (2021). International Commission on the Futures of Education, UNESCO.
- Rovšek, M. (2020). Med pravičnostjo, kakovostjo in učnimi dosežki v osnovni šoli. *Šolsko polje*, 3, št. 1/2, str. 167–189.
- Rupnik Vec, T. in Slivar, B. (2019). *Vpliv različnih dejavnikov na doživljanje in znake stresa pri učencih v 6. in 8. razredu osnovne šole*. Poročilo o raziskavi. Ljubljana: Zavod RS za šolstvo.
- Schwartz, K. D., Exner-Cortens, D., McMorris, C. A., Makarenko, E., Arnold, P., Van Bavel, M., Williams, S. in Canfield, R. (2021). COVID-19 and student well-being: Stress and mental health during return-to-school. *Canadian Journal of School Psychology*, 36, št. 2, str. 166–185.

- Silverman, D. (2001). *Interpreting qualitative data: methods for analysing talk, text and interaction*. London: Sage.
- Ule, M. (2011). Spremembe odraščanja in nove identitetne politike. *Sodobna pedagogika*, 62, št. 3, str. 90–103.
- Ule, M. (2011a). *Za vedno mladi?: socialna psihologija odraščanja*. Ljubljana: Fakulteta za družbene vede, Založba FDV.
- Ule, M. (2015). Vloga staršev v izobraževalnih potekih otrok v Sloveniji. *Sodobna pedagogika*, 66, št. 1, str. 30–45.
- Verhaeghe, P. (2014). *What about me? The struggle for identity in a market-based society*. London: Scribe Publication.
- West Burnham, J. (2011). Kje so meje? Izobraževanje, šola in skupnost. *Vodenje v vzgoji in izobraževanju*, 9, št. 2, str. 3–13.
- Wilkinson, R. G. in Pickett, K. (2012). *Velika ideja: zakaj je enakost boljša za vse*. Novo mesto: Penca.

Špela RAZPOTNIK and Jana RAPUŠ PAVEL (University of Ljubljana, Faculty of Education, Slovenia)

YOUNG PEOPLE, PSYCHOSOCIAL DISTRESS AND SCHOOL AS A POTENTIAL SUPPORTIVE FACTOR

Abstract: The increasing incidence of psychosocial distress as a trend is intensifying in the economically developed world. Psychosocial distress is becoming more complex and is experienced by increasing numbers of young people and, indirectly, their families and even school classes. At the same time, sources of support are scarce and difficult to access. Experts in the field of psychosocial distress are therefore increasingly emphasising the importance of engaging community resources that reach young people. The school environment is certainly an example of this. In this article, we draw on sources linking psychosocial distress and the school environment. We present recent research on the first-person perspectives of young people with experiences of psychosocial distress, focusing on the school environment. Based on the research findings, we outline a vision of how this environment could function more supportively for young people, focusing on the prosocial orientation of the school environment in terms of community orientation. In the case of young people experiencing psychosocial distress, the prosocial and protective dimension of school is missing from the concept of school, not least because of the foregrounding of conflicting priorities (competitiveness and individualism). We argue that it is precisely this prosocial and protective role that should be played by the school if it is to be a supporting factor.

Keywords: young people, psychosocial distress, school, community

E-mail for correspondence: spela.razpotnik@pef.uni-lj.si

Špela Razpotnik and Jana Rapuš Pavel

Young People, Psychosocial Distress and School as a Potential Supportive Factor

Abstract: The increasing incidence of psychosocial distress as a trend is intensifying in the economically developed world. Psychosocial distress is becoming more complex and is experienced by increasing numbers of young people and, indirectly, their families and even school classes. At the same time, sources of support are scarce and difficult to access. Experts in the field of psychosocial distress are therefore increasingly emphasising the importance of engaging community resources that reach young people. The school environment is certainly an example of this. In this article, we draw on sources linking psychosocial distress and the school environment. We present recent research on the first-person perspectives of young people with experiences of psychosocial distress, focusing on the school environment. Based on the research findings, we outline a vision of how this environment could function more supportively for young people, focusing on the prosocial orientation of the school environment in terms of community orientation. In the case of young people experiencing psychosocial distress, the prosocial and protective dimension of school is missing from the concept of school, not least because of the foregrounding of conflicting priorities (competitiveness and individualism). We argue that it is precisely this prosocial and protective role that should be played by the school if it is to be a supporting factor.

Keywords: young people, psychosocial distress, school, community

UDC: 38.015.4

Scientific paper

Špela Razpotnik, PhD., associate professor, University of Ljubljana, Faculty of Education, Department of social pedagogy, Kardeljeva ploščad 16, SI-1000 Ljubljana, Slovenia; e-mail: spela.razpotnik@pef.uni-lj.si

Jana Rapuš Pavel, PhD., associate professor, University of Ljubljana, Faculty of Education, Department of social pedagogy, Kardeljeva ploščad 16, SI-1000 Ljubljana, Slovenia; e-mail: jana.pavel@pef.uni-lj.si

Introduction

At a recent professional meeting, the principal of a Ljubljana school coined the phrase »the children are not okay«. This conveys a concern about what is happening to young people in contemporary society, reflecting observations and research findings about the increasing extent of psychosocial distress among young people. Although this trend existed prior to the epidemic, the recent international health crisis has certainly intensified the situation (e.g. Cesar et al. 2021; Hasking et al. 2021; Jeriček Klanšček et al. 2017; Lavrič et al. 2021; Mc Gory et al. 2007; Schwartz et al. 2021). For schools to better fulfil their preventive and supportive functions in terms of children's psychosocial well-being, reflection on the current state of priorities is necessary. Both the professional and the general public are in unanimous agreement that changes to the education system are necessary; it is a system that has not undergone significant change for a long time, while the circumstances in which it is embedded are changing rapidly (e.g. Čačinovič Vogrinčič 2008; Razpotnik and Tadič 2019; Reimagining... 2021). In this article, we present recent Slovenian research on the first-person perspectives of young people with experiences of psychosocial distress, focusing on the school environment (Dekleva et al. 2018; Dekleva et al. 2021). Based on the research findings, we outline a vision of how this environment could function more supportively for young people, focusing on the prosocial orientation of the school environment in terms of connectedness to the community.

The rise of psychosocial distress among young people

Mikuš Kos (2017, 2019) explains that the term psychosocial distress assumes that it is mainly caused by an unfavourable environment, i.e. socio-environmental factors, such as repeated stress, traumatic experiences, persistent adverse family situations or peer violence. Between mental health and mental disorders, there is a continuum of phenomena and problems that are part of life (crisis periods, grief, emotional distress caused by love disappointments, distress caused by school

failure, etc.). These are emotional problems, distress and crisis situations that are transitory and subside when there is no longer any cause for the emotional equilibrium to be upset (ibid.).

In the present article, we use the term *psychosocial distress*, which is broader than the concept of mental health problems, encompassing the subjective assessment of one's own condition and, above all, the social context of the problems. It also represents a broader continuum than just clinically diagnosed psychiatric problems. Other related terms, such as mental health problems, stress and mental distress, may appear in individual references within the article.

Let us look at some more data that support the thesis that psychosocial distress among young people is on the rise. According to a study conducted by the Slovenian National Institute of Public Health, the prevalence of mental health problems among young people under 18 has increased by 64% in the last 25 years (Jeriček Klanšček et al. 2018). This trend is, of course, linked to complex and diverse social aspects, one of which is certainly the increased attention paid by professionals to this area. It is also a result of individuals being more informed about their own psychosocial situation and thus recognising a wider range of different conditions in themselves and others than was the case in the past. Collishaw (2015) reported an increase in the diagnosis and treatment of child and adolescent mental health disorders in the UK in recent decades. McGorry et al. (2007) found that 19% of young people in Australia aged 13–17 reported mental health problems. This figure increases to 27% for the 18–24 age group, meaning that one in four adolescents experience drug abuse, depression or anxiety, and most commonly a combination of these (ibid.). In Slovenia, too, these kinds of problems became acute during the pandemic, leading to the psychosocial distress of young people becoming firmly established on the public agenda. For example, the National Institute of Public Health conducted a study (Cesar et al. 2021) that brought data on the mental or psychosocial distress of the student population to public attention. To illustrate this point, before the pandemic, 32% of students sought help for mental distress, while during the pandemic, 56% of the survey participants sought help for mental distress, with about one-third of them seeking help frequently. The survey Slovenian Youth 2020 (Lavrič and Deželan 2021) concludes that the main predictors of distress among young people are female gender, poorer relationships with parents, more screen time, poorer school climate and poorer family financial situation. In a qualitative study by the National Institute of Public Health (Jeriček Klanšček 2016), children and adolescents shared their perceptions and ideas about mental health. The young people in the study mainly associated the perception of mental health problems with stress at school due to various obligations and relationships with teachers and peers. In examining the impact of various factors on schoolchildren's experiences and symptoms of stress, Rupnik Vec and Slivar (2019) found that almost a fifth of 10- and 13-year-old students experience high levels of stress in relation to school. Jeriček Klanšček et al. (2019) also reported on an international survey of health-related behaviour involving Slovenian children, which found that less than a third of 11-year-olds and less than a seventh of 13-year-olds liked school.

In the economically developed Western world, despite the relative material affluence, there is, therefore, an increasing number of children and young people who are expressing psychosocial distress or who are seeking, or rather trying to find, support in this area. At the same time, studies have indicated that youth mental health services are inadequate in relation to the needs in this area and the declared priority that they should represent (see Klemenčič Mirazchiyski 2017). Similarly, other authors have highlighted poor intersectoral integration (Muijen 2015). In a report analysing the situation in Slovenia, Muijen (ibid.) highlighted the exaggerated extent of inpatient and psychiatric support while highlighting the lack of community-based support as a priority for Slovenia.

Competitiveness vs. cooperation

When we think about changes to the education system, we necessarily examine different criteria regarding what constitutes a good and successful education system. The first source of criteria is usually international comparisons of student achievement. The most established of these is the OECD's system (Programme for International Student Assessment, PISA), which ranks countries according to externally set criteria in terms of how well students perform in tests, particularly in science, language and mathematics. However, a growing number of critics (e.g. Cefai and Cavioni 2015) point out that the education system, and its mission, is much more than the acquisition of performance competences and the reproduction of these in tests in selected subjects. Rovšek (2020) has written about broadening the concept of equity in schools and raises the question of how schools could provide a more appropriate response to the needs of a wider range of pupils, including those who are often simply overlooked or pushed into segregated forms of education (e.g. children with disabilities, children from families with a Roma or migrant background and with a lower socioeconomic status or a particularly burdensome family background). The area of children's psychosocial well-being, which is linked with the theme of the growing distress faced by young people, is just one of the areas that are not sufficiently recognised in the school environment. Specifically, Cefai and Cavioni (2015) criticised this type of one-dimensional (achievement-based) approach for its narrow focus on a limited range of demonstrated cognitive abilities, which is said to promote a very narrow view of education, one that focuses primarily on preparing students for the labour market. In their reflection, the authors advocate a "broader educational agenda", which for them means creating people who are academically but also socially and emotionally literate and who are sufficiently capable and mentally resilient to navigate the uncertainties that characterise modern life (ibid.). The UNESCO document entitled *Reimagining Our Futures Together: A New Social Contract for Education* (2021) also touches upon measuring achievement. »To say that something cannot be quantified, however, is not to say that meaningful progress can never be observed. The goal of cooperation, for example, can be empirically observed when a group of students navigate through processes of negotiation, conflict reso-

lution and experimentation, and throughout this process increase their capacities to listen ...» (p. 55). The authors add that »Teachers should have the latitude to determine when competitive activities can be drawn on to serve specific pedagogical goals, rather than responding to external pressures that relate to benchmarks that are often distant and unknown«. If we look only at the system of grades and credits (points) for promotion and the choice of further education at different levels of education, we see that the promotion of competition is part of a socialisation process to prepare students for later roles in social life (Pergar Kuščer and Razdevšek Pučko 2005). Grades are supposed to reflect knowledge, but a problem arises when the competition for grades turns into competition for high grades rather than for deeper knowledge. This trend is clearly replacing more collaborative forms of learning (ibid.). Peklaj (2001) researched collaborative learning and found that it is effective in deepening the knowledge and understanding of learning content. It also has an important effect on the development of critical thinking and complex reasoning, contributes to the production of new ideas and solutions and is an important factor in the development of group cohesiveness.

At this point, we can also mention Bečaj (2005), who highlighted the fact that social values and school culture define how a school performs its educational function. As he explains, »Schools would like to have children who are tolerant, enjoy life, are curious, can empathise with other people and are willing to help them, but they reward their pupils above all for their academic performance, hard work, discipline and respect for authority. They have one value system as an ideal but apply another in their daily lives. They are not very aware of this gap, and this may be a major problem« (ibid., p. 18). To put the desired values into practice, we should first identify the characteristics of the current value orientation and its consequences. With its emphasis on efficiency, a typical performance-oriented culture intensifies competition and fear of failure, while undermining self-confidence. It automatically divides individuals into losers and winners and, interestingly, even the latter do not necessarily have a positive self-image (ibid.; see also Ule 2011a, 2015). Čačinovič Vogrinčič (2008) pointed out that a paradigm shift needs to take place in the school environment, which she understands in a similar way to Bečaj (2005). In her empirical studies, she focuses, inter alia, on testing the possibilities of a co-creative culture in school. According to her, the school should ensure that the student is a co-creator in the project of supporting him- or herself. The school should repeatedly encourage, professionally support and commit all adults who shape the child's life at school to ground their work in dialogue and cooperation and to ensure that the student is an active participant in both the learning process and the process of gaining support, if he or she needs it (ibid.). The author also sees a competitive and performance-oriented school environment as an obstacle to achieving these goals.

Purpose and context of the research

In the present paper, we drew on the results of two studies in which the authors were involved (one or both) as research collaborators. The aim of the first study (Dekleva et al. 2018), entitled »Accessibility of Organised Forms of Support for Young People with Psychosocial and Mental Health Problems and their Contexts«, was to carry out an indicative assessment of the state of play of systemic support services, their accessibility and their adaptation to the needs of young people with psychosocial problems or their families. The study also focused on the perspectives of young people. We were interested in how young people in educational institutions sought, perceived and evaluated help in the event of psychosocial distress. Another specific purpose of this study was to gain the perspectives of practitioners who work with young people within educational contexts in order to investigate their experiences and ways of intervening when faced with young people's distress. Building on the findings of the first study, the second study (Dekleva et al. 2021), entitled »Support Networks for Young People in Psychosocial Adversity«, aimed, among other things, at analysing the factors that lead young people to drop out of functioning support networks in the face of diverse psychosocial adversities.

The present paper draws on the results and findings of the qualitative part of the two studies, which are relevant to the focus or topic of the paper. We decided to investigate the accessibility of support in a broader sense, and we therefore analysed the school environment as one of the key environments for young people. With regard to the purpose of this paper, we established the following research questions:

- What are the barriers most frequently cited by young people in accessing support within the school environment?
- How do young people evaluate supportive mechanisms and factors of distress in school?
- How can school community orientation be understood as a supportive environment for young people?

Methodology

In the present paper, we drew on part of the qualitative results and conclusions of the two aforementioned studies, in which different research approaches were used (see Dekleva et al. 2018; Dekleva et al. 2021). The qualitative research of both studies focused on the user's perspective, considering the fact that an individual who has experienced psychosocial distress can best evaluate the support process and, in doing so, can understand many other aspects of his or her daily life, in addition to his or her symptoms (see Bjønness et al. 2020). In selecting the user's perspective, the research also considered the concept of social recovery, which emphasises the involvement of the individual in meaningful relationships and his or her meaningful participation in society (see Dekleva et al. 2021).

Participants

From the first study (Dekleva et al. 2018), we draw on the results of two parts of the qualitative research: the first part (Dekleva et al. 2018, p. 21–120) included a sample of 143 young people, and the second part (Razpotnik in Dekleva et al. 2018, p. 121–139) referred to a shortlist of 32 young people with expressed multifaceted and complex problems. The average age of the participants at the time of the interviews was 21.26 years, and the psychosocial and mental problems reported by them began to appear at an average age of 12.6 years. The sampling took place mainly according to the principles of snowballing, that is, opportunistically. In addition to the participants' views on their own history of distress, we were also interested in their retrospective views of their experiences of seeking support and their subjective assessments of this support in the school context. From the second study (Dekleva et al. 2021), we drew on the presentation of the results of part of the qualitative research (Dekleva et al. 2021, p. 348–364), which includes eight school counsellors selected based on the criterion that they perceive themselves to be developing good practices in the field of coping with young people's psychosocial distress.

Data collection and ethical considerations

Semi-structured interviews were used for data collection in both studies. Senior or postgraduate students in social pedagogy were trained to conduct interviews with young people who had experienced mental distress and problems. A large part of the interviewer training, which consisted of approximately 16 hours, was devoted to the ethical issues of the research. For the interviewees, we prepared an introductory letter of motivation, a leaflet with information about the research and a form for consent to conduct an interview with a minor. The professional researchers conducting the research were available to the interviewers for consultation during the interview period. A semi-structured interview scheme was prepared to execute the interviews, outlining the thematic areas that they should cover. With the consent of the interviewees, the interviews were audio-recorded. After being transcribed verbatim, the audio recordings were deleted. The transcribed interviews were anonymised to avoid the risk of identifying interviewees (see Dekleva et al. 2018, 2021). The material obtained in this way in the two studies was then processed qualitatively using content analysis (see Silverman, 2001).

Results

In the answers to the research questions posed in the present paper, we interweave the results and key findings of the aforementioned studies with the newly added substantive focus and connect them with the findings of related research and reflections by various authors.

(In)accessibility of support for young people in psychosocial distress in the school environment

In a content analysis of 143 transcripts of youth interviews, Dekleva et al. (2018, p. 53–120) identified 183 quotes from young people related to events in the school environment, 58 of which concerned experiences with the school counselling service. The results show that the experiences of young people with school counselling services are mixed, both positive (22 quotes) and negative (36 quotes), but slightly more often negative. In the analysis of the responses, the researchers identified four types of barriers that affected the help-seeking process: (1) young people were not fully aware of their problems and did not know how to seek help; (2) school counselling services were inaccessible; (3) young people wanted to conceal their problems because they were afraid of repressive action on the part of psychiatry or social work centres; and (4) young people were afraid of stigmatisation and shame for revealing their problems. The latter was the most prominent among the young people interviewed (*ibid.*).

The results suggest that strengthening the »non-educational« role of schools would be useful to improve access to help for young people in need while also taking into account the multifaceted nature of the notion of access to help. In the interviews, the young people did not typically report that help was unavailable to them at school due to the absence of a counselling service but rather emphasised the relational aspect or subjective inaccessibility of the service. The young people's reservations about their stigmatisation clearly indicate the need to destigmatise distress among young people and to develop services with a non-stigmatising approach. Concerns about stigma are also likely to be closely intertwined with the priority given to the performance and productivity aspects of young people in the school space, as well as the discourse of individualism, in which mental distress is conceptualised as a personal defeat.

Regarding the accessibility of help and seeking help in the school environment, the young people attached particular significance to negative experiences with peers in the school context, which the school failed to prevent. Such experiences can cause a great deal of distress among young people. In this sense, the school can be considered not only as being passive in the process of seeking help but also as being an environment that contributes to the emergence of distress. Among the negative experiences with peers in the school environment, the interviewees highlighted avoidance and isolation as well as contempt and stigmatisation. The relationship between the support provider and the young person emerged as the most important factor in the evaluation of the help received.

The results of both studies (Dekleva et al. 2018; 2021), which were based on reports of young people, generally indicate a considerable absence of the role of schools in seeking help for young people in distress. Schools were not typically active initiators in the young people's seeking help, even though the young people had usually been in distress for a long time before commencing to seek help. This indicates that their difficulties in school were not noticed or recognised or were simply ignored. Schools were not even the first source of help typically sought by

the young people, despite the fact that school counselling services are physically the closest, most readily available and seemingly most easily accessible source of help (Dekleva and Tadič in Dekleva et al. 2018, p. 69–70). This clearly demonstrates the key role of the subjective dynamics of the availability of help.

Supportive vs. threatening aspects of school

In our study (Dekleva et al. 2018), the testimonies of young people themselves show the outlines of a competitive, performance-based concept of education, which, from their perspective, is perceived primarily as a place for attaining the formal achievements and competences that are supposed to enable progress up the social ladder, thus bearing the promise of good social status. Let us be a little more specific about this finding. From all the interviews, we selected 32 for partial analysis (Razpotnik et al. 2018, p. 121–139). We selected interviews in which several aspects of vulnerability accumulated, from family background and school problems to physical and mental health problems. In a separate part, we extracted each area and selected from the interviews the supportive and threatening factors mentioned by the young people linked to each life context (family, school, peer group, other support services, etc.). In the context of »school«—which is presented below—only two supportive aspects were identified, while there were nine aspects in which school was positioned as a threatening factor from the perspective of a young person in need.

Factors at school	Content categories identified from the young people's responses	Frequency of occurrence
Supportive	Strong personal involvement of a teacher or counsellor	Often
	Adaptability of the school to individual needs	Rarely
Threatening	Feeling of being judged, placing blame on the person in need	Often
	Mistrust, disbelief and denial of the adolescent's distress	Often
	Lack of interest of school staff in the young person's plight	Often
	School focus on achievement	Often
	Bullying and the school's inadequate response to it	Often
	Insulting and belittling attitudes of some teachers	Rarely
	Indiscretion and abuse of trust by a school professional in relation to the problems entrusted to her	Rarely
	Distrust of school services	Often
	Exclusion from school programmes or threat of exclusion	Less often

Table 1: Supportive and threatening factors in school for young people with complex and multiple problems (see Razpotnik et al. 2018, p. 126–127)

In Table 1, the individual factors (content categories) are rated according to how often they appear in the 32 interviews, where »often« means appearing in at least half of the cases, »less often« means appearing in less than half of the cases and »rarely« means appearing less than four times.

Among the supportive aspects, »strong personal involvement of a school professional« was frequently mentioned, while »adapting the school environment to the individual needs of the adolescent« was mentioned slightly less frequently. Among the threatening aspects, the most frequently mentioned were »the feeling of being judged and blamed individually for their own distress«, »distrust and disbelief of school professionals regarding their distress«, »lack of interest of school professionals in their distress« and »lack of understanding of their distress from the perspective of school professionals«. Less frequently mentioned were »insulting or belittling attitudes towards them by school staff« and »exclusion from programmes or threats of exclusion«. In a broader sense, the disconnection and lack of coordination between the school and other institutions (e.g. social care centres, health and other services) can also be mentioned as a factor that hindered adequate support for young people. Strong personal involvement, as the most supportive aspect of school as a supportive environment, also needs to be discussed. The emphasis on the personal commitment of individual practitioners is certainly an interesting topic, but it also indicates a broader picture in which the question of support is left to the commitment of individual practitioners in today's school system. The need to find solutions to the perceived challenges is left to the profession on the ground: teachers and other school professionals. In our research, Mikuš Kos (in Dekleva et al. 2021, p. 56–57) repeatedly pointed out that school is a place of exceptional importance, as it encompasses all children. It is therefore more important to think of its value in terms of providing a supportive, protective environment for all and ensuring protection against threats such as the consequences of war, psychosocial distress, violence, intergenerational stresses and poverty.

Opening the school to the community

To answer this research question, we drew on the findings of Dekleva et al. (2021, p. 348–364), who analysed good practices in schools in dealing with young people's psychosocial distress. In this part of the research, special attention was also paid to the school's action and orientation towards practices or activities that also have a broader socially integrative function by enabling and facilitating young people's involvement in certain external structures, such as the local community, projects and other organisations. The eight school counsellors involved were selected based on the criterion that they perceived themselves to be developing good practices in the field of coping with young people's psychosocial distress. The findings show that good practices are characterised by an understanding of the contextuality of psychosocial distress. There was also a strong concern expressed by our respondents (school counselling services) that it is often necessary to make

professional judgements about priorities and to put young people's psychosocial well-being before certain other goals, such as performance goals, that would show quick measurable results. The study of good practices in schools also strongly highlighted the need for additional training and skills for school counsellors to identify students' distress. In addition, it emphasised the need to create a collaborative classroom climate and a general socially inclusive orientation of schools to be implemented in the manner of the ethos of the school and the development of an appropriate school culture. The interviews with school counsellors also revealed the need to depathologise psychosocial distress and make external professional support more accessible than it is at present.

However, our research (see Dekleva et al. 2018, 2021) shows that cases of developing good practices in this field are rather isolated attempts, driven by the strong professional and ethical drive of individual actors and thus requiring a high level of engagement, which is usually not systemically supported (see also Klemenčič Rozman and Dekleva 2019). All of this is in favour of opening the school to the community. School integration with other actors in the local community was also explored by Kos et al. (2019). Our interlocutors, representatives of school counselling services, stressed the importance of building a school community as a basis for a good psychosocial climate that could be supportive for all children.

Discussion

Due to its great importance, school can play a double-edged role: although potentially supportive, its protective role can, in combination with other stressors, quickly be side-lined, or it can even act as an additional stressor, as can be understood from the analysis of the supportive and threatening factors perceived by youth in school.

One of the fundamental functions of a school is to provide a supportive and stimulating environment for all. From our survey (see Dekleva et al. 2018; 2021), it can be seen that young people facing psychosocial distress perceive the school environment primarily as one that is aimed at performance goals, namely enabling them to obtain grades translatable into credits, which are increasingly believed to be something that can enable young people to progress to the desired higher levels of schooling and thus to a higher social status in the future (Razpotnik and Tadič 2019; Ule 2011).

When trying to understand the epidemic-scale increase in psychosocial distress that we are experiencing today in a social context, one of the themes that authors have highlighted as crucial is the lack of a sense of connectedness and acceptance in the environments in which young generations live (Wilkinson and Pickett 2012; Verhaeghe 2014).

The psychiatric profession, which is particularly overstretched, still holds primacy in the field of psychosocial distress. However, as can be seen from Muijen's report (2015) for Slovenia, the support is conceived too narrowly, mainly somatically, often medication-based and not holistically, failing to consider the

»ecosystemic view« of the human being, as introduced by a key figure of this approach, psychologist Urie Bronfenbrenner (1979). Based on the discussion so far, we think about more holistic support for children and adolescents—which would constitute both prevention of psychosocial distress and a protective environment when distress does occur—one of the important systems that can be relied upon in the future is the school (see also Fjermestad et al. 2020; Kamody and Bloch 2022; McGory et al. 2014).

According to the school counsellors included in our study, schools can mobilise additional sources of support, both formal and informal, and expand their networks, which can benefit everyone involved. In particular, the young interviewees in the study showed a lack of understanding of school as a potentially supportive and safe space. In the case of psychosocial distress, the social and protective dimension of school is therefore missing from the concept of school from the point of view of our respondents, and this, we would argue, is precisely the function that the school should play if it is to be a protective factor for young people in today's world. When schools connect with individuals and groups in the community, they work together, empowering both sides and increasing the effort and motivation to achieve goals that cannot be achieved individually. School–community partnerships are particularly important for students from disadvantaged backgrounds, that is, students who are more likely to face psychosocial distress (Gregorčič Mrvar et al. 2016). The authors also highlight the benefits for school practitioners, including that school staff can be more effective in their work, they can become more familiar with the individuals and institutions in the community to whom they can refer students or their parents and they can develop skills to work with volunteers and mentors. They can also gain knowledge and use resources in the community for their own educational or counselling work (*ibid.*).

One of the consequences of the pandemic is that children are not connecting at the classroom level to the same extent as in the past. The older they get, the more pronounced this is (e.g. Darmody et al. 2020; Doolan et al. 2020). They do not know who to turn to and they do not really know each other; the fact that they have created groups on social networks does not necessarily give them a sense of security or belonging, especially if it has no real basis in advance. Individualism, which, as a pre-existing social trend, only intensified during the pandemic, does not give way so easily. It is not a given that the regrowth or intensification of social contacts will occur on its own if there are no incentives, conditions, models or opportunities.

West-Burnham (2011) argued that schools are the product of their environment; they are successful to the extent that the communities and families involved in them are successful. In many social settings, it is thus taken for granted that schools are primarily focused on academic achievement, neglecting their community orientation. However, the community approach of the school has great potential. It can either allow advantage to be taken of the already existing networks in some communities, or it can help a diffuse community to begin to connect, thus creating new social networks that are an essential part of the joint search for and planning of responses (Kvaternik and Kodele 2010). The school space is an ideal

environment for implementing preventive community projects.

If schools are to become cohesive communities, first, it is important to address the internal inequalities that are present in schools, including the inequalities with which children enter schools. In Slovenia, a strong public education system (and other public systems) certainly protects children from the potentiation of inequality, but unfortunately, it is not a sufficient safeguard against the processes of inequality that are pervasive in all spheres of society worldwide (see Wilkinson and Pickett 2012). Medveš (2018) argued that too much of the financial growth nowadays is channelled into increasing private comfort rather than social development. In such a situation, the austerity orientation of state budgets always favours capital, while social disparities widen. In his view, this is characteristic of the modern processes of globalisation. In addition to the economic inequality that we perceive within individual countries (Bauman 2014), global inequality is also an important topic, but this is beyond the scope of the present article. However, as well as opening the school to the community, inequality is certainly a theme that will need to be taken more seriously in the future.

Conclusion

Several conclusions can be drawn in response to the three research questions. There are objective and subjective barriers to the accessibility of support for young people facing psychosocial distress. One of them is certainly the pathologisation and medicalisation that are still very present in the rhetoric surrounding distress. The needs of young people are complex, and the responses to these needs should be complex and contextualised. School is an important environment in which the normalisation of psychosocial distress should take place; it should provide a safe place for open dialogue about the challenges young people face.

From the point of view of young people facing psychosocial distress, the supportive role of schools is missing. This is even more emphasised when talking about youth with more complex needs when different vulnerabilities intersect. From the perspectives of both young people and school counsellors, additional engagement is needed to meet the needs of students facing distress, indicating that a more systemic awareness of the supportive role of school is missing. From both perspectives (of students and professionals), another missing aspect is better cooperation between schools and other support services for young people facing psychosocial distress. School could have an integrating role in this regard, especially if it takes its role as the centre of the community seriously.

Schools that support young people in the psychosocial field and represent a safeguard for them are those that are sensitive, open to the community and pro-social, promoting and practising compassion. The question is, of course, whether this is compatible with a performance-oriented and quantified results-oriented educational environment. This is one of the guiding challenges in the present reflection. We could conclude that school as a stimulating and supportive environment for all and primarily as a means of obtaining credits are, at least to some extent,

incompatible perspectives, and that we are faced with an important question of priorities when we think about the future of the educational system.

Is the educational system capable of reflection? With regard to visions for its development, there is no shortage of models and ideas to draw on. One of the most recent examples of such a vision is the broad UNESCO document *Reimagining our futures together: a new social contract for education* (2021), which places a strong emphasis on one of the key topics of our research—opening schools to the community—and on pedagogies of cooperation and solidarity as well as on environmental issues in relation to education. It sees the main role of educators as seeking »to secure the engagement of students, they must build relationships of care and trust« (ibid.). In drawing on ideas of co-creation, dialogue and the creation of spaces of reciprocal and problem-based learning, the ideas in this document are reminiscent of some older pedagogical ideas, especially those of a radical and critical pedagogy, one that is inherently transformative. In fact, the transformative role of the school features prominently in the UNESCO document; for example, »pedagogy should be rooted in cooperation and solidarity, building the capacities of students and teachers to work together in trust to transform the world« (p. 50). There is also a strong component of solidarity in the document and a focus on creating more equitable power relations. The poetic subtitle of one of the chapters is »Learning to Heal the Wounds of Injustice«, while another is »Learning to Unlearn Divisiveness«. The ideas of transformative pedagogy have been with us for decades, and not least, they carry epistemologies other than those of the West, with their ideas of growth and continuous linear progress.

In our view, the way to reverse the paradigm is, therefore, to move away from the rhetoric of continuous linear progress and the collection and measurement of points and credits as the main purpose of education. It is a turn towards the dimensions of relationality, collaboration and openness to the challenges and resources of the community and towards reflection on emerging issues in school communities. It is in the autonomy of the teaching profession to respond to current societal issues here and now, in a unique, localised way, that nonetheless takes account of its embeddedness in the global system and recognises itself as an inevitable part of it. In this way, the school, in partnership with the community, can better address challenges such as the rise in psychosocial distress among young people and the currently unsatisfactory and too narrowly focused responses to these issues.

References

- Bauman, Z. (2014). *Does the richness of the few benefit us all?* Cambridge: Polity.
- Bečaj, J. (2005). Radi bi imeli strpne in solidarne učence, silimo jih pa v tekmovalnost in individualizem. *Vzgoja in izobraževanje*, 36, issue 6, pp.16–23.
- Bjønness, S., Viksveen, P., Johannessen, J.O. and Storm, M. (2020). User participation and shared decision-making in adolescent mental healthcare: a qualitative study of healthcare professionals' perspectives. *Child Adolesc Psychiatry Mental Health*, 14, issue 2, pp. 2–9.

- Bronfenbrenner, U. (1979). *The ecology of human development: Experiments by nature and design*. London: Harvard University Press.
- Čačinovič Vogrinčič, G. (2008). *Soustvarjanje v šoli: učenje kot pogovor*. Ljubljana: Zavod Republike Slovenije za šolstvo.
- Cefai, C. and Cavioni, V. (2015). Beyond PISA: Schools as contexts for the promotion of children's mental health and well-being. *Contemp School Psychol*, 19, issue 4, pp. 233–242.
- Cesar, K., Crnkovič, N., Selak, Š., Šorgo, A. and Gabrovec, B. (2021). *Raziskava o doživljanju epidemije COVID-19 med študenti: poročilo o opravljeni raziskavi (med izrednimi študenti)*. Ljubljana: Nacionalni inštitut za javno zdravje. Retrieved from https://www.nijz.si/sites/www.nijz.si/files/datoteke/raziskava_o_dozivljanju_epidemije_covid-19_med_studenti_medicine_in_zdravstvenih_ved.pdf (Accessed on 27. 5. 2022).
- Collishaw, S. (2015). Annual research review: Secular trends in child and adolescent mental health. *Journal Child Psychol Psychiatry*, 56, issue 3, pp. 370–393.
- Darmody, M., Smyth, E. and Russell, H. (2020). The implications of the COVID-19 pandemic for policy in relation to children and young people. *ESRI Surv. Stat. Rep. Ser.*, issue 94. Retrieved from https://www.esri.ie/system/files/publications/SUSTAT94_3.pdf (Accessed on 17. 9. 2021).
- Dekleva, B., Klemenčič Rozman M. M., Razpotnik Š., Sande M., Škraban J. and Tadič D. (2018). *Dostopnost organiziranih oblik podpore mladim v psihosocialnih in duševnih težavah in konteksti teh težav: preliminarna študija*. Raziskovalno poročilo. Ljubljana: Pedagoška fakulteta, Univerza v Ljubljani.
- Dekleva, B., Grbec, H., Klemenčič Rozman, M. M., Lah, A., Leskošek, V., Mikuš-Kos, A., Polajžer, P., Rapuš-Pavel, J., Razpotnik, Š., Sande, M., Simić, S. and Tadič, D. (2021). *Podporne mreže mladih v psihosocialnih stiskah: zaključno poročilo ciljnega raziskovalnega projekta*. Ljubljana: UL, Fakulteta za socialno delo; UL, Pedagoška fakulteta.
- Doolan, K., Barada, V., Buric, I., Krolo, K. and Tonkovic, Z. (2020). *Student life during the COVID-19 pandemic: Europe-wide insights*. European Students' Union. Retrieved from https://www.esu-online.org/wp-content/uploads/2021/04/0010-ESU-SIderal-Covid19_WEB.pdf (Accessed on 14.7.2022).
- Fjermestad, K. W., Wergeland, G. J., Rogde, A., Bjaastad, J. F., Heiervang, E. and Haugland, B. S. (2020). School-based targeted prevention compared to specialist mental health treatment for youth anxiety. *Child and adolescent mental health*, 25, issue 2, pp. 102–109.
- Gregorčič Mrvar, P., Kalin, J., Mažgon, J., Muršak, J. and Šteh, B. (2016). *Skupnost in šola: vrata se odpirajo v obe smeri*. Ljubljana: Znanstvena založba Filozofske fakultete Univerze v Ljubljani.
- Hasking, P., Lewis, S. P., Bloom, E., Brausch, A., Kaess, M. and Robinson, K. (2021). Impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on students at elevated risk of self-injury: The importance of virtual and online resources. *School Psychology International*, 42, issue 1, pp. 57–78.
- Jeriček Klanšček, H. (2016). *Mladostniki o duševnem zdravju*. Ljubljana: Nacionalni inštitut za javno zdravje.
- Jeriček Klanšček, H., Koprivnikar, H., Drev, A., Zupanič, T. and Hribar, K. (2017). Zdravje in vedenja slovenskih mladostnikov – rezultati mednarodne raziskave. *Iskanja*, 35, issue 55/56, pp. 10–19.
- Jeriček Klanšček, H., Roškar, M., Drev, A., Pucelj, V., Koprivnikar, H., Zupanič, T. and Korosec, A. (2019). *Z zdravjem povezana vedenja v šolskem obdobju med mladostniki v Sloveniji*. Ljubljana: Nacionalni inštitut za javno zdravje.

- Jeriček Klanšček, H., Saška Roškar, S., Vinko, M. and Hočevar Grom, A. (2018). *Duševno zdravje otrok in mladostnikov v Sloveniji*. Ljubljana: Nacionalni inštitut za duševno zdravje.
- Kamody, R. C. and Bloch, M. H. (2022). Editorial: Schools on the frontline of suicide prevention. *J Child Psychol Psychiatr*, 63, issue 8, pp. 833–835.
- Klemenčič Mirazchijski, E. (2017). *Razvoj modela nacionalne mreže služb za duševno zdravje otrok in mladostnikov*. Koper: UP Pedagoška fakulteta.
- Klemenčič Rozman, M. M. and Dekleva, B. (2019). Stališča šolskih delavk in modeli dobre prakse v šolah v zvezi z duševnimi stiskami mladih. *Socialna pedagogika*, 23, issue 3/4, pp. 218–243.
- Kos, Ž., Tašner, V. and Gaber, S. (2019). Schools and the collaborative commons. *Teorija in praksa: revija za družbena vprašanja*, 56, issue 3, pp. 896–910.
- Kvaternik, I. and Kodele, T. (2010). Sodelovanje in soustvarjanje: skupnostni projekt na področju preventive v šolskem okolju. *Socialna pedagogika*, 14, issue 3, pp. 347–362.
- Lavrič, M. and Deželan, T. (eds.) (2021). *Mladina 2020: položaj mladih v Sloveniji*. Maribor: Univerza v Mariboru, Univerzitetna založba; Ljubljana: Založba Univerze v Ljubljani.
- McGorry, P. D., Goldstone, S. D., Parker, A. G., Rickwood, D. J. and Hickie, I., B. (2014). Cultures for mental health care of young people: an Australian blueprint for reform. *Lancet Psychiatry*, 7, issue 1, pp. 559–568.
- McGorry, P. D., Purcell, R., Hickie, I. B. and Jorm, A. F. (2007). Investing in youth mental health is a best buy. *Medical Journal of Australia*, 187, issue 7, pp. 5–7.
- Medveš, Z. (2018). Vzgoja med etičnim diskurzom in zdravno pametjo. *Sodobna pedagogika*, 69, issue 135, pp. 44–69.
- Mikuš Kos, A. (2017). *Duševno zdravje otrok današnjega časa*. Radovljica: Didakta.
- Mikuš Kos, A. (2019). Duševne težave in motnje otrok ter mladostnikov – kako zmanjšati razkorak med potrebami in možnostmi pomoči. *Socialna pedagogika*, 23, issue 3/4, pp. 273–299.
- Muijen, M. (2015). *Mental health Mission Slovenia, 19–21 April 2015*. Neobjavljeno poročilo. Ljubljana: WHO Regional Office for Europe.
- Peklaj, C. (2001). *Sodelovalno učenje ali Kdaj več glav več ve*. Ljubljana: DZS.
- Pergar Kuščer, M. and Razdevšek Pučko, C. (2005). Sodelovanje in tekmovanje v šoli. *Sodobna pedagogika*, 56, issue 3, pp. 98–109.
- Razpotnik, Š. and Tadič, D. (2019). Refleksija sodobnega šolskega prostora na Pedagoški fakulteti Univerze v Ljubljani. *Vzgoja in Izobraževanje*, 50, issue 5/6, pp. 30–38.
- Reimagining our futures together: a new social contract for education* (2021). International Commission on the Futures of Education, UNESCO.
- Rovšek, M. (2020). Med pravičnostjo, kakovostjo in učnimi dosežki v osnovni šoli. *Šolsko polje*, 3, issue 1/2, pp. 167–189.
- Rupnik Vec, T. and Slivar, B. (2019). *Vpliv različnih dejavnikov na doživljanje in znake stresa pri učencih v 6. in 8. razredu osnovne šole*. Poročilo o raziskavi. Ljubljana: Zavod RS za šolstvo.
- Schwartz, K. D., Exner-Cortens, D., McMorris, C. A., Makarenko, E., Arnold, P., Van Bavel, M., Williams, S. and Canfield, R. (2021). COVID-19 and Student Well-Being: Stress and Mental Health during Return-to-School. *Canadian Journal of School Psychology*, 36, issue 2, pp. 166–185.
- Silverman, D. (2001). *Interpreting qualitative data: methods for analysing talk, text and interaction*. London: Sage.
- Ule, M. (2011). Spremembe odraščanja in nove identitetne politike, *Sodobna pedagogika*, 62, issue 3, pp. 90–103.

- Ule, M. (2011a). *Za vedno mladi?: socialna psihologija odraščanja*. Ljubljana: Fakulteta za družbene vede, Založba FDV.
- Ule, M. (2015). Vloga staršev v izobraževalnih potekih otrok v Sloveniji. *Sodobna pedagogika*, 66, issue 1, pp. 30–45.
- Verhaeghe, P. (2014). *What about me? The struggle for identity in a market-based society*. London: Scribe Publication.
- West Burnham, J. (2011). Kje so meje? Izobraževanje, šola in skupnost. *Vodenje v vzgoji in izobraževanju*, 9, issue 2, pp. 3–13.
- Wilkinson, R. G. and Pickett, K. (2012). *Velika ideja: zakaj je enakost boljša za vse*. Novo mesto: Penca.

Špela RAZPOTNIK in Jana RAPUŠ PAVEL (Univerza v Ljubljani, Pedagoška fakulteta, Slovenija)

MLADI, PSIHOSOCIALNE STISKE IN ŠOLA KOT POTENCIALNI PODPORNİ DEJAVNIK

Povzetek: Večja pojavnost psihosocialnih stisk je trend, ki se v ekonomsko razvitem sodobnem svetu stopnjuje, k stopnjevanju pa je doprinesla tudi nedavna epidemija. Psihosocialne stiske mladih postajajo bolj kompleksne, doživlja jih vse večje število mladih in posredno njihovih družin, skupin, tudi šolskih razredov, obenem pa so čakalne vrste za dostopanje do podpore težje dostopne, viri podpore pa zapolnjeni. Strokovnjaki s področja psihosocialnih stisk zato vse bolj poudarjajo, kako pomembno je angažirati tiste vire v skupnosti, ki zajamejo veliko večino mladih. Primer takega vira je vsekakor šolsko okolje. V članku predstaviva del nedavnega raziskovanja prvoosebne perspektive mladih z izkušnjo psihosocialnih stisk, pri čemer fokus usmerjava v šolsko okolje. Na podlagi raziskovalnih izsledkov izriševa vizijo, kako bi le-to lahko delovalo kot bolj podporno za mlade v obdobju obremenjenosti za celo paleto psihosocialnih stisk, pri čemer je najin fokus prosocialna usmerjenost šolskega okolja, tako navznoter kot tudi navzven, torej v smislu povezanosti s skupnostjo. Socialna in podporna dimenzija šole v primeru izkušanja psihosocialnih stisk je torej nekaj, kar pri pojmovanju šolskega prostora za mlade umanjka tudi zaradi postavljanja ravno nasprotnih prioritet (tekmovalnosti, individualizma) v ospredje, prav socialna in podporna vloga šole pa je, kot argumentirava, tista vloga, ki bi jo šola morala odigrati, če želi predstavljati podporno okolje za mlade.

Ključne besede: mladi, psihosocialne stiske, šola, skupnost

Elektronski naslov: spela.razpotnik@pef.uni-lj.si