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Abstract
The aim of the paper is to analyse the restrictions on the collaboration of social pedagogue and form tutor when coping with bullying cases in school. To successfully deal with the bullying issues in school, it is necessary to make use of different forms of collaboration and to remove restrictions on the collaboration of social pedagogue and form tutor. By the analysis of the expert-identified drawbacks and hindrances of collaboration, the following restrictions were identified: the failure to perceive the goals of collaboration, a shortage of time, a lack of the system of collaboration and/or its regulation, a lack of the specialists’ motivation, and a lack of competence. Only the development of a sustainable system of social pedagogue and form tutor’s collaboration will ensure effective work with schoolchildren, their parents, and pedagogues when coping with the bullying cases in school.
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Introduction

In European comprehensive schools, bullying is an especially relevant issue, and the situation in Lithuanian schools is no exception as well. As revealed by the national surveys, about 70% of Lithuanian schoolchildren experienced bullying (National Child Abuse Prevention and Children Support Programme 2008–2010). Bullying, as well as other violence manifestation forms, is the consequence of “very low emotional literacy” of our society, and simultaneously the cause of numerous failures of socialisation experienced by our youth. Lithuanian researchers related bullying manifestations to a shortage of social skills which was also largely affected by child’s microenvironment (Barkauskaitė, 2001; Petrušyte, 2003; Targamadzė, Valeckienė, 2007; Zaborski, Cirtautienė, Žemaitienė, 2005). As noted in the researchers’ works, to reduce the scale of the bullying manifestation in schools, teachers’ close collaboration was of primary importance (Zaborski, Cirtautienė, Žemaitienė, 2005; Povilačius, Valiukevičiūtė, 2006; Olweus, 2003; M. Piskin, 2002; Myers, 2008 and other).

The importance of collaboration in coping with social pedagogical problems in school was analysed by researchers abroad: P. Dalin, 1999; Stoner, 2006; Everard, 1997; Hopkins, 1998; Fullan, 1998; Stoll, Fink, 1998; Hargreaves, 1999 and other, and in Lithuania: Jučevičius, 1996; Želvys, 2003; Sakalas, 2003; Merkys, 2004; Kačinskiene, Leikus, Mišėika, Mackevičienė, 2010; Bitinas, Šidlauskienė, 2002 and other. As emphasised by the researchers, the specificity of educational organisations affected the formation of collaboration processes and the characteristics of expression which so far remained problematic and relevant. K. A. Rothman (2002) accentuated the importance of the development of a common programme of actions in the collaboration and organisation of common activities. It was the programme of actions and its transparency to the support providing specialists that predetermined successful coping with social problems in school.

The education process in classroom is organised by teachers: they plan and implement the aims of education for specific children and their groups. Form tutors, who most frequently are also subject teachers, devote their attention to the formation of the class community and additional and non-formal education of the class (Barkauskaitė, 2001). The internal pedagogical meaning of the activity of form tutor may be defined in the following way: form tutor is a guide of the pupils’ spiritual life. The key idea is the perception of form tutor and pupil as spiritually communicating people who understand each other and feel close to each other.

The said aims are implemented by form tutor in collaboration with the social pedagogue of the school. Such collaboration is bilateral: teachers and form tutors provide social pedagogue with the information about the educational situation on the basis of which the directions of coping with the social pedagogical problem are planned, while social pedagogue, in collaboration with form tutors, acquires important information about the children who experience bullying and, on the basis of the received information, provides support both to them and to their parents by advising who ought to be addressed about the child’s specific problems.
To date, the restrictions affecting the collaboration of the school social pedagogues and form tutors (such as organisational aspects, documents that regulate their interaction, the advantages and disadvantages of the collaboration, and pedagogue’s personal abilities and efforts of collaboration) have been little examined. Therefore, the collaboration of social pedagogue and form tutor in the coping with bullying issues is very meaningful and important. It is necessary to reveal:

How collaboration in the coping with bullying preventions at school is assessed by social pedagogue and form tutor, what is emphasised and what is significant for successful collaboration between the said pedagogues? What restrictions on collaboration did they notice?

The aim of the paper is to analyse the restrictions on the collaboration of social pedagogue and form tutor when coping with bullying prevention in school. Research methods: analysis of research literature, document analysis, content analysis, expert method, a structurised interview.

As laid out in Article 49 of the Law on Education of the Republic of Lithuania (2011), teacher has to ensure pupils’ safety and to inform parents, guardians, or carers about their children’s behaviour. Form tutor, as argued by R. Povilaitis et al. (2007), has to ensure the safety of the educated pupils, to develop their strong moral, civic, ethnic, and patriotic stand, to guarantee the development of their personal abilities, to take care of the support provision to the pupils with education and learning difficulties or with special needs, and to regularly inform parents (guardians, carers) about the needs and achievements of their children’s self-education. Pupils tend to primarily apply for support to their form tutor. As witnessed by the research of G. Kvieskienė and others (Karmaza, Grigutytė, Karmazė, 2007), the pupils would most often come to their form tutor when some pupils make noise or behave in a disorderly way during lessons (72,8 %), when pupils quarrel or argue (66,5 %), and when other pupils hit them or push them around (64,7 %), or bully them (53,4%). Therefore, form tutor has to be ready to act in the cases of violence: to be interested in respective trainings, to read literature, to attend courses, and to apply for help to the school social pedagogue and psychologist.

Collaboration is understood as common activity of social pedagogue and form tutor when coping with bullying cases in school. The activity of collaboration can be defined as co-ordinated activities of the school staff in accordance with an action plan (model) that has to ensure successful coping with social problems in school. Social pedagogue will use the collaboration skills to work not merely with pupils, but also with pedagogues and parents.

The role of social pedagogue in coping with bullying cases at school. Social pedagogue must be the only specialist in school who by individual actions can attain good results in the fields of violence prevention and support provision. When child suffers from violence or commits acts of violence, he needs psychological and social pedagogical support. Article 21 of the Law on Education of the Republic of Lithuania (2011) defines the social pedagogical support in the following way: The function of social pedagogical support is to support the implementation of child’s right to schooling, to ensure their safety in school, to remove the causes that prevent child from attending school or make them avoid school, to bring back to school the children who had dropped it, and together with parents (guardians) to assist child in the choice of a school in accordance with their intellectual and physical abilities and in the adaptation in it.

Only by means of collaboration social pedagogue and form tutor will be able to provide timely and effective social pedagogical support to pupils and their parents (Order No. ISAK-2819, ŠMM, 30-12-2009). It should be noted that in the cases of bullying the necessity of a support provision plan is emphasised, to be discussed by the school community and approved by the head of the school (Karmaza, N. Grigutytė, E.G Karmazė, 2007).

As noted by Brewster and Bowen (2004), pedagogues’ support is related to children’s wellbeing at school and adaptation to school (Way, Reddy, Rhodes, 2007). Moreover, pedagogues’ support is positively related to prompt coping with bullying and violence cases in school, to pupils’ activity at school, and to the development of supportive relations between peers and adults in school (Jennings, 2003). It is possible to analyse collaboration from different viewpoints: as a principle, as a model of education, a method, a way of activity organisation, etc. However, the key aspect is the regulation of the activity co-ordination, of the identification and achievement of the pursued outcomes, and of a system of transparent rules of common activity.

The regulation of common activity is important in order to avoid the overlapping of specialists’ functions. The more different the overlapping functions are, the more gaps occur that those who need support get into (Vaicekeauskienė, 2003). Social pedagogue and form tutor are among the key solvers in the cases of bullying on whose interaction pupils’ safety in school depends. To date, over 1,000 social pedagogues work all over the country, however, the issue of bullying at school remains relevant. One can...
argue that, in the organisation of specialist collaboration in school, due to unavoidable inappropriate or partly inappropriate organisation of collaboration, form tutors or social pedagogues frequently solve pupils’ problems individually or dub each other’s functions. (G. Kvieskiene, 2003; Indrashienë, Kvieskiene, Merfeldaitė, 2007).

To quote V. Targamadze, D. Valeckienë (2007), the most effective support in the bullying prevention is team work when social pedagogue, form tutor, the school administration, and psychologist work in collaboration.

To reveal the restrictions on social pedagogue and form tutor’s collaboration when coping with bullying prevention in school, qualitative research was conducted. An interview was chosen as a data collection method for the qualitative research. The sample of the research: by means of convenience sampling, 6 social pedagogues and 4 form tutors from Klaipeda Region progymnasiums were interviewed.

The research outcomes

Comparative analysis of the restrictions on the collaboration of social pedagogues and form tutors. All over the process of education, communication and collaboration of its participants and organisers is very important. As argued by Čegytė, Ališauskienë (2009), collaboration in coping with children’s bullying issues is much more productive than individual efforts.

Collaboration consists of the exchange of information, ideas, and knowledge, participation in common projects and meetings, and organisation of common events. To reveal the restrictions on specialists’ collaboration, we first of all sought to identify the forms of collaboration of social pedagogue and form tutor in coping with the bullying prevention in school. The experts identified the following forms of collaboration when coping with the bullying prevention in school: talks, events, counselling, class meetings, case studies, and sittings (e.g., in Child Welfare Panel or other) (see Fig. 1).

Fig. 1. The key forms of social pedagogue and form tutor collaboration when coping with the bullying prevention in school

It should be noted that the form tutors and the social pedagogues indicated very similar forms of collaboration. However, the comparison of the identified forms of collaboration also revealed some differences. The social pedagogues placed emphasis on event organisation and counselling, while the form tutors accentuated case studies and the development of an action plan. That led to a conclusion that in the process of collaboration the social pedagogues initiated different events and campaigns and consulted form tutors, while the form tutors tried to identify the cases of bullying in school and, after having analysed a specific case with the help of social pedagogue, planned the support provision to pupil.

Upon the analysis of the informants’ opinions about the effectiveness of the forms of collaboration when
coping with the bullying prevention in school, one could observe the concurrence of the form tutors and the social pedagogues’ views on the effectiveness of the talks with form pupils and their parents. However, the social pedagogues more often applied pedagogue counselling and class meetings, while the form tutors preferred sittings of the Child Welfare Panels. The difference in the assessment of collaboration forms may be related to the difference in the competences and the performed functions of social pedagogue and form tutor and indicated collaboration at the level of the form and school. Both the social pedagogues and the form tutors applied the discussions of bullying prevention and the roleplay of bullying situations. Simultaneously, specific social pedagogue-applied methods were pupils’ trainings teaching them to appropriately respond to bullying, to communicate and collaborate, and to improve their social skills. Those included, e.g., “individual and group talks with form tutor, pupils, parents, and the school administration, common events, competitions, and campaigns”, “watching films on bullying and violence”, counselling of teachers and parents at an appointed time, consideration in Child Welfare Panel”, “sometimes an individual talk sufficed, and more difficult cases needed to be considered in the Child Welfare Panel, with the participation of parents and police representatives”.

By the analysis of the expert-identified drawbacks and hindrances of collaboration, the following restrictions were identified: the failure to perceive the goals of collaboration, a shortage of time, a lack of the system of collaboration and /or its regulation, a lack of the specialists’ motivation, and a lack of competence (see Fig. 2).

The experts most frequently identified the following major goals: to cope with the bullying prevention; to provide support to form tutor; to provide support to children in the cases of bullying; and to reduce bullying in school, e.g.: child’s wellbeing, both of the abused and of the abuser, to protect the abused child and to provide him with moral support; to cope with the bullying cases, to plan the ways of problem solution, to get help from respective institutions and specialists; and to assist form tutors in the solution of arising problems by trainings. The comparison of the answers of the social pedagogues and the form tutors revealed that the views of both groups concurred on such goals of collaboration as the provision of support to child and the reduction of bullying prevention. However, some differences surfaced. For the social pedagogues, prompt coping with a case of bullying and avoidance of repeated cases of bullying was of primary importance. Meanwhile, the goal of collaboration indicated by the form tutors included the provision of support to form tutor, pupil, and his family by teaching to see, to recognise, and by common efforts to stop the cases of bullying in school.

The analysis of the experts’ answers to the question What helps and what hinders the achievement of goals? revealed that the social pedagogues identified more problems of collaboration than the form tutors.
One could state that the social pedagogue assisted the form tutor in the coping with the bullying problems and performed the basic investigation. Meanwhile, the form tutor just informed the social pedagogue about the prevention of bullying and expected the latter and all the community to help solve the problem. That was why the views of the social pedagogues and the form tutors on collaboration in the coping with bullying cases in school occasionally differed, e.g. “The named goals were not always achieved, as the final outcome depended not merely on the form tutor and the social pedagogue; the views of pupils and their parents, the response of classmates, and the environment, etc., also mattered; “Not always. The goal will be achieved when form tutor and social pedagogue closely co-operate and co-ordinate their activity, and when the collaboration is absent, problems are difficult to solve”.

The comparison of the informants’ answers about the necessity of the system of form tutor and social pedagogue’s collaboration and/or its regulation when coping with the bullying prevention in school revealed that both the social pedagogues and the form tutors were guided by the documents of general regulation of school activities: Law on Education (2011), the regulations of social pedagogical support, job descriptions, the recommendations of the Olweus programme, etc. The experts (the form tutors) placed emphasis on the school’s internal rules, and the social pedagogues, on the regulations of social pedagogical support and the recommendations of the Olweus programme. That proved the absence of a single document that would regulate the collaboration of form tutor and social pedagogue when coping with the bullying prevention in school. Therefore, the collaboration seemed to be a matter of internal agreement, e.g. the school is guided by the school principal-approved job descriptions (S2).

It should be noted that the experts, when providing the cases of collaboration in their schools, named a similar schema of actions. Both groups offered an identical model of coping with the bullying cases and prevention in school: the situation was analysed, the pupils and their parents were talked to, and, whenever necessary, other specialists were invited and the case was considered in the Child Welfare Panel. However, it had to be noted that in the said schema more functions were performed by the school social pedagogue. The social pedagogue both consulted the form tutors and developed an action plan for the coping with bullying, communicated with the administration, and took part in the decision making of the Child Welfare Panel. That allowed to state that the collaboration of form tutor and social pedagogue included mutual support provision, the exchange of the possessed information, the planning of common actions (participation in the sittings of the Child Welfare Panel or in talks to children and their parents), and the sharing of the responsibility for the accepted functions. Thus, e.g., “The form tutor addressed the social pedagogue in an oral or written form”; “Then a talk with the abused and the abuser took place in order to get as many as possible facts”; “The situation was observed: if it repeated, parents were invited.” The administration stepped in merely in the cases when “the bullying was especially painful, and the specialist with the form tutor alone could not cope with the issue”, “If the bullying case repeated, the child’s behaviour was considered in the Child Welfare Panel and decisions were taken, and „consistency and systematicity were necessary”. The experts revealed that frequently, when coping with the bullying cases in school, the Child Welfare Panel was addressed. It usually consisted of the school psychologist, the social pedagogue, the school administration, and the special pedagogue. The role of the social pedagogue in the Panel was exclusive. As stated by Kvieskienė (2003), an optimal model of the activity of social pedagogue could not be imagined without a team of social pedagogical support. The social pedagogue played an important role in the school team of social pedagogical support. Frequently he initiated the formation of the team and co-ordinated its activity.

Another restriction identified by the experts was a shortage of time (high occupation of the social pedagogues and the form tutors). The said problem was more frequently emphasised by the form tutors. As stated by the informants, a shortage of time was an acute problem in the collaboration of form tutor and social pedagogue, as “the number of children in class was too large, there were quite a few unmotivated, risk group children, the number of children with special needs was increasing, therefore, form tutor did not manage to cope with all the bullying cases”; “form tutor gave lessons and was on duty during the breaks, therefore, she had no time to discuss bullying issues”; “social pedagogue was assigned so many time-consuming functions and tasks that they were short of time for work with the children and the school community”. Meanwhile, the social pedagogues found problems of collaboration in the lack of the form tutors’ initiative and their incompetence to cope with bullying cases, e.g. “to cope with bullying meant to devote more of your own time than you had thought or planned, and not all the form tutors had the time or willingness to give that time to coping with bullying issues”.

One more restriction on collaboration identified by the experts was the specialists’ incompetence. The experts identified not just a lack of support provision knowledge and abilities, but also the inability to
recognise the phenomenon of bullying: *form tutors who failed to recognise the cases of bullying, who responded merely to physical bullying and “failed to see” psychological and emotional children’s bullying*, *infrequently form tutor did not distinguish between bullying and normal behaviour*.

A lack of the specialists’ motivation to cope with the cases of bullying in school was named as an infrequent, however, important issue, e.g., *a lack of form tutor’s initiative, and sometimes indifference to bullying issues*, *a lack of form tutor’s initiative*, *sometimes motivation was lost*.

The informants believed that the drawbacks in the collaboration of social pedagogue and form tutor could be removed by a change of attitude towards coping with the bullying issues. In other words, it was necessary to more actively involve parents in the collaboration process, to more frequently invite social pedagogy to class and parent meetings, as well as to improve the system of collaboration and the transparency and consistency of its procedures.

Upon summarising the informant answers, one could state that the form tutors saw the social pedagogue as a help in coping with the bullying prevention in school, while the social pedagogues would have liked the form tutors to be able to independently cope with bullying prevention in school. That justified occasional differences in the approach of social pedagogue and form tutor to their collaboration when coping with the bullying cases in school. The analysis of the expert answers about the restrictions on the collaboration of social pedagogue and form tutor demonstrated that their removal would enable the interested parties to more effectively cope with the bullying prevention in school.

Conclusions and generalisations

To successfully deal with the bullying issues in school, it is necessary to make use of different forms of collaboration and to remove restrictions on the collaboration of social pedagogue and form tutor. Only the development of a sustainable system of social pedagogue and form tutor’s collaboration will ensure effective work with schoolchildren, their parents, and pedagogues when coping with the bullying prevention in school.

As revealed by the research outcomes, the most frequent restrictions on social pedagogue and form tutor’s collaboration when coping with the bullying prevention in school include: the differences in the understanding of the collaboration goals; a shortage of time for that collaborative activity; a lack of specialist motivation to collaborate respectfully and in good faith and to purposefully pursue the goals; a lack of specialists’ competence to appropriately co-ordinate the collaboration, to plan the directions of common activity, and to recognise the cases of bullying; and the absence of a system of common activity and the procedures of collaboration.

For the social pedagogues, the principal collaboration problems included the form tutor’s shortage of time, a lack of initiative, and incompetence to independently identify and cope with the bullying prevention in school. The form tutors believed that the problems of collaboration were the social pedagogue’s high occupation, the absence of mutual respect, and the form tutor’s lack of knowledge and ability to cope with the bullying cases in school.

To effectively cope with the bullying cases in school, it is necessary to effectively improve the system of social pedagogue and form tutor’s collaboration, the transparency and consistency of its procedures, to improve specialists’ professional competences (to develop the skills necessary for the collaboration and the skills of bullying identification and the provision of appropriate support), to foster the tradition of collaboration in school (by developing different forms of collaboration and involving all the members of the school community), and to implement education activity by informing pupils and parents about the ways of bullying identification and the available support in school.
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SOCIALINIŲ PEDAGOGŲ IR KLASĖS AUKLĖTOJŲ BENDRADARBIAVIMO RIBOJIMAI VYKDANT PATYCIŲ PREVENCIJĄ MOKYKLOJE

Ilona Klanienė, Gražina Šmitienė

Santrauka

Patyčių problema Lietuvos bendrojo ugdymo mokykloje išlieka vieš aktualiųjų problemų. Nepaisant pastarųjų metų vystomų patyčių prevencijos programų Lietuvoje, padidėjusio mokslininkų ir praktikų dėmesio mokinių patyčių prevencijos problemai, vis tik patyčių atvejai nuolat kartoja mokyklose. Dauguma mokslininkų tyrimų skirti mokinių patyčių rašikai, prevencinių programų analizei ir vertinimui, tačiau iki šiol mažas tyrinėtas mokyklos socialinių pedagogų ir klasės vadovų bendradarbiavimas, vykdant patyčių prevenciją mokykloje.


Kokybinių tyrimo rezultatai atskleidė, jog klasės vadovai ir socialiniai pedagogai nurodė labai panasius bendradarbiavimo formas, tačiau išryškėjo šie esminiai skirtumai. Bendradarbiavimo procese socialiniai pedagogai inicijuoją įvairius renginius, akcijas, konsultuoja klasės vadovus, o klasės vadovai stengiasi pastebėti patyčių atvejus mokykloje ir su socialinio pedagogo pagalba išanalizuoti konkretų atvejį, suplanojant pagalbos mokiniui teikimą. Tiek socialinio pedagogo, tiek klasės vadovai esmės bendradarbiavimo tikslus nurodyti pagal pinigų skirstymą, prevenciją, o klasės vadovai bendradarbiavimo tikslui nurodyti pagal pagalbos mokiniui teikimą ir patyčių atvejų sprendimą. Tačiau informačiniams pedagogams štai svarbūs vartoti patyčių atvejų sprendimo operatyvumas, prevencija, o klasės vadovai bendradarbiavimo tikslui nurodyti pagal pagalbos mokiniui, mokiniai ir jo šeimai teikimą, mokant pastebėti, atpažinti ir bendromis jėgomis stabdyti patyčių mokykloje.

Socialiniai pedagogai ir klasės auklėtojai išskyrė šiuos bendradarbiavimo trikūdžius: bendradarbiavimo tikslų suvokimas, laiko trukmės, bendradarbiavimo sistemas ir (ar) reglamentavimo neaiškumas, specialiųjų motyvacijos, kompetencijos stoka. Kokybinių tyrimo rezultatai atskleidė, jog nėra atskiro dokumento, reglamentuojančio socialinio pedagogo ir klasės vadovo bendradarbiavimą vykdant patyčių prevenciją mokykloje, todėl bendradarbiavimas yra šių specialistų vidaus susitarimo reikšmė ir gali skirtis skirtingose mokyklose. Vieną iš bendradarbiavimo ribojimų veiksmingumo klaidą sukelia klasės kūrėjai ir socialiniai pedagogai bendradarbiavimo problemas Žvelgia klasės vadovų iniciatyvumo stokos bei jų nekompetentingumo steigti patyčių atvejus. Apibendrinant informantų atsakymus galima teigti, kad klasės vadovai į socialinį pedagogą žiūrėti kaip į pagalbininką vykdydamas patyčių prevenciją socialinizmo, o socialiniai pedagogai pasitinka klasės vadovų kompetencijos savarankškai sprendžiant patyčių atvejus mokykloje. Taigi socialinio pedagogo ir klasės vadovo požiūris į jų bendradarbiavimą sprendžiant patyčių atvejus yra labai svarbus, tačiau dažnai sutampa. Informantų nuomonė socialinio pedagogo ir klasės vadovo bendradarbiavimo trikūdžius įvairių autorių pasikeitus pakeitus požymis, nepakitus požymis, nepakitus požymis, nepakitus požymis. Tikslų bendradarbiavimo sistemomis, nosėstos dėmesio ir nuoseklumą, nepakitus požymis, nepakitus požymis, nepakitus požymis.

Tyrimo rezultatai atskleidė, jog dažnai socialinio pedagogo ir klasės auklėtojo bendradarbiavimo ribojimai yra šie: bendradarbiavimo tikslų suvokimas, laiko trukmė, bendradarbiavimo veiklai stoka, specialistų motyvacijos trūkumas, bendradarbiavimui, specialistų nebegalima tinkamai koordinuoti bendradarbiavimą, bendros veiklos sistemas, bendradarbiavimo tvarkos nebuvinimas. Taigi socialinio pedagogo ir klasės auklėtojo esminiai bendradarbiavimu veikiantys ribojimai yra šie: organizaciniai aspektai, bendradarbiavimą reglamentuojantys dokumentų nebuvinimas, pedagogų asmeniniai gebėjimai ir pastangos bendradarbiavinti. Analizuojant ekspertų atsakymus apie socialinio pedagogo ir klasės auklėtojo bendradarbiavimo ribojimus, teigima, jog jų požiūrius į galimų efektyvų spręsti patyčių sukelto problemas mokykloje. Siekiant efektyviai vykdyti patyčių prevenciją mokykloje būtina: tobulinti socialinio pedagogo ir klasės vadovo bendradarbiavimo sistemą, aptarti ir aprašyti bendradarbiavimo procedūras; tobulinti specialistų profesines kompetencijas (plėtoti bendradarbiavimui reikalingus išgūzdžius, patyčių atpažinimo ir veiksmingos pagalbos teikimo išgūzdžius), pusešelė mokyklose bendradarbiavimo kultūrą, vykdyti švietėjusią veiklą informuojant mokinius bei tėvus apie patyčias, galimą pagalbą mokykloje.