The Qualitative Report

Volume 22 | Number 8 Article 13

8-22-2017

The Construction of "Discomfort Psychological": An Exploration of Italians Teachers' Reports

Antonio Iudici

Department of Philosophy, Sociology, Education and Applied Psychology- University of Padova, antonio.iudici@unipd.it

Matteo Fabbri

Department of Philosophy, Sociology, Education and Applied Psychology- University of Padova, fabbrimatteo5@yahoo.it

The Construction of "Discomfort Psychological": An Exploration of Italians Teachers' Reports

Abstract

Although there are several studies on youth problems in school, there are few studies on how teachers report psychological discomfort of the students and on what criteria does their procedure. Considering that schools increasingly make such reports to social or neuropsychiatry services, we wanted to find out whether it is flawless (bias, etc.) and how it can affect a student's career. This research presents an investigation on how the practice of signaling "psychological discomfort" at school is set up. Objects of the survey are the procedures used by the teachers to submit the psychological problems. The research subjects were Secondary School teachers. In this research, we used qualitative research methods. We specifically chose to use a semi-structured interview. The data analysis was conducted in line with the analysis of the conventional content. From an analysis of the responses, it is possible to highlight that there is no generally agreed description of psychological discomfort, that the criteria for identifying distress are different and that the way in which they follow the reporting procedure varies very much from teacher to teacher. Finally, we discuss the implications of individualized reports both for the school course of the student and for the requirements of the teachers.

Keywords

Psychological Discomfort, School, Qualitative Research, Reporting, Teachers

The Qualitative Report 2017 Volume 22, Number 8, Article 12, 2281-2295

The Construction of "Discomfort Psychological": An Exploration of Italians Teachers' Reports

Antonio Iudici and Matteo Fabbri
University of Padova, Italy

Although there are several studies on youth problems in school, there are few studies on how teachers report psychological discomfort of the students and on what criteria does their procedure. Considering that schools increasingly make such reports to social or neuropsychiatry services, we wanted to find out whether it is flawless (bias, etc.) and how it can affect a student's career. This research presents an investigation on how the practice of signaling "psychological discomfort" at school is set up. Objects of the survey are the procedures used by the teachers to submit the psychological problems. The research subjects were Secondary School teachers. In this research, we used qualitative research methods. We specifically chose to use a semi-structured interview. The data analysis was conducted in line with the analysis of the conventional content. From an analysis of the responses, it is possible to highlight that there is no generally agreed description of psychological discomfort, that the criteria for identifying distress are different and that the way in which they follow the reporting procedure varies very much from teacher to teacher. Finally, we discuss the implications of individualized reports both for the school course of the student and for the requirements of the teachers.
Keywords: Psychological Discomfort, School, Qualitative Research, Reporting, Teachers

Schools are making more and more use of psychological or neuropsychiatric services designed to detect distress amongst school students. In many cases, reporting is controlled by agreements between schools and services, other times procedures are arranged among the institutions, in other cases reporting is based on common sense, that means it's up to personal beliefs of the teachers. The literature reports that in the latter case, there may be several critical repercussions on the student. Some teachers may consider certain behaviour as problematic, which for other teachers is not problematic, or they may be convinced of a disorder in a student due to common sense beliefs. The reporting itself may be affected by these beliefs and the decision to highlight, might run in the well-known "confirmation bias" (Evans, 1989). Some teachers might relate to students considered as "disadvantaged" differently than to other students, and so not appropriate in relation to the mandate assigned to them by the institution (Gadin & Hammarström, 2005; Jussim, Eccles, & Madon, 1996). These students may receive attention and assistance that reinforce the idea of someone with problems or difficulties (Pennebaker, 2000; Trouilloud et al., 2002). In many cases this means attributing a distinct idea to the student, at the risk of limiting the development of the student's personal representation (Hinnant, O'Brien, & Ghazarian, 2009; Smith, Jussim, & Eccles, 1999). Moreover, if a reporting is not shared with the student or his family, it may lead to a refusal of follow the recommended procedures, or to a conflict between parents and teachers. A further implication may be that the student could feel stigmatized (Jussim & Harber, 2005). A good report system may also improve collaboration between schools and families, help the school to promote health interventions (Bohnenkamp, Stephan, & Bobo, 2015; Rickwood, Deane, & Wilson, 2007; Robinson et al., 2013; Weare, 2000; Woods, 2011) and prevent the most serious situations form occurring (Baksheev et al., 2011; Bridge, Hanssens, & Santhanam, 2007; De

Leo & Heller, 2004). In literature, there are studies that reveal the results of the reports and the effects on scholastic malaise students, but there are no studies on how the psychological discomfort is reported amongst the teachers. From this comes the need to understand the processes of the build-up of psychological distress on the side of the teacher and if these can affect the very distress level of the student. We will attempt to address this research gap with the use of semi-structured interviews aimed at revealing how teachers report psychological discomfort in the school environment.

The Norms in the Italian School System

A research into reporting in the school context should be accompanied with the studying of the laws in force in Italy. We specify some information about the Italian school system in general, and what is available for the management of the problems of young people. The theme of transmission from teachers to family and/or to a developmental age service is quoted accurately in some laws and in a less direct way in others. Starting with the currently in force laws (170/2010, 104/1992) it was first of all possible to extract a commitment: the regulations impose the duty for teachers to make a report if they deem it appropriate. The procedures imposed by the law are: after having observed the students for a while, after having tried to prepare "specific activities of recovery and strengthening" (D.M. 5669/2011, p. 5). For cases deemed serious and after a consultation with colleagues, if it is necessary, they should proceed with reporting to the children's parents, who will have to turn to the services in charge, for example the Rehabilitation Services for Children and Adolescents. The welfare services have the task of certifying the problem or disability (Law 104/92, DPCM, 2006). The school, which is an expert in teaching and educating, has the task of integrating the information that the certification of the disability gives them in the Individualized Education Plan as soon as the disability has been established (DPR 1994). Recently, with the entry into force of the laws on Educational Special Needs, we have expanded the measures provided for by Italian law regarding Specific Learning Disorders and handicaps to all pupils considered at that time in difficulty, since "every pupil, continuously or during specific periods, can show Special Educational Needs either due to physical, biological, physiological or even psychological and social reasons for which it is necessary that schools provide an adequate and personalised response" (Ministerial Directive 27/12/2012, p. 1). In this way, in Italy and in Europe, the Special Education Needs Act (Peer & Reid, 2016; WHO, 2001) has made it possible to report potentially any student, based on the beliefs and opinions of the teachers. So the intervention in mild cases thus depends on the observations of the teachers alone, who can report problems and specific needs to the family, activating Personalised Educational Projects. The critical aspect concerns the absence of specific criteria to be used for signaling, that leads to a great increase of the personal initiative of teachers.

Method

Conceptual Framework

This work stands in the modern interactionism and constructivist epistemology (Fay, 2014; Martin, Sugarman & Slaney, 2015; Reynolds & Herman, 2003; Salvini, 2004, 2011; Von Glasersfeld, 2009, 2013) and found its own way of doing science on a solid epistemological reflection. The foundation of this perspective is based on the principle for which "the observer determines the observed" (Bateson, 1979; Heisenberg, 1958; Watzlawick, 1984), from which follows the belief that reality is indeterminate, can't be built independently of the cognitive categories that creates it (Aldiabat & Le Navenec, 2011; Atkinson & Housley, 2003; Blumer,

1986; Crotty, 2003; Faccio, Nardin, & Cipolletta, 2016). In this perspective, the object of study becomes the narratives and discourses that construct reality (Turchi & Celleghin, 2010). Salvini (2004, p. 70), uses the concept of "schemes of personality typing," defining them as "organizational modalities of interpersonal knowledge that are based on categorical abstractions generated by intent evaluative, diagnostic and prognostic making it possible to assign individuals to a set of psychological characteristics." They are based on the process of "categorization," which allows to obtain, through a process that can be inductive or deductive, a number of information, excluding other, selecting, discriminating and then aggregating certain events into classes and creating taxonomies and prototypes (Salvini, 2004).

These schemes are used not only by experts, but in the same way also common people. The category containing the events are then grouped as labeled, are assigned names and make up that reality and the world that then perceive as outside ourselves and objectively existing (Berger & Luckman, 1966). Especially for the teachers, this process is often forgotten in function of its outcome: the identification of a category. In fact, to label a person with the term discomfort, difficulty, illness or deviance has very important consequences (Iudici, 2014; Robinson et al., 2011; Trouilloud et al., 2002;). The labelling theorists (Lemert, 1972) and several other scholars (Dryer, Kiernan, & Tyson, 2006; Machù, Kočvarová, & Císlerová, 2015; McMahon, 2012; Thomson, 2012; Thurlow, 2001; Thurlow & Brown, 2003) have always warned the various professionals about the misuse of the categories, which for example can have the function to generalize, to induce the desired behaviour or contrary behaviour, ease the affiliation to a certain group of people sharing the same label, as well as to induce feelings of isolation and discrimination. In his book by the same name, Goffman (1963) speaks of the stigma that is placed on those people who are not regarded as the ones who are the criteria for normality shared. The label is likely to become as a summary of the characteristics of that person, at the same time cause and effect of his actions past, present and future (Iudici, Castelnuovo, & Faccio, 2015; Iudici & Verdecchia, 2015).

Interactionism encourages students, teachers, and parents to explore the different ways to experience the school, regardless of the abilities and the learning difficulties. Students and teachers should learn to know the differences. In other words, instead of differentiating the instruction to separate groups of students on the basis of capacity, problems and difficulties, Interactionism focuses on the collaboration between the groups, ie on the way through which together define difficulties and solutions (Scruton & McNamara, 2015). A constant interaction between services could also promote early management of any potential difficulties (Iudici, Gagliardo Corsi, 2017).

This research presents an investigation on how the practice of signaling "psychological discomfort" at school is set up.

Research Design

Research Questions and Objectives

The target of investigation of this research is exploring how the practice of signaling psychological discomfort at school is set up. Objects of the survey have been the procedures used by the teachers to submit psychological discomfort. In particular, we were interested in having a much closer look at the following research questions deduced from the critical issues identified in the study of literature.

1. What definition can be given to "psychological discomfort"? (focus on the definition)
2. What criteria use the teachers to report? (focus on the criteria)

3. How is the reporting process? (focus on the process)
4. What critical issues are detected in this process? (focus on the difficulties and obstacles)
5. What strategies can be implemented to improve the reporting process? (focus on improving)

Participants

The subjects of the study were teachers of a middle school in north Italy (in the Venice province). The choice of such a grade of school education comes from the belief that it is precisely at this level that teachers are called to report psychological discomfort. After having made arrangements with the Headmaster, we asked and obtained the availability of 42 teachers, aged between 35 and 55 years.

The sample consisted of 35 females and 7 males. Teachers, who had already compiled at least one report, were involved. None of them had specific training on the psychological problems of the students. Teachers have made themselves available to the headmaster, and were contacted through the headmaster. Each teacher signed the form, declaring informed consent and giving consent for audio recording. No other formal or institutional approval was required for us to conduct this type of research. An information sheet for participants was also presented to respondents, defined by the Ethics Committee of the University of Padova, which stated that all information provided will be treated as completely confidential, protected by the Privacy Act and collected in a confidential manner. It is also stated that everything that emerges by the end of the study will be stored (without the possibility of access for third parties) and the final results will be disclosed anonymously. We decided to interview them because of the direct role they play in daily relationship with students, as well as the formal responsibility the laws assigns them: they are the signatories, along with the Headmaster, of the formal request for intervention given to parents, and addressed to the dedicated services.

Qualitative Methods and Instrument (Semi-Structured Interview)

The research questions needed to look at the actual experience as lived by the teachers with regards to the need of reporting psychological discomfort. For this reason, the qualitative approach seemed to be the most suitable. Indeed, qualitative methods are believed more appropriate to get adequately stories narratives, actions, conversations and meanings that within a given context generate particular configurations of reality (Banister et al., 1994; Rothe, 1993). This type of analysis is useful in order to be able to account for the richness of the experiences provided by the respondent, limiting the risk of reducing them to purely quantitative categories (Smith, 1995). Qualitative methods, characterized by the search for etiologies or objective data (Denzin & Lincoln, 1998, p. 24) make possible to rebuild the meanings attributed by the participants in relation to the context in which they are inserted (Bryman & Burgess, 1999; Chenail, 2011; Neuman, 1997). In this exploratory research, it was important for us to allow teachers to express their way to make the signaling, trying with them to explain the criteria and the modalities of their reasoning. Our interest has been to highlight the quality of the experience in the role of reporters. We decided to use the semi-structured interview, in order to extract the experiential data about the way they define and report the students' psychological problems and in order to share the meaning of their answers, obstacles and strategies used by them during the interview. All interviews were audio recorded and transcribed with the permission of the teachers, carried out within the school, during the teachers' free hours. Prior to recruitment and data collection, research procedures have been approved for use with human subjects. Informed consent was obtained from all participants.

Data Collection and Conventional Content Analysis

According with Seidman (2012), it was given great attention in order to avoid leading, allusive or inductive questions, starting from the fundamental need to identify a particular response text.

Questions were created following an approach called emic (Have, 1999). The emic approach to research is referred to by Morey and Luthans (1984, p. 22) as "internal and subjective the informant's point of view." This can be seen to relate quite well to the epistemological approach to research known as social constructivism Morris et al. (1999) point out that emic research seeks to uncover and describe the participant's understanding of events and circumstances and that these understandings are "culturally and historically bound" (p. 782). Harris (1976) describes emic research as an approach which shows "respect to what goes on in people's heads" (p. 330). It has therefore respecting the categories recognized by the participants (Krippendorff, 2004; Neuendorf, 2016; White & Marsh, 2006). In order to detect the object of each report, we used the term "psychological discomfort" with the intention of leaving teachers the widest possible range of response. The teachers, in fact, were able to argue their answers, providing not only a series of data on how such a construct is defined, but also on how it is meant.

The researchers collected data through interviews with open-ended questions, derived from the research questions, followed by specific questions. They were constructed to allow the respondent to answer as freely as possible (Anyan, 2013; Ibrahim & Edgley, 2015; LeBlanc, 2010; Paine, 2015).

Initially we asked the teachers the following questions:

1. What definition can be given to "psychological discomfort"? (focus on the definition)
2. What criteria use the teachers to report? (focus on the criteria)
3. How is the reporting process? (focus on the process)
4. What critical issues are detected in this process? (focus on the difficulties and obstacles)
5. What strategies can be implemented to improve the reporting process? (focus on improving)

A pre-test to some teachers of the Middle School was carried out to verify the comprehensibility and relevance of the questions, and then, on the basis of the answers, the general track of the Protocol.

The researchers used as tool of analysis, the conventional analysis of the content, which is generally used with a study design whose purpose is to describe a new phenomenon (Morse, 1991; Miles & Huberman, 1994). Because studies on how teachers reported psychological discomfort and on which criteria is based their procedure are missing, we chose this type of analysis. Content analysis is usually appropriate when the existing scientific literature on the investigated phenomenon is limited (Dhillon, 2016; Hsieh & Shannon, 2005; Kondracki & Wellman, 2002; Yu, Jannasch-Pennell, & Di Gangi, 2011).

The dimensions of analysis considered are five:

1. Description of "psychological discomfort"
2. The criteria used for the reporting
3. The reporting process (Phases of the alert)
4. The critical (difficulties and obstacles) process
5. Strategies for improvement

Results

How is the "psychological discomfort" defined

Most of the responses have been anticipated by a brief commentary that suggests a certain difficulty to answer, “It is difficult to answer abstractly, to give a definition in general.” Someone highlights the difficulty by saying that “there are various forms of youth psychological discomfort.” Despite these difficulties, all 42 respondents offer a definition of youth problems. Among these, we were able to extrapolate 24 distinct "descriptors,” that is, 18 definitions were repeated. Overall, psychological discomfort are mainly associated with student's problems, both personal (“psychological discomfort is when the student is hyperactivity”) and educational (“inability to connect the knowledge they have” or even "the inability to pay attention and to concentrate. To focus on the assigned work, even in terms of the minimum requirements ... the minimum targets"). In second place youth problems are associated with relational problems ("the student didn't get on well with the school environment," "a gap between school requirements and students' expectations"). Others offer even more abstract answers, such as " psychological discomfort occur because we have no more values," or "children have the problem of being spoilt by society."

The criteria used for the reporting

The criteria which emerged were 38 kinds and they were divided into 5 areas. The areas are:

1. Criteria which identifies "interacting trouble" between the student and the other social actors (refers to all of those actions which expressly contain an element of interaction between the student and the other people around him, that is, classmates or adults; for example: "I reported students who failed to integrate into the classroom”).
2. Criteria which identifies "problems in the context of specific learning disabilities" (they explicitly refer to those who, in the diagnostic manuals, are defined as having specific learning disabilities, for example: "We suspected dyslexia disorders, so we filed a report").
3. Criteria to identify "problems in the performance" (referring to the scholastic performance itself; for example: "A criterion for reporting concerns in terms of homework not being completed or unanswered questions").
4. Criteria to identify "difficulties recognized as "own" of the individual" (meaning difficulties and problems in the characteristics of the student, "own" exactly, and which they do not explicitly refer to a component of relation to other social actors; for example: "hyperactivity, that is, he can’t stand still, he moves around the class"; "he is apathetic;” for example, Reports also typically psychological, as "he does not live well the scholastic situation”).
5. Criteria which describes the "subjective perception" of teachers (they explicitly refer to the subjectivity of the reporter; It is the "subjective perception" of a teacher, which states: "you perceive the discomfort, you feel it in the class").

Four of the five criteria described above are focused on the difficulties of the student and they do not imply any relationship with the contextual dimension (family, territory, culture), as it appeared among the definitions of discomfort demand one. During the analysis we realised that simple behaviour signs were some of the criteria used by teachers. Some

teachers use criteria which are behavior for others. For example, the term "apathetic" is used for ("personal difficulty") by a teacher and as a behavior of the "discomfort in the interacting with others." In some cases, criteria with the same name has been identified starting from different indicators. For example, "discomfort/learning difficulties" is produced by very different behavior: on the one hand the reading problems, decoding of the text, problems in the carrying out of a problem, decoding of the math test, on the other hand it is indicated by the "he has not passed the tests in the first three years." In other cases, again, the same behavior is useful to identify yet other criteria. For example, the "isolation" of a pupil shows both "discomfort in the report," both the criterion "individual difficulties."

The practice of reporting

The results refer to a macro and to a specific level. In the first, it refers to the actions required by law, in the second to how it is realized.

In most of the interviews, there are the macro steps provided by the regulations: observation, the attempt of recovery, the consultation of teachers, and the reporting to the parent.

The second level, which requires a depth analysis of individual actions, can be seen as:

- The monitoring phase varies from teacher to teacher, in fact, they used different criteria to identify the disease. Some respondents observe, "the assessment of knowledge," others "the origin of disease," others "the adaptation in the classroom," others "assess the personality of the student," others "the behavior during the lesson," and so on.
- The personal attempt of "recovery" of every teacher, is described according to very different strategies: "involving the student," "talking to him," "motivating him," "choosing topics of interest for him," "organizing group activities to involve him."
- The point of the process is different when the role of the parent makes its debut. In fact, in some responses parents are contacted before the final phase of the signal. In other cases, the parents are involved, "after the first signs" or immediately after evaluating negatively the recovery efforts of the teacher who has noted the "discomfort." Overall, parental involvement often occurs on the personal initiative of the individual teacher and not after a collegial sharing.

Critical aspects of the process of reporting

The responses were divided as follows: 1. Aspects related to "school organization"; 2. Aspects related to "the role of teachers"; 3. Aspects related to "the role of the family."

In the first category, the critical issues were related to:

- The internal organization of the school (for example: "*the number of pupils for every class is high and we can't observe deeply*");
- The setting of services (for example, " *all the support services should be increased*");
- The interaction between services and school (it is the case of "*the criticality is that* [...] *the developmental team should work in synergy with the school*").

In the category "role of teachers" are included problems attributable to their role. Examples are: "*few training courses for teachers*." Other respondents highlight the difference between

teachers: "*teachers do not always have the same mode of work and the same elasticity and malleability, [...] the same vision*."

In reference to the critical issues relating to "the role of the family," there is only one occasion: "*The collaboration with the family is discontinuous*." Other teachers say that "many parents do not appreciate our reporting."

Improving strategies

Interviews it was found at least one direct link between critical and strategies. For example, for those considering problematic the issue "*rigidity of the educational programming*" a possible improvement strategy is "*the adaptation of programs*."

The strategies identified are attributable to the following four levels:

- Level "organization," for example, some teachers have focused on training: "More training for teachers on youth problems in order to recognise and intervene better." Others focus more on collaboration with social services: "Closer work with specialist services."
- Level "role of teachers," for example, "Greater teamwork among teachers"
- Level "role of the family," for example, "It would be helpful to have more discussions with the families."
- Level "role of the student," includes strategies to intervene directly on the boy, for example, "Help children to be more aware of their own problems"; and "Make the guys working on the interpersonal relationship, developing this type of competence, of relation among students."

Discussion

In reference to the description of "psychological discomfort" from which the report is made, there has been a wide variety of responses. From this, it follows that the discomfort is configured very differently among teachers. Overall it is considered an internal problem of the person, a family or learning problem (of learning or performance).

The vagueness of the definition of psychological discomfort explains in our opinion the fact recorded in the second dimension of the survey, the "criteria of the reporting," which is the highest number of criteria identified (24 descriptors). It was also found a discrepancy between the descriptors of psychological discomfort and the criteria used to identify it later. In fact, while in the description of psychological discomfort are reported as significant some descriptors in which there is reference to a "contextual dimension" where the student lives (e.g., "family factors," the "environmental problems" the lack of "values, a question of culture"), the same size is not considered among the criteria on which the report is based. This implies that after the "diagnosis" does not follow a coherent intervention.

It has also been detected an overlap between indicators and criteria (for example, the use of the same indicators to explain different criteria, as well as the use of different indicators to explain the same criteria). Therefore, they are closely related to the subjectivity and to the personal experience of the individual teacher. The criteria, are not formalized by a scientific point of view but are just statements of common sense. The criteria are mostly related to actions, behaviors, problems, "of the pupil," not to possible aspects related to the whole school context (e.g., a the "*inattention of the students"*). It is difficult to imagine how, on the basis of such a number of criteria, it is possible to obtain observations founded on a common basis.

In reference to the practice of reporting, the results refer to a macro level and to a specific one. The first refers to the actions required by law, in the second to how they are

carried. From this point of view, it was possible to note that the activities described are consistent with the legislation currently in force in Italy. On the second level of analysis, which is about how to implement them, significant differences emerge. For example, both the activity of observation, and the attempts of "recovery" are performed using different criteria, as they are made with completely different strategies. The involvement of parents, another activity required by the regulations, takes place at different times: for example, some teachers involve parents after the "first signs," others only after have attempted the recovery, others only when there is the need for an external evaluation.

With reference to the criticality of the reporting process (the fourth dimension of the investigation), the organizational level was most problematic, in particular, the high number of students for every class, the "rigidity of the teaching program," the "lack of support services," the "very long wait time between warning and response services," and "the lack of synergy between the school and the team developmental services outside the school."

These elements do not allow, according to the teachers, to implement the precise signaling. It's interesting to note that respondents consider the organizational level as the most problematic aspect for reporting and they only report problems in relation to their own role to a very limited extent.

This highlights the idea that teachers perceive their possibilities for action in a subordinate way compared to organizational aspects, suggesting a lack of responsibility by teachers themselves in relation to their degree of incidence in the reporting process. The different critical points reported also indicate a wide discrepancy in the identification of what does not facilitate the reporting.

Consequently, even compared to the size of "improvement strategies," the twenty-four strategies identified, reflect more than the width of the tools available, a theoretical and methodological fragmentation with which we approach to reporting. Even for the improving strategies there has been more reference to organizational issues related to the school, the services, and the interactions between the two. It is on this point, that teachers concentrate more efforts to improve the process.

Conclusion, Future Prospects, and Limitations

From the analysis of the responses, it is possible to detect that there isn't a shared description of youth problems that is associated with the individuality of the student, family issues in which it is inserted, and didactical problems.

In general terms, the guidance of teachers has to follow the dictates of the Italian legislation. The general character of the legislation, however, leaves room for interpretation by teachers that turns out to be individual and personal.

The presence of criteria so configured undermines the possibility of an observation shared and based on clear assumptions and contributes to the presence of a practice of the signaling that has been revealed arbitrary, of common sense and determined by personal theories.

This seems perfectly understandable when you consider that although teachers are expected to report student's problems by law, they are not provided with the adequate resources to carry out this duty. To date, therefore, teachers have reported matters based on their own sensitivity, intuition and interpretation, but this can lead to reporting a student as "troubled or problematic" based on personal rather than professional criteria.

Such practices lead to the risk of labelling a student with terms such as "ill" or "troubled" which could start the process of creating a certain identity (Faccio et al., 2016). As argued by Salvini (2011), to assign a role to a person (in this case the assignment of person

with discomfort) can induce processes of identification in the same role and generate a representation of the self, connected to it.

Teachers' observations thus become crucial as they can lead to a stigma or encourage joint management of the problem. In this context, the teacher's role is an integral part of the process, it opens the way for, it influences and justifies the behaviour, making its own contribution to creating the reality of youth problems. It might therefore be useful to establish a working group among teachers aimed at connecting the way each teacher reports, in an attempt to achieve a unanimous practice. As for areas of improvement, there is a real need to organise training courses to clarify what is understood by "psychological discomfort" and to provide teachers with relevant observation instruments for the role, that is, precise and transferable. Only in this way can be reach a reporting in terms of shared practice.

It would be interesting to deepen this research by extending the focus to a greater number of participants. For example, the inclusion of all those who potentially have a role in reporting, such as students, parents, the headmaster and Social Services, in the research.

This work can be used to kick off various types of group interventions. In addition to the two examples already assumed, we can expect that this research can be a first opportunity for discussion and sharing, as well as awareness for the Regional School Offices and professional associations. The limitations of this work are in regards to the involvement of teachers from schools from a single territory, the province of Venice. The study should therefore be extended to other territories to evaluate possible differences. Another limitation was the choice of making semi-structured interviews from predefined themes. This choice was due to a specific theme, "reporting psychological discomfort" that however initiates more complex processes, so that we felt obliged to investigate through interviews in order to grasp the direct experiences of teachers.

References

Aldiabat, K. M., & Le Navenec, C. L. (2011). Philosophical roots of classical grounded theory: Its foundations in symbolic interactionism. *The Qualitative Report*, *16*(4), 1063-1080. Retrieved from http://nsuworks.nova.edu/tqr/vol16/iss4/9/

Anyan, F. (2013). The influence of power shifts in data collection and analysis stages: A focus on qualitative research interview. *The Qualitative Report*, *18*(18), 1-9. Retrieved from http://nsuworks.nova.edu/tqr/vol18/iss18/2/

Atkinson, P., & Housley, W. (2003). *Interactionism*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Baksheev, G. N., Robinson, J., Cosgrave, E. M., Baker, K., & Yung, A. R. (2011). Validity of the 12-item General Health Questionnaire (GHQ-12) in detecting depressive and anxiety disorders among high school students. *Psychiatry research*, *187*(1), 291-296.

Banister, P., Bruman, E., Parker, I., Taylor, M., & Tindall, C. (Eds.). (1994). *Qualitative methods in psychology: A research guide.* Buckingham, UK: Open University.

Bateson, G. (1979). *Mind and nature: A necessary unity*. New York, NY: Dutton.

Berger, P. L., & Luckmann, T. (1966). *The social construction of reality.* Garden City, N.Y., Doubleday.

Blumer, H. (1986). *Symbolic interactionism: Perspective and method*. Berkley, CA: Univeristy of California Press.

Bohnenkamp, J. H., Stephan, S. H., & Bobo, N. (2015). Supporting student mental health: The role of the school nurse in coordinated school mental health care. *Psychology in the Schools*, *52*(7), 714-727.

Bridge, S., Hanssens, L., & Santhanam, R. (2007). Dealing with suicidal thoughts in schools: Information and education directed at secondary schools. *Australasian Psychiatry*, *15*(1 Suppl), S58-S62.

Bryman, A., & Burgess, R. G. (Eds.). (1999). *Qualitative research* (Vol. 4). London, UK: Sage.

Chenail, R. J. (2011). Interviewing the investigator: Strategies for addressing instrumentation and researcher bias concerns in qualitative research. *The Qualitative Report*, *16*(1), 255. Retrieved from http://nsuworks.nova.edu/tqr/vol16/iss1/16

Circolare Ministeriale n. 13 del 8/2/2011. *Integrazione scolastica degli alunni con disabilità – L. 440/97. Piano di riparto fondi per l'arricchimento e l'ampliamento dell'offerta formativa e per gli interventi perequativi. - E. F. 2010.*

Circolare Ministeriale n. 199 del 28/07/1979. *Forme particolari di sostegno a favore degli alunni portatori di handicap* (artt. 2 e 7 della Legge n. 517/1977).

Circolare Ministeriale n. 8 del 6/03/2013. *Direttiva Ministeriale 27/12/2012 "Strumenti d'intervento per alunni con bisogni educativi speciali e organizzazione territoriale per l'inclusione scolastica. Indicazioni operative."*

Crotty, M. (2003). *The foundations of social research.* London, UK: Sage.

De Leo, D., & Heller, T. S. (2004). Who are the kids who self-harm? An Australian self-report school survey. *Medical journal of Australia*, *181*(3), 140-144.

Decreto Ministeriale. (2011). n. 5669, 12 Luglio. applicativo della Legge 8 ottobre 2010, n. 170.

Denzin, N. K., & Lincoln, Y. S. (Eds.). (1998). *Collecting and interpreting qualitative materials*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Dhillon, S. (2016). Beyond the coding process: A review of Margrit Schreier's qualitative content analysis in practice. *The Qualitative Report*, *21*(8), 1425-1427. Retrieved from http://nsuworks.nova.edu/tqr/vol21/iss8/6/

Dryer, R., Kiernan, M. J., & Tyson, G. A. (2006). The effects of diagnostic labelling on the implicit theories of attention-deficit/hyperactivity disorder held by health professionals. *Behaviour Change*, *23*(3), 177-185.

Evans, J. B. T. (1989). *Bias in human reasoning: Causes and consequences*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Faccio, E., Nardin, A., & Cipolletta, S. (2016). Becoming ex-obese: Narrations about identity changes before and after the experience of the bariatric surgery. *Journal of Clinical Nursing*, *25*(11-12), 1713-1720.

Faccio, E., Belloni, E., Cipolletta, S., Iudici, A., Castiglioni, M. & Mannarini, S. (2016): The power of weight and the weight of power in adolescence: a comparison between young and adult women, *Journal of Family Studies*, Doi: 10.1080/13229400.2016.1187660.

Fay, B. (2014). *Social theory and political practice (RLE social theory)*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Gådin, K. G., & Hammarström, A. (2005). A possible contributor to the higher degree of girls reporting psychological symptoms compared with boys in grade nine? *The European Journal of Public Health*, *15*(4), 380-385.

Goffman, E. (1963). *Stigma, notes on the management of spoiled identity.* New York, NY: Simon and Schuster/Touchstone Books.

Harris, M. (1976). History and significance of the emic/etic distinction. *Annual Review of Anthropology*, *5*, 329-350.

Have, P. (1999). *Doing conversation analysis. A practical guide.* London, UK: Sage.

Hinnant, J. B., O'Brien, M., & Ghazarian, S. R. (2009). The longitudinal relations of teacher expectations to achievement in the early school years. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, *101*(3), 662-670.

Heisenberg, W. (1958). *Physics and philosophy: The revolution in modern science*. London, UK: Penguin Books.

Hsieh, H. F., & Shannon, S. E. (2005). Three approaches to qualitative content analysis. *Qualitative Health Research*, *15*(9), 1277-1288.

Ibrahim, N., & Edgley, A. (2015). Embedding researcher's reflexive accounts within the analysis of a semi-structured qualitative interview. *The Qualitative Report*, *20*(10), 1671-1681. Retrieved from http://nsuworks.nova.edu/tqr/vol20/iss10/9

Iudici, A. (2014). *Health promotion in school: Theory, practice and clinical implications*. New York, NY: NOVA.

Iudici, A., Castelnuovo, G., & Faccio, E. (2015, March 17). New drugs and polydrug use: Implications for clinical psychology. *Frontiers Psychology*, *6*, 267. Retrieved from http://journal.frontiersin.org/article/10.3389/fpsyg.2015.00267/full

Iudici, A., & Verdecchia, M. (2015). Homophobic labeling in the process of identity construction. *Sexuality & Culture*, *19*(4), 737-758. doi:10.1007/s12119-015-9287-0.

Iudici, A., & Gagliardo Corsi, A. (2017). Evaluation in the field of social services for minors: Measuring the efficacy of interventions in the Italian Service for Health Protection and Promotion. *Evaluation and Program Planning*, *61*(4), 160-168. Retrieved from http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.evalprogplan.2016.11.016

Kondracki, N. L., & Wellman, N. S. (2002). Content analysis: Review of methods and their applications in nutrition education. *Journal of Nutrition Education and Behavior*, *34*(4), 224-230.

Jussim, L., Eccles, J., & Madon, S. (1996). Social perception, social stereotypes, and teacher expectations: Accuracy and the quest for the powerful self-fulfilling prophecy. *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*, *28*, 281-388.

Jussim, L., & Harber, K. D. (2005). Teacher expectations and self-fulfilling prophecies: Knowns and unknowns, resolved and unresolved controversies. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, *9*(2), 131-155.

Legge n. 104, 5 Febbraio 1992. Legge-quadro per l'assistenza, l'integrazione sociale e i diritti delle persone handicappate.

Legge n. 170, 8 Ottobre 2010. Nuove norme in materia di disturbi specifici di apprendimento in ambito scolastico.

Lemert, E. M. (1972). *Human deviance, social problems, and social control* (2nd ed.). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

LeBlanc, P. R. (2010). A practical approach to qualitative interviews. *The Qualitative Report*, *15*(6), 1621-1623. Retrieved from http://nsuworks.nova.edu/tqr/vol15/iss6/17

Krippendorff, K. (2004). *Content analysis: An introduction to its methodology*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

McMahon, S. E. (2012). Doctors diagnose, teachers label: The unexpected in pre-service teachers' talk about labelling children with ADHD. *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, *16*(3), 249-264.

Machů, E., Kočvarová, I., & Číslerová, T. (2015). Labeling in the education of gifted pupils. *Stanisław Juszczyk: The New Educational Review*, *4*(3), 218-230.

Martin, J., Sugarman, J., & Slaney, K. L. (2015). *The Wiley handbook of theoretical and philosophical psychology: Methods, approaches, and new directions for social sciences*. Somerset, NJ: John Wiley & Sons.

Miles, M. B., & Huberman, A. M. (1994). *Qualitative data analysis: An expanded sourcebook.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

MIUR. (2009). *Linee guida per l'integrazione degli alunni con disabilità.*

MIUR. (2012). Direttiva Ministeriale 27/12/2012. *Strumenti d'intervento per alunni con Bisogni Educativi Speciali e organizzazione territoriale per l'inclusione scolastica.* Retrieved from http://hubmiur.pubblica.istruzione.it/alfresco/d/d/workspace/SpacesStore/8d31611f-9d06-47d0-bcb7-3580ea282df1/dir271212.pdf (ver. 22.12.13).

Morey, N. C., & Luthans, F. (1984). An emic perspective and ethnoscience methods for organizational research. *The Academy of Management Review*, *9*(1), 27-36.

Morris, M. W., Leung, K., Ames, D., & Lickel, B. (1999). Views from inside and outside: Integrating emic and etic insights about culture and justice judgment. *Academy of Management Review*, *24*(4), 781-796.

Morse, J. M. (1991). *Qualitative nursing research*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Neuman, W. L. (1997). *Social research methods: Qualitative and quantitative approaches* (3rd ed.). Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon.

Neuendorf, K. A. (2016). *The content analysis guidebook*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Paine, G. (2015). A pattern-generating tool for use in semi-structured interviews. *The Qualitative Report*, *20*(4), 468-481. Retrieved from http://nsuworks.nova.edu/tqr/vol20/iss4/9.

Peer, L., & Reid, G. (Eds.). (2016). *Special educational needs: A guide for inclusive practice*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Pennebaker, J. W. (2000). Psychological factors influencing the reporting of physical symptoms. In C. A. Bachrach, J. B. Jobe, H. S. Kurtzman, & V. S. Cain (Eds.), *The science of self-report: Implications for research and practice* (pp. 299-315). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Reynolds, L. T., & Herman-McKinney, N. J. (Eds.). (2003). *Handbook of symbolic interactionism*. Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield.

Rickwood, D. J., Deane, F. P., & Wilson, C. J. (2007). When and how do young people seek professional help for mental health problems. *Medical Journal of Australia*, *187*(7 Suppl), S35-S39.

Robinson, J., Cox, G., Malone, A., Williamson, M., Baldwin, G., Fletcher, K., & O'Brien, M. (2013). A systematic review of school-based interventions aimed at preventing, treating, and responding to suicide-related behavior in young people. *Crisis: The Journal of Crisis Intervention and Suicide Prevention*, *34*(3), 164-182.

Robinson, J., Yuen, H., Martin, C., Hughes, A., Baksheev, G., Dodd, S., & Yung, A. (2011). Does screening high school students for psychological distress, deliberate self-harm or suicidal ideation cause distress and is it acceptable? An Australian based study. *Crisis*, *32*, 254-263. doi:10.1027/0227-5910/a000087.

Rothe, J. P. (1993). *Qualitative research: A practical guide*. Heidelberg, Canada: RCI Publications.

Salvini, A. (2011). *Psicologia clinica dell'interazione e psicoterapia*. Firenze, Italy: Giunti.

Salvini, A. (2004). *Psicologia clinica*. Padova, Italy: Utet.

Scruton, H., & McNamara, J. (2015). An interactionist approach to learning disabilities. *International Journal of Education*, *7*(4), 43-52.

Seidman, I. (2012). *Interviewing as qualitative research: A guide for researchers in education and the social sciences* (4th ed.). New York, NY: Teachers College, Columbia University.

Smith, J. A. (1995). Semi-structured interviewing and qualitative analysis. In J. A. Smith, R. Harré, & L. Van Langenhove (Eds.), *Rethinking methods in psychology* (pp. 9-26). London, UK: Sage.

Smith, A. E., Jussim, L., & Eccles, J. (1999). Do self-fulfilling prophecies accumulate, dissipate, or remain stable over time? *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *77*(3), 548-565.

Thomson, M. M. (2012). Labelling and self- esteem: Does labelling exceptional students impact their self- esteem? *Support for Learning*, *27*(4), 158-165.

Trouilloud, D. O., Sarrazin, P. G., Martinek, T. J., & Guillet, E. (2002). The influence of teacher expectations on student achievement in physical education classes: Pygmalion revisited. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, *32*(5), 591-607.

Turchi, G. P., & Celleghin E. (2010). *Logoi - dialoghi di e su Psicologia delle differenze culturali e clinica della devianza come occasione peripatetica per un agorà delle politiche sociali.* Padova, Italy: Upsel Domeneghini.

Thurlow, C. (2001). Naming the "outsider within": Homophobic pejoratives and the verbal abuse of lesbian, gay and bisexual high-school pupils. *Journal of Adolescence*, *24*(1), 25-38.

Thurlow, C., & Brown, A. (2003). Generation txt? The sociolinguistics of young people's text-messaging. *Discourse Analysis Online*, *1*(1). Retrieved from https://extra.shu.ac.uk/daol/articles/v1/n1/a3/thurlow2002003.html

Yu, C. H., Jannasch-Pennell, A., & Di Gangi, S. (2011). Compatibility between text mining and qualitative research in the perspectives of grounded theory, content analysis, and reliability. *The Qualitative Report*, *16*(3), 730-744 Retrieved from http://nsuworks.nova.edu/tqr/vol16/iss3/6

Von Glasersfeld, E. (2009). L'interazionismo costruttivista: Interazionismo e costruzione della conoscenza. *Scienze dell'Interazione*, *1*(1), 6-13.

Von Glasersfeld, E. (2013). *Radical constructivism*. London, UK: Routledge.

Watzlawick, P. (Ed.). (1984). *The invented reality: How do we know what we believe we know? (Contributions to constructivism).* Markham, Canada: W.W. Norton & Company.

Weare, K. (2000). *Promoting mental, emotional, and social health: A whole school approach*. London, UK: Routledge.

White, M. D., & Marsh, E. E. (2006). Content analysis: A flexible methodology. *Library Trends*, *55*(1), 22-45.

Woods, P. (2011). *Divided school* (Vol. 206). New York, NY: Routledge.

World Health Organization. (2001). *International Classification of Functioning, Disability and Health: ICF*. Retrieved from http://www.who.int/classifications/icf/en/

Author Note

Antonio Iudici has master's degrees in psychology and specialization in scholastic psychology and psychotherapy. He currently teaches "Methods and techniques in interactionist and constructivist" in Department of Philosophy, Education, Sociology and Applied Psychology (FISPPA) of the University of Padova (Italy). He is Associate Researcher at the Institute of Psychology and Psychotherapy of Padova and he teaches in Scuola di Psicoterapia Interazionista di Padova. He is the Director of the Master in Forensic Psychology. Areas of research: health promotion, disability, child protection, counseling in legal-child, deviance, school integration and educational. He has published most paper in international journals and he published the book *Health Promotion in School: Theory, Practice and Clinical Implications*. Correspondence regarding this article can be addressed directly to: antonio.iudici@unipd.it.

Matteo Fabbri has master degrees in psychology and he is specialist in family, criminal, community, civil and commercial Mediation. He currently works in a community for minors and carry out various educational and psychological activities in many schools. Areas of research: Learning Disabilities, Child Protection, Counseling in legal-child, Mediation in civil and scholastic field. Correspondence regarding this article can also be addressed directly to: fabbrimatteo5@yahoo.it.

Article Citation

Iudici, A., & Fabbri, M. (2017). The construction of "discomfort psychological": An exploration of Italians teachers' reports. *The Qualitative Report, 22*(8), 2281-2295. Retrieved from http://nsuworks.nova.edu/tqr/vol22/iss8/13