

Democratic School Culture and Democratic School Leadership

Pažur, Monika; Domović, Vlatka; Kovač, Vesna

Source / Izvornik: **Croatian Journal of Education : Hrvatski časopis za odgoj i obrazovanje, 2020, 22, 1137 - 1164**

Journal article, Published version

Rad u časopisu, Objavljena verzija rada (izdavačev PDF)

<https://doi.org/10.15516/cje.v22i4.4022>

Permanent link / Trajna poveznica: <https://urn.nsk.hr/urn:nbn:hr:186:048909>

Rights / Prava: [In copyright](#)/[Zaštićeno autorskim pravom.](#)

Download date / Datum preuzimanja: **2025-03-31**



Repository / Repozitorij:

[Repository of the University of Rijeka, Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences - FHSSRI Repository](#)



Democratic School Culture and Democratic School Leadership

Monika Pažur¹, Vlatka Domović¹ and Vesna Kovač²
¹Faculty of Teacher Education, University of Zagreb
²Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, University of Rijeka

Abstract

The paper presents the results of research exploring the relationship between democratic school leadership and democratic school culture in primary schools. The research is based on the present knowledge that points to the significant role of principals in the process of developing and changing school culture (Fullan, 2005). The aim of the research was to determine the extent of primary teachers' perception regarding the level of development of selected characteristics of democratic school leadership and its connection to their estimate of the level of development of selected characteristics of democratic school culture. The research comprised 651 teachers from the City of Zagreb and Zagreb County. The research was conducted by means of a survey using a questionnaire containing two instruments: the Instrument for the measurement of characteristics of democratic school leadership (designed for the research) and the Instrument for the measurement of characteristics of democratic school culture (adopted from Spajić-Vrkaš, 2016). According to the teachers' perception, principals in the City of Zagreb and Zagreb County implement characteristics of democratic school leadership to a significant degree. They perceive the level of characteristics of democratic school culture as moderate. In addition, the research has determined a statistically significant high positive correlation between characteristics of democratic school leadership and democratic school culture.

Key words: *democratic school culture; democratic school leadership; primary school; principal, teachers.*

Introduction

Modern democratic society is empowered by nurturing fundamental democratic values, which need to be integrated into all spheres and dimensions of society, including education. The interaction between the development of democratic society and

education is complex, since democracy can be empowered by education, but, on the other hand, democratic education is possible only in a democratic social environment (Dundar, 2013).

In response to the needs of contemporary democratic societies, the actual global, European and Croatian educational policies require greater openness, flexibility and inclusiveness from educational institutions (Croatian Parliament, 2014). In such a way, schools should be contributing to the development of society by developing competences which will enable students for active participation in democratic society in adulthood (Council of Europe, 2010).

The fundamental precondition for the realization of democratic educational aims is the democratic functioning of schools, which are themselves characterised by a high level of democratic school culture. The development of school culture is a long-lasting process which requires the continuous and systematic action of all stakeholders involved in school life (Reitzug & O`Hair, 2002; Rusch, 1994; Rusch & Perry, 1993; Willimas et al., 2009), wherein a particular role is played by the way school leadership is carried out (Delgado, 2014; Dorczak, 2014; Gülbeher, 2016; Harber & Trafford, 1999; Jwan et al., 2010; Kensler et al., 2009; Normore & Jean-Marie, 2008).

In the Republic of Croatia, research has been conducted on school culture and school climate (Domović, 2004; Spajić-Vrkaš et al., 2016), school leadership (Buchberger et al., 2018; Staničić, 2006), and the relationship between school culture and school leadership (Slavić et al., 2019). However, there is no research focusing on democratic school culture and democratic school leadership, i.e. their development and interaction. Although data on school culture and school leadership are usually collected from different sources by means of different research instruments, this research uses data based on teacher estimates. Teachers are co-creators of school culture (Prosser, 1999; Schein, 2000; Stoll, 1998), and thus relevant actors who can provide quality evaluation of the characteristics of school culture and school leadership (Fullan, 2005; 2007; Hargreaves, 1999). In line with this, a research has been conducted to test whether there is a connection between the characteristics of democratic school culture and democratic school leadership in primary schools.

Democratic school culture

School culture is of great interest to researchers in education for its complexity and multidimensionality but also for its strong influence on the work and development of schools. School culture refers to overall school relationships which are based on a complex pattern of values and norms (Spajić-Vrkaš, 2016). Unlike this general definition of school culture, in this paper democratic school culture is understood as culture based on democratic values and democratic norms which represent the basis for nurturing and developing democratic relationships in schools. *Democratic values* are fundamental values which represent the main strongholds of human rights: freedom¹, equal rights²

¹ It refers to freedom of thought, freedom of conscience and religious belief, and freedom of thinking and expression.

and solidarity³ (Universal Declaration of Human Rights, Article 1). *Democratic norms* are the assumptions, beliefs, symbols and taboos which are based on full respect and protection of human dignity and incorporate the principles of equality, participation, majority rule and minority rights, the rule of law, respecting human rights, free and fair elections, and division of power⁴. Furthermore, *democratic relations* are the verbal and non-verbal interactions which enable and foster freedom, equal rights and solidarity, encourage critical thinking and open up space for sharing ideas, and which reflect an atmosphere of trust, non-violence and respecting differences.

The description of democratic school culture is based on values derived from human rights theory (Apple & Beane, 1995; Ehman, 1980; Spajić-Vrkaš, 2016). Accordingly, in democratic school culture students participate in adopting rules and in organizing various events (Lenzi et al., 2014), and the whole school promotes the freedom of expression of all stakeholders (Vieno et al., 2005). The values and ways of acting in democratic schools are summarized by Apple and Beane (1995) in their book *Democratic schools*, where they explain that the central mission of democratic schools is to promote “the content” of democracy. They see democracy as an “idealized” set of values and norms we have to live by and which must lead us. The content of democracy implies the care for dignity and for the rights of individuals and minorities as well as the care for “the common good”. A democratic school encourages students to accept differences (John & Osborn, 1992; acc. to Mellor & Elliot, 1996). Based on the mentioned democratic values and norms, democratic school culture is imbued with specific relationships. Here mutual trust and positive relationships among all the school actors are nurtured, including discussions on topics which are relevant and significant for the community (Homana et al., 2006). Democratic school cultures nurture the freedom of expressing thought and encourage the development and use of critical thinking, thus creating an open space for sharing and implementing ideas (Apple & Beane, 1995). In democratic school culture, democratic values and practices are an integral part of the curriculum, of the organization of learning and teaching, and of school leadership. Hyde and LaPrad (2015) describe democratic school culture as that in which teachers critically interpret the national curriculum. In democratic school cultures the responsibility regarding decision-making is shared among all actors in the school community, thus not allowing the arbitrariness of individual stakeholders (Mintz, 2005). Teachers, parents, representatives of the local community and other citizens are expected to critically participate in developing school policies and programmes (Apple & Beane, 1995).

Democratic school leadership

Results of research on democratic school culture (Delgado, 2014; Dorczak, 2014; Gülbeher, 2016; Harber & Trafford, 1999; Jwan et al., 2010; Kensler et al., 2009; Normore

² It refers to equal protection against all forms of discrimination in the field of all human rights.

³ It refers to social security, an adequate standard of living and the availability of education.

⁴ Adapted according to the key elements of modern democracy from the manual on understanding human rights by Benedek and Nikolova (2003).

& Jean-Marie, 2008) point to the importance of the role of school principals as key agents and initiators of change, and special attention of researchers is focused on finding those characteristics of principals' leadership which significantly contribute to strengthening democratic school culture. Most authors agree that democracy, and democratic school culture respectively, can be developed if they are encouraged in practice and implemented in everyday school situations (Hope, 2012; Moos, 2011; Riley, 2003; Woods, 2004; Woods, 2005), particularly when school staff and students are adequately included in activities of school leadership, that is, in decision-making processes (Parham, 1944; Riley, 2003; Woods, 2005). In other words, school principals are expected to practise characteristics of democratic school leadership.

The results of conducted research reveal numerous possibilities how to operationalize democratic school leadership, visible in various initiatives taken by principals and other stakeholders, which can be summarized through three dimensions of action: *empowering stakeholders for democracy, creating conditions for democracy, and daily "modelling" of democracy* (Pažur & Kovač, 2019)⁵. As an illustration of such initiatives, Woods (2005) emphasizes that teachers, students and other stakeholders should be given clear guidelines regarding the way of their inclusion in making decisions about day-to-day functioning of schools, also stressing the importance of applying "softer" measures such as complimenting staff on successfully completed tasks through which motivation and self-esteem for taking initiative are increased (Møller, 2006). Hope (2012) suggests the implementation of new institutional structures of management which can empower the practice of democratic decision-making (for instance, appointing one or more deputy-principals, forming temporary or permanent managing bodies which are entrusted with making certain decisions). Leadership activities in which principals model democratic values through their own behaviour are highly recommended, for example, by solving conflicts through dialogue of all involved actors (Begley & Zaretsky, 2004; Riley, 2003) or by creating situations which foster free expression of opinions and open conversation (Rusch, 1995; Woods, 2007).

Research results so far indicate the numerous positive effects that practising certain dimensions of democratic school leadership has on schools, teachers and students (Chi Keung, 2008; Magner & Nowak, 2012; Quinn & Owen, 2016; Rice & Schneider, 1994; Smylie, Lazarus & Brownlee-Conyers, 1996)⁶. Nevertheless, it should be noted

⁵ In a detailed analysis of research focusing on democratic school leadership, Pažur and Kovač (2019) summarize the key elements within which the features of this type of leadership are operationalized: *circulating/circular leadership* (individuals and/or groups exempt from hierarchically-based structures alternately participate in leadership; they design and/or take over initiatives for the development of their school and its specific aims and mission); *practising democracy* (creating everyday situations which encourage and empower individuals to fulfil their right to participate in decision-making processes, the right to freedom of expression and the right to their own personal and professional development) and *development of democracy* (with time, through their active participation in leadership processes, all stakeholders develop knowledge, skills and abilities which make them into active and responsible citizens).

⁶ In addition to the emphasized positive effects that democratic school leadership has on schools, students and teachers, the importance of discussions that point to the challenges and deficiencies of democratic school leadership should not be underestimated (see Pažur & Kovač, 2019, p. 55).

there is not enough empirical data that could contribute to a better understanding of the circumstances in which the effects of democratic school leadership will be stronger, more positive and will make more sense. It is possible to assume that some organizational characteristics of schools, such as their size or geographic location, can function as circumstances which either encourage or hinder the development of certain dimensions of democratic school practice (Genc, 2008; Hope, 2012). Besides, specific characteristics of principals (e.g. the length of their tenure) can influence their ability to practise democratic school leadership (Delgado, 2014).

In order to gain insight into the development of democratic school culture and democratic school leadership, and to establish the nature of their relationship, an empirical study has been carried out including teachers employed in twenty primary schools in Croatia.

Aims of the research

The conducted research had the following aims:

- 1 To determine how primary school teachers perceive the level of development of certain characteristics of democratic school culture and democratic school leadership.
- 2 To determine whether there is a correlation between teachers' estimates of the characteristics of democratic school culture and their estimates regarding the characteristics of democratic school leadership.
- 3 To determine the correlation between teachers' estimates of the characteristics of democratic school leadership, certain school features (size, geographic location), teachers (the length of their professional experience), the principals (the duration of their tenure) on the one hand, and the characteristics of democratic school culture on the other.

Methodology

Sample and data collection

The research included 651 teachers from 20 primary schools from the City of Zagreb and Zagreb County. The sample of schools was based on the random choice of schools, which was proportional to basic school features in the area of the City of Zagreb and Zagreb County (Table 1)⁷.

⁷ Due to the inexistence of previous research in the Republic of Croatia which would suggest regional differences regarding the characteristics of democratic school leadership and democratic school culture, the present study included two Croatian counties: The City of Zagreb and Zagreb County. The real distribution of teachers in the areas of the City of Zagreb and Zagreb County was developed on the basis of the number of students in the schools, starting from the assumption that the number of students in schools would be proportional to the number of teachers in the same schools, since the number of students per class is defined by the State Pedagogical Standards for the System of Primary Education (NN 63/2008), and the number of teachers in schools depends on the number of classes. The total number of students in the area of the City of Zagreb and Zagreb County is 76,837. As many as 73 % of them come from the City of Zagreb and 27 % from Zagreb County.

Table 1
Schools in which the research was conducted

County	City of Zagreb: 424 (65 %)		Zagreb County: 227 (35 %)	
Location of the school: inner-city / suburb	Inner-city: 347 (82 %)	Suburb: 77 (18 %)	Inner-city: 137 (60 %)	Suburb: 90 (40 %)
School size (small = >300 students; medium = 300 - 600 students; large = <600 students)	Small: 0 Medium: 211 (61 %) Large: 136 (39 %)	Small: 29 (37 %) Medium: 0 Large: 48 (63 %)	Small: 24 (18 %) Medium: 0 Large: 113 (82 %)	Small: 31 (35 %) Medium: 59 (65 %) Large: 0

Besides school features, the independent variables in the research included the years of teachers' professional experience and the length of the current principal's tenure. In the 20 schools included in the research, regarding the two independent variables, the sample comprised 47.3 % of teachers employed in schools where the current principal was holding that position from 1-5 years, 35.5 % of teachers worked in schools where the current principal had an experience of 6-9 years, whereas 17.2 % worked in schools where the principal held that position for 10 and more years. The interviewed teachers had a professional experience in school ranging from one year up to 42 years, with the following distribution: 31.2 % of the teachers had 1 to 9 years of professional experience, 30 % had 10-19 years of professional experience, 23.7 % had between 20 and 29 years of professional experience and 12.3 % had 30 or more years of professional experience. The data were gathered in January and February 2019, in those schools which had previously agreed to participate in the research via an online questionnaire. Before the procedure started, the principals signed an informed consent stating the school was willing to participate in the research. Moreover, all teachers were informed of the aim of the investigation, their anonymity was granted, and the way the data would be used was explained to them. The teachers' participation in the research was voluntary. The data were gathered at the beginning of teacher council meetings (55 %) or by means of coded questionnaires sent to the school addresses by mail (45 %).

The instruments

The questionnaire used in the research consists of a scale for measuring the characteristics of democratic school culture and a scale for measuring the characteristics of democratic school leadership. Besides the mentioned measures, data on teacher's professional experience, the school size (number of students), the school location according to the criterion urban – suburban, and the duration of the principal's tenure were collected. These demographic data were chosen because earlier research had shown these school features to be relevant for the development of democratic school culture and democratic school leadership (Delgado, 2014; Hope, 2012; Genc, 2008).

To measure the characteristics of democratic school culture an instrument was used which had previously been used in three studies (Batarelo et al., 2010; Spajić-Vrkaš et al., 2014; Spajić-Vrkaš et al., 2016). The original instrument consisted of 32 statements.

Each statement was linked to a Likert-type scale with five verbalised scale points, where 1 means total disagreement and 5 total agreement with the corresponding statement.

A factor analysis with *varimax* rotation was performed on the collected data, and it yielded 7 factors explaining 56 % of the variance. Based on the analysis, 6 items whose factor loading was significant/visible on several factors were removed from further procedure. The factor analysis with *oblimin* rotation was repeated, and 5 factors were extracted, showing latent types of development of school culture with expressed different characteristics of democracy – *School culture oriented towards social themes*, *School culture with predominantly authoritarian characteristics*, *School culture with orientation towards non-violent conflict resolution*, *School culture with orientation towards student participation in the work of the school*. The instrument explained 52.1 % of the variance ($\alpha = .816$). Considering the aim of the study, this work utilised only the subscale *School culture with predominantly democratic characteristics* (the shorter term *Democratic school culture* is used further in the text). Cronbach's Alpha for this subscale is $\alpha = .823$. This subscale consists of seven items which refer to a school culture in which: students respect their teachers, and the teachers are careful not to violate the dignity of their students; teachers emphasize the positive sides of the student, not the negative ones; a feeling of satisfaction is developed; students have a strong feeling of school belonging and their vote matters when making decisions; their teachers require from them to critically evaluate what they learn.

An instrument which measures the characteristics of democratic school leadership was constructed specially for the needs of this research⁸, and it contains 32 statements which describe the typical characteristics of a principal who practises democratic school leadership. On a scale from 1 to 5, the teachers estimated the degree to which each statement refers to their principal⁹. In order to determine the structure of the questionnaire, a factor analysis was conducted on the gathered data. Two factors were extracted which in the *oblimin* rotation were in high mutual correlation ($r = 0.726$) and together explain 67 % of the variance. The Cronbach α coefficient of reliability for the whole instrument is $\alpha = .981$. This instrument can be used to measure one general factor which describes the phenomenon of democratic school leadership, since all the necessary requirements for the instrument to indicate one-dimensionality of the object of measurement have been confirmed (Carmines & Zeller, 1979)¹⁰.

⁸ Before the final use of the instrument in the research, a detailed theoretical operationalization of the construct, an expert validation with the aim of establishing the content validity of the construct, and a metric validation on a trial sample of 77 teachers was conducted (for more detail, see Pažur, 2020).

⁹ Examples of items describing characteristics of democratic school leaderships are: the principal creates an atmosphere of mutual respect and co-operation; when making decisions, the principal includes all stakeholders in discussion about facts which are necessary to make that decision; the principal creates an atmosphere in which all persons can freely express their opinions and attitudes without fear of consequences; when distributing school tasks, the principal gives a chance to everyone to participate in them.

¹⁰ It refers to the following: 1) the proportion of variance of the first extracted factor explains 62 % of the variance; 2) the subsequent factors explain approximately equal proportions of the remaining variance, with a gradual decrease; 3) all, or the majority of the items, have a relatively high saturation on the first factor (from 0.861 to 0.603); 4) all, or the majority of factors, have a higher saturation on the first factor than on the subsequent factors.

Results

Research results reveal that the average values of the estimates of the development of democratic school leadership's characteristics in the observed schools are relatively high ($M=4,16$; $SD = 0.723$), while the estimates of democratic school culture's characteristics show medium values ($M=3,74$; $SD=0.59$). Of the suggested democratic school leadership's characteristics, teachers value most highly the statement that their principals are available for free communication for all members of the school organization when they need help ($M = 4.42$, $SD = 0.87$). Further, they highly value the statements that principals communicate with decision-makers and promote the introduction of positive changes in school ($M = 4.38$, $SD = 0.85$), and that they accept initiatives suggested by the teachers ($M = 4.36$, $SD = 0.86$). Regarding the characteristics of democratic school culture, teachers assign the highest values to the statements that teachers are careful not to violate the dignity of their students ($M = 4.13$, $SD = 0.73$), and that they require students to critically evaluate what they learn ($M = 3.85$, $SD = 0.84$). Besides, teachers estimate that the students in their schools have a strong sense of school belonging ($M = 3.76$, $SD = 0.79$). Although these results should be taken cautiously, since the sample consists of schools whose principals have expressed interest in participating in the research and who probably favour practising democratic leadership, nevertheless, a trend towards encouraging the democratization of schools can be observed.

In order to answer the question whether there is a correlation between the teachers' perception of democratic school leadership and their perception of democratic school culture, the Pearson coefficient of correlation was calculated (Table 2). The results point to a statistically high positive correlation between the teachers' perception of the level of characteristics of democratic school culture and democratic school leadership in the observed primary schools ($R = 0.625$; $F(5,501) = 72.85$; $p < 0.001$). In other words, principals who practise democratic school leadership contribute to a significantly higher degree to the development of democratic school culture in their schools. Democratic school leadership explains 39.1 % of the variance of democratic school culture (Figure 1).

Table 2

Correlation: democratic school leadership and democratic school culture

		DEMOCRATIC SCHOOL CULTURE	DEMOCRATIC SCHOOL LEADERSHIP
DEMOCRATIC SCHOOL CULTURE	Pearson Coefficient	1	.625**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000
	N	626	519
DEMOCRATIC SCHOOL LEADERSHIP	Pearson Coefficient	.625**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	
	N	519	536




Figure 1. Dispersion diagram of democratic school leadership and characteristics of democratic school culture

A multiple regression analysis was performed in order to better explain the relationship between teachers' perception of democratic school culture and other variables included in the research (democratic school leadership, teachers' professional experience, school size, school location according to the urban-suburban criterion, the duration of the principal's tenure). The extent of the effect (Table 3) shows that 42.1 % of the variance ($R^2 = 0.421$) was explained by means of the model of democratic school leadership and democratic school culture together with the independent variables.

Table 3

Extent of effect of the model of democratic school leadership and democratic school culture

Model	R	R ²	adapted R ²	expected standard error	Statistics of changes				
					change R ²	change F	df1	df2	Sig. F change
1	.649 ^a	.421	.415	.44406	.421	72.854	5	501	.000

predictors: teachers' professional experience, school size, school location, duration of the principal's tenure, democratic school leadership

Besides the already established correlation between democratic school leadership and democratic school culture, the results of regression analysis have pointed to several more statistically significant indicators (Table 4). A low negative correlation ($R = -0.175$; $p < 0.001$) has been established between the number of students attending a particular school and democratic school culture, i.e. in schools with smaller number of students, a higher level of characteristics of democratic school culture has been observed. Further, a larger number of students ($R = 0.339$; $p < 0.001$) attend schools

situated in urban areas. Results point to a low negative statistical correlation between the duration of the current principal’s tenure and the development of characteristics of school leadership ($R = -0.164$; $p < 0.001$). Results do not reveal any significant correlation between the development of teachers’ professional experience and their perception of the development of characteristics of democratic school leadership and democratic school culture.

Table 4
Model of democratic school leadership (N=507)

		DSC	DSL	School location	School size	Teachers’ professional experience	Principal’s length of tenure
Pearson correlation coefficient	DSC	1.000	.618	-.112	-.175	-.023	-.003
	DSL	.618	1.000	.042	-.035	-.072	-.164
	School location	-.112	.042	1.000	.339	.068	-.333
	School size	-.175	-.035	.339	1.000	.099	.022
	Teachers’ professional experience	-.023	-.072	.068	.099	1.000	.047
	Principal’s length of tenure	-.003	-.164	-.333	.022	.047	1.000
	Sig. (1-tailed)	DSC	.	.000	.006	.000	.306
DSL		.000	.	.171	.215	.053	.000
School location		.006	.171	.	.000	.063	.000
School size		.000	.215	.000	.	.013	.311
Teachers’ professional experience		.306	.053	.063	.013	.	.146
Principal’s length of tenure		.473	.000	.000	.311	.146	.

Legend: DSL – democratic school leadership; DSC – democratic school culture

Table 5 shows that the level of correlation between the teachers’ perception of democratic school leadership and democratic school culture changes with relation to/ depending on the duration of the current principal’s appointment. Namely, in schools whose principals perform this function between 1 and 5 years, the correlation is $R = 0.619$, whereas in those schools where the principal has an experience of 10 years or longer, this correlation is significantly higher, i.e. $R = 0.769$. The intensity of a teacher’s perception of the connection between democratic school culture and democratic school leadership significantly changes depending on the length of professional experience of the teacher performing the estimate.

Table 5

Correlation between DSL and DSC in relation to the duration of the current principal's tenure

			Democratic school leadership	Democratic school culture
1-5 years	Democratic school leadership	Pearson Sig. (2-tailed) N	1 257	.619** .000 243
	Democratic school culture	Pearson Sig. (2-tailed) N	.619** .000 243	1 285
	Democratic school leadership	Pearson Sig. (2-tailed) N	1 194	.616** .000 181
6-9 years	Democratic school culture	Pearson Sig. (2-tailed) N	.616** .000 181	1 214
	Democratic school leadership	Pearson Sig. (2-tailed) N	1 85	.769** .000 84
	Democratic school culture	Pearson Sig. (2-tailed) N	.769** .000 84	1 105

Interpretation of the results

The results of the estimates of teachers included in the research of democratic school leadership and democratic school culture have revealed several significant trends. The estimates of the presence of characteristics of democratic school culture show there is significant space for its further development. This is particularly important because democratic school culture is not an aim in itself, but represents the context that facilitates the implementation of the actual recommendations of global, European and Croatian educational policies. What those recommendations have in common is the requirement that democratic practices and democratic values be implemented in educational institutions (Croatian Parliament, 2014; Council of Europe, 2010). The Strategy for Education, Science and Technology (2014, p. 50) stresses the following educational aims: “educating students in line with general cultural and civic values, including those of human rights and children’s rights, thereby rendering children competent to live in a multicultural world, to respect differences, to be tolerant and to participate actively and responsibly in the democratic development of society.” These aims can be achieved only in schools which nurture a democratic school culture and where all the stakeholders participate in its development.

Results of some previously conducted research (Pažur, 2016; Spajić-Vrkaš et al., 2016) have pointed to the lack of democratic practices and characteristics in educational institutions in Croatia, and it can thus be concluded that the development of democratic culture in schools is a complex and long-term process, which can be affected at different

levels and in different ways. Encouraging characteristics of democratic school leadership is just one of the factors in this process, whose importance and power of action is also supported by the results of this study.

It should be recalled that results which confirm a high positive correlation between the estimated development of characteristics of democratic school leadership and democratic school culture in Croatian schools are in line with discussions that emphasize principals as important actors who, both through their voluntary and involuntary actions, contribute to shaping certain features of school culture, including democratic ones (Delgado, 2014; Dorczak, 2014; Gülbeher, 2016; Harber & Trafford, 1999; Jwan et al., 2010; Kensler et al., 2009; Normore & Jean-Marie, 2008). The relatively high level of democratic school leadership reported by the teachers interviewed most certainly describes current trends in school leadership which should be further empowered¹¹. Future research should, nevertheless, additionally ascertain what the aspects of democratic school leadership are by which principals more significantly contribute to the development of democratic school culture: empowering other stakeholders, creating conditions for democratic leadership or modelling democracy (Pažur & Kovač, 2019).

Furthermore, the correlation between the level of democratic school culture and democratic school leadership is higher when estimated by teachers employed in schools whose principals have been performing their duty for a longer period of time. Assuming that certain features of school leadership have been in practice for a longer period of time, it is to be expected that the effects such leadership will have on school culture will be noticed only in the later stages of a principal's tenure. The explanation of such effects can be corroborated by Fullan's findings (2005) which point out that work on changing the school culture is a long-lasting and difficult process and consequently the effects of the principal's practice cannot be noticed in the first stage of a his/her appointment. Besides, those findings should be placed in the context of planning programmes of permanent professional development of principals which should ensure that developing competences for the implementation of democratic school leadership be practised from the very beginning of their tenure.

The length of the teachers' professional experience does not contribute to the change in the intensity of the correlation between the teacher's estimate of the development of characteristics of democratic school culture and democratic school leadership. These results can be placed in the context of research into teachers' professional development and their relationship with different activities in school, depending on their professional experience (e.g. Huberman, 1989). In the middle stage of their career teachers are more professionally mature and show a tendency towards experimenting with new ways of work, in comparison with novice teachers, and wish to advance their career through

¹¹ These findings are in line with research focusing on the characteristics of distributed school leadership, whose results point to high average individual values of features describing the participation of teachers and other staff in formal bodies of school management, and also including those features indicating adequate forms of interaction among stakeholders during decision-making (Buchberger et al., 2018).

co-operation with others and through feedback about their own work. It is possible to assume that those teachers expect a higher level of participation in decision-making and in other processes of school leadership, in comparison to novice teachers, who are more focused on developing their basic teaching competences. Including this group of teachers in the process of decision-making is an important message to principals, since experienced teachers can significantly contribute to shaping quality decisions that will improve the work of their school, and higher participation can indirectly strengthen their motivation and job satisfaction (Buchberger et al., 2018).

Conclusion and limitations of the research

This research has established a high correlation between teacher perceptions of democratic school leadership and democratic school culture. In other words, some aspects of how principals' democratic school leadership influences the development of democratic school culture have been explained. When interpreting the research results, certain limitations referring to the selected sample and the way of collecting data should be taken into consideration.

The research sample consisted of teachers employed in primary schools in the City of Zagreb and Zagreb County. Besides, the research was conducted in the urban and suburban areas of those two counties, which suggests that future research should verify the existence of possible regional differences at the level of the Republic of Croatia, and should include schools situated in rural areas as well.

It is important to take into consideration results of other research into school culture (Deal & Peterson, 1998; Prosser, 1999; Stoll, 1999) which in their description of characteristics emphasize the potential differences in perception among different actors, such as teachers, students and parents. This suggests that future research should include those stakeholders and their perspectives.

It should be noted that the obtained results represent the current state in schools, whereas the development of democratic school culture and democratic school leadership is seen as a continuous process. Consequently, those elements of school life should preferably be observed over a longer period of time.

The results of this study can have strong implications for shaping the school leadership practice, particularly in the context of further planning the professionalization of principals and of encouraging various mechanisms for the implementation of competences of democratic school leadership. On the other hand, it is necessary to empower teachers for active reflection on and participation in the development of democratic school culture.

References

- Apple, M. W., & Beane, J. A. (2007). *Democratic schools: Lessons in powerful education*. Heinemann.
- Batarelo, I., Čulig, B., Novak, J., Reškovac, T., & Spajić-Vrkaš, V. (2010). *Demokracija i ljudska prava u osnovnim školama: teorija i praksa*. Tipograf Zagreb d.o.o.

- Begley, P.T., & Zaretsky, L. (2004). Democratic school leadership in Canada's public school systems: Professional value and social ethic. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 42 (6), 640-655. <https://doi.org/10.1108/09578230410563647>
- Benedek, W., & Nikolova, M. (eds.). (2005). *Razumijevanje ljudskih prava: Priručnik o obrazovanju za ljudska prava*. Istraživačko-obrazovni centar za ljudska prava i demokratsko građanstvo.
- Buchberger, I., Kovač, V., & Ažić-Bastalić, A. (2018). Prínos distributivního vedení škol k pracovní spokojenosti učitelů. *Studia Paedagogica*, 23, 55 – 80. <https://doi.org/10.5817/SP2018-1-4>
- Carmines, E. G., & Zeller, R. A. (1979). *Reliability and validity assessment*. Sage Publications. <https://doi.org/10.4135/9781412985642>
- Chi Keung, C. (2008). The effect of shared decision-making on the improvement in teachers' job development. *New Horizons in Education*, 56(3), 31-46.
- Deal, E.T., & Peterson, K.D. (1999). *Shaping school culture: The heart of leadership*. Jossey-Bass Inc..
- Delgado, M.L. (2014). Democratic leadership in middle schools of Chihuahua Mexico: Improving middle schools through democracy. *Journal of International Education and Leadership*, 4(1), 1-11.
- Domović, V. (2004). Školsko ozračje i učinkovitost škola. Naknada Slap.
- Dorzak, R. (2014). Leadership for democracy: Developing democratic organizations. *Contemporary Educational Leadership*, 1(3), 19-25.
- Dundar, S. (2013). Students' participation to the decision-making process as a tool for democratic school. *Educational Sciences: Theory & Practice*, 13 (2), 867-875.
- Ehman, L. H. (1980). Change in high school students' political attitudes as a function of social studies classroom climate. *American Educational Research Journal*, 17, 253–265. <https://doi.org/10.3102/00028312017002253>
- Fullan, M. (2005). *Leadership & sustainability. System thinkers in action*. Corwin Press.
- Fullan, M. (2007). *The new meaning of educational change*. Teachers College, Columbia University.
- Genc, S.Z. (2008). An evaluation of teachers' views of primary school principals' practice of democratic values. *Social Behaviour and Personality*, 36(4), 483-492. <https://doi.org/10.2224/sbp.2008.36.4.483>
- Gülbahar, B. (2016). Views of the teachers on the behaviours and the personal characteristics of the school principal which are effective in formation of a democratic school environment. *Anthropologist*, 23(1-2), 21-32. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09720073.2016.11891920>
- Harber, C., & Trafford, B. (1999). Democratic management and school effectiveness in two countries: A case of pupil participation?. *Educational Management and Administration*, 27(1), 45-54. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0263211X990271004>
- Hargreaves, D.H. (1999). Helping practitioners explore their school's culture. In Prosser, J. (1999). *School Culture*. Paul Chapman Publishing Ltd.
- Homana, G., Barber, C., & Torney-Purta, J. (2006). Assessing school citizenship education climate: Implications for the social studies. *CIRCLE Working Paper 48*. <http://www.civicyouth.org/PopUps/WorkingPapers/WP48Homana.pdf>

- Hope, M.A. (2012). Small and perfectly formed? Is democracy an alternative approach to school leadership?. *School Leadership & Management*, 32 (3), 291-305. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13632434.2012.688739>
- Hrvatski Sabor. (2014). *Strategija obrazovanja, znanosti i tehnologije*. http://narodne-novine.nn.hr/clanci/sluzbeni/2014_10_124_2364.html
- Huberman, M. (1989). The professional life cycle of teachers. *Teacher College Records*, 91, 31-57.
- Hyde, A.M., & LaPrad, J.G. (2015). *Mindfulness, democracy and education*. *Democracy and Education*, 23(2), Article 2. <http://democracyeducationjournal.org/home/vol23/iss2/2>
- Jwan, J., Anderson, L., & Bennet, N. (2010). Democratic school leadership reforms in Kenya: Cultural and historical challenges. *Journal of Educational Administration and History*, 42 (3), 247-273. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00220620.2010.492962>
- Kensler, L. A. W., Caskie, G.I.L., Barber, M.E., & White, G.P. (2009). The ecology of democratic learning communities: Faculty trust and continuous learning in public middle schools. *Journal of School Leadership*, Volume 19, 697-735. <https://doi.org/10.1177/105268460901900604>
- Lenzi, M, Vieno, A., Sharkey, J., Mayworm, A., Scacchi, L., Pastore, M., & Santinello, M. (2014). How school can teach civic engagement besides civic education: The role of democratic school climate. *American Journal in Community Psychology*, 54(3), 251-261. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10464-014-9669-8>
- Mager, U., & Nowak, P. (2012). Effects of student participation in decision making at school. A systematic review and synthesis of empirical research. *Educational Research Review*, Volume 7, 38-61. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.edurev.2011.11.001>
- Mellor, S., & Elliot, M. (1996). School ethos and citizenship. *Australian Council for Educational Research*. http://works.bepress.com/suzanne_mellor/57/
- Mintz, J. (2005). *Democratic school governance*. <http://www.educationrevolution.org/blog/democratic-school-governance>
- Møller, J. (2006). Democratic schooling in Norway: Implications for leadership in practice. *Leadership and Policy in Schools*, 5, 53-69. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15700760500498779>
- Moos, L. (2011). Educating school leaders for democracy. *Scholar-Practitioner Quarterly*, 4 (4), 353-357.
- Normore, A. H., & Jean-Marie, G. (2008). Female secondary school leaders: At the helm of social justice, democratic schooling and equity. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 29 (2), 182-205. <https://doi.org/10.1108/01437730810852515>
- Parham, L.C. (1944). Democratic school administration. *The Social Studies*, 35 (6), 252-255. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00220973.1937.11016969>
- Pažur, M. (2016). *Rekonstrukcija građanskog odgoja i obrazovanja: koncept, teorije i prakse*. Mreža mladih Hrvatske.
- Pažur, M. (2019). *Povezanost demokratskoga školskog vođenja i demokratske školske kulture u percepciji učitelja osnovnih škola*. Doktorska disertacija. https://www.ffri.uniri.hr/files/dokumentiodsjeka/PED/Doktorski_rad-M_Pazur.pdf
- Pažur, M. (2020). Development and validation of a research instrument for measuring the presence of democratic school leadership characteristics. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*. <https://doi.org/10.1177/17411432200937312>
- Pažur, M., & Kovač, V. (2019). Demokratsko školsko vođenje: analiza dosadašnjih istraživanja i otvorena pitanja. *Metodički ogleđi*, 66(1), 33-60. <https://doi.org/10.21464/mo.26.1.5>

- Prosser, J. (1999). *School Culture*. Paul Chapan Publishing Ltd.
- Quinn, S., & Owen, S. (2016). Digging deeper: Understanding the power of 'student voice'. *Australian Journal of Education*, 1-13. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0004944115626402>
- Reitzug, U.C., & O'Hair, M. J. (2002). Tensions and struggles in moving toward a democratic school community, In Furman, G. (ed.) (2002). *School as community: From Promise to Practice*. State of New York, 119 – 141.
- Rice, E.M., & Schneider, G.T. (1994). A decade of teacher empowerment: An empirical analysis of teacher involvement in decision making, 1980-1991. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 32 (1), 43-58. <https://doi.org/10.1108/09578239410051844>
- Riley, K. (2003). 'Democratic leadership' – A contradiction in terms?. *Leadership and Policy in School*, 2(2), 125-139. <https://doi.org/10.1076/lpos.2.2.125.15543>
- Rusch, E.A. (1994, April). *Gaining voice: Democratic praxis in restructured schools*. [Paper presentation]. Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans, LA.
- Rusch, E.A. (1995, April). *Leadership in evolving democratic school communities*. [Paper presentation]. Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco, CA.
- Rusch, E.A., & Perry, E.A. (1993, April). *Resistance to change: Fact or stereotype*. [Paper presentation]. Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Atlanta, GA..
- Schein, E.H. (2000). *Sense and nonsense about culture and climate*. Sage. 2nd ed.
- Slavić, A., Rijavec, M., & Matić, D. (2019). Stil vodstva i subjektivna dobrobit učitelja: posredujuća uloga školske kulture. *Napredak*, 160(1-2), 7-27.
- Smylie, M.A., Lazarus, V., & Brownlee-Conyers, J. (1996). Instructional outcomes of school-based participative decision making. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 18 (3), 181-198. <https://doi.org/10.3102/01623737018003181>
- Spajić-Vrkaš, V. (2016). Stavovi učenika i nastavnika o školskoj kulturi kao kontekstu provedbe i rezultatima provedbe građanskog odgoja i obrazovanja: kvantitativna analiza. In Pažur, M. (ed.) (2016). *Rekonstrukcija građanskog odgoja i obrazovanja u Hrvatskoj: koncept, institucije i prakse*. Mreža mladih Hrvatske, pp. 77-123.
- Spajić-Vrkaš, V. (Suradnici: Čehulić, M., Elezović, I., Pažur, M., Rukavina, I., Vahtar, D.) (2016). *(Ne)moć građanskog odgoja i obrazovanja: objedinjeni izvještaj o učincima eksperimentalne provedbe kurikuluma građanskog odgoja i obrazovanja u 12 osnovnih i srednjih škola (2012./2013.)*. Zagreb: Nacionalni centar za vanjsko vrednovanje obrazovanja. https://www.ncvvo.hr/wp-content/uploads/2016/06/GOO_e_publicacija.pdf
- Staničić, S. (2006). *Menadžment u obrazovanju*. Rijeka: Vlastita naklada.
- Stoll, L. (1998). *School culture*. School Improvement Network's Bulletin, 9, 9-14. <https://doi.org/10.18296/set.0805>
- Stoll, L. (1999). School culture: Black hole or fertile garden for school improvement?. In Prosser, J. (1999). *School Culture*. Paul Chapan Publishing Ltd.
- Vieno, A., Perkins, D. D., Smith, T.M., & Santinello, M. (2005). Democratic school climate and sense of community in school: A multilevel analysis. *American Journal in Community Psychology*, 36(3), 327-341. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10464-005-8629-8>

- Vijeće Ministra Vijeća Europe. (2010). *Povelja Vijeća Europe o odgoju i obrazovanju za demokratsko građanstvo te odgoju i obrazovanju za ljudska prava* <https://rm.coe.int/CoERMPublicCommonSearchServices/DisplayDCTMContent?documentId=0900001680487821>
- Williams, L., Cate, J., & O' Hair, M.J. (2009). The boundary-spanning role of democratic learning communities. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, 37 (4), 452-472. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1741143209334580>
- Woods, P.A. (2004). Democratic leadership: Drawing distinctions with distributed leadership. *International Journal of Leadership in Education*, 7(1), 3-26. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1360312032000154522>
- Woods, P. A. (2005). *Democratic leadership in education*. Paul Chapman Publishing.
- Woods, P.A. (2007). A democracy of all learners: Ethical rationality and the affective roots of democratic leadership. *School Leadership and Management*, 26(4), 321-337. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13632430600900672>

Monika Pažur

Faculty of Teacher Education
Department of Education
University of Zagreb
Savska cesta 77, 10000 Zagreb, Croatia
monika.pazur@ufzg.hr

Vlatka Domović

Faculty of Teacher Education
Department of Education
University of Zagreb
Savska cesta 77, 10000 Zagreb, Croatia
vlatka.domovic@ufzg.hr

Vesna Kovač

University of Rijeka
Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences
Sveučilišna avenija 4, 51000 Rijeka, Croatia
vkovac@ffri.hr

Demokratska školska kultura i demokratsko školsko vođenje

Sažetak

U radu je prikazano istraživanje u kojem je provjeren odnos između demokratskoga školskog vođenja i demokratske školske kulture u osnovnim školama. Istraživanje se temelji na dosadašnjim spoznajama koje upućuju na značajnu ulogu ravnatelja u razvoju i mijenjanju školske kulture (Fullan, 2005). Svrha je istraživanja utvrditi je li i u kojoj mjeri procjena učitelja osnovnih škola o stupnju razvijenosti odabranih obilježja demokratskoga školskog vođenja povezana s njihovom procjenom stupnja razvijenosti odabranih obilježja demokratske školske kulture. U istraživanju je sudjelovao 651 učitelj iz grada Zagreba i Zagrebačke županije. Istraživanje je provedeno anketnim ispitivanjem u kojem je korišten upitnik koji je sadržavao Instrument za mjerenje obilježja demokratskoga školskog vođenja (izrađen za potrebe istraživanja) i Instrument za mjerenje obilježja demokratske školske kulture (preuzet od Spajić-Vrkaš, 2016.). Prema percepciji učitelja ravnatelj i u Gradu Zagrebu i Zagrebačkoj županiji u značajnoj mjeri implementiraju obilježja demokratskoga školskog vođenja te percipiraju da u školama postoji osrednja razina prisutnosti obilježja demokratske školske kulture. Nadalje, istraživanjem je utvrđena statistički značajna visoka pozitivna povezanost između obilježja demokratskoga školskog vođenja i demokratske školske kulture.

Ključne riječi: demokratska školska kultura; demokratsko školsko vođenje; osnovna škola; ravnatelj; učitelji.

Uvod

Suvremeno demokratsko društvo osnažuje se njegovanjem temeljnih demokratskih vrijednosti koje trebaju biti integrirane u sve sfere i dimenzije društva, pa tako i u odgoj i obrazovanje. Interakcija između razvoja demokratskoga društva i odgoja i obrazovanja je složena jer se demokracija može osnaživati obrazovanjem, a s druge strane demokratsko obrazovanje moguće je samo u demokratskom društvenom okruženju (Dundar, 2013).

Kao odgovor na potrebe suvremenih demokratskih društava, aktualna globalna, europska i hrvatska odgojno-obrazovna politika od odgojno-obrazovnih institucija zahtijeva veću otvorenost, fleksibilnost i uključivost (Hrvatski sabor, 2014). Na taj način škole bi razvoju društva trebale doprinijeti razvojem kompetencija koje će učenike i učenice osposobiti za aktivnu participaciju u demokratskom društvu u odrasloj dobi (Vijeće Europe, 2010).

Temeljna pretpostavka ostvarivanja demokratskih odgojno-obrazovnih ciljeva je demokratsko funkcioniranje samih škola koje karakterizira razvijena demokratska školska kultura. Razvoj školske kulture dugotrajan je proces koji zahtijeva kontinuirano i sustavno djelovanje svih uključenih u život škole (Reitzug i O`Hair, 2002; Rusch, 1994; Rusch i Perry, 1993; Willimas, Cate i O`Hair, 2009), pri čemu osobitu ulogu ima način vođenja škole (Delgado, 2014; Dorczak, 2014; Gülbeher, 2016; Harber i Trafford, 1999; Jwan, Anderson i Bennet, 2010; Kensler i sur., 2009; Normore i Jean-Marie, 2008).

U Republici Hrvatskoj postoje istraživanja koja se bave školskom kulturom i klimom (Domović, 2004; Spajić-Vrkaš i sur., 2016), školskim vođenjem (Buchberger, Kovač i Ažić-Bastalić, 2018; Staničić, 2006), kao i odnosom školske kulture i vođenja (Slavić, Rijavec i Matić, 2019). Međutim, ne postoje istraživanja koja su fokusirana na demokratsku školsku kulturu i demokratsko školsko vođenje, odnosno njihovu razvijenost i međuodnos. Iako se podatci o školskoj kulturi i školskom vođenju u pravilu prikupljaju iz različitih izvora i primjenom različitih istraživačkih instrumenata, u ovom istraživanju koriste se podatci temeljeni na procjenama učitelja. Učitelji su sukreatori školske kulture (Prosser, 1999; Schein, 2000; Stoll, 1998) te mjerodavni akteri koji mogu kvalitetno procijeniti obilježja školske kulture i školskoga vođenja (Fullan, 2005; 2007; Hargreaves, 1999). U skladu s tim provedeno je istraživanje u kojem se ispitalo postoji li povezanost između obilježja demokratske školske kulture i demokratskoga školskog vođenja u osnovnim školama.

Demokratska školska kultura

Školska kultura je od velikoga interesa za istraživače odgoja i obrazovanja zbog njezine kompleksnosti i višedimenzionalnosti, ali i zbog njezinoga velikog utjecaja na rad i razvoj škole. Školska se kultura odnosi na cjelokupne odnose u školi koji se temelje na složenom obrascu vrijednosti i normi (Spajić-Vrkaš, 2016). Za razliku od ove opće definicije školske kulture, demokratska se školska kultura, u ovom radu, razumije kao kultura koja se temelji na demokratskim vrijednostima i demokratskim normama na temelju kojih se njeguju i razvijaju demokratski odnosi u školi. *Demokratske vrijednosti* su temeljne vrijednosti koje su glavna uporišta ljudskih prava: sloboda¹, jednakopravnost² i solidarnost³ (Opća deklaracija o ljudskim pravima, članak 1). *Demokratske norme* su one pretpostavke, vjerovanja, simboli i tabui koji se temelje na punom poštovanju i zaštiti ljudskoga dostojanstva te integriraju načela jednakosti, sudjelovanja, vladavinu većine i prava manjina, vladavinu prava, poštivanje ljudskih prava, slobodne i poštene izbore, te podjelu moći⁴. Nadalje, *demokratski odnosi* su verbalne i neverbalne interakcije

¹ Podrazumijeva slobodu misli, savjesti i vjeroispovijesti te slobodu mišljenja i izražavanja.

² Podrazumijeva jednaku zaštitu protiv svih oblika diskriminacije u uvažavanju svih ljudskih prava.

³ Podrazumijeva socijalnu sigurnost, odgovarajući standard i dostupnost obrazovanja.

⁴ Prilagođeno na temelju ključnih elemenata moderne demokracije iz priručnika za razumijevanje ljudskih prava Benedek i Nikolova (2003).

koje omogućavaju i njeguju slobodu, jednakopravnost i solidarnost, koje potiču na kritičko promišljanje i otvaraju prostor za iznošenje ideja te u kojima se odražava kultura povjerenja, nenasilja i uvažavanja različitosti.

Opis demokratske školske kulture temelji se na vrijednostima koje proizlaze iz teorije ljudskih prava (Apple i Beane, 1995; Ehman, 1980; Spajić-Vrkaš, 2016). U skladu s tim, u demokratskoj školskoj kulturi učenici sudjeluju u donošenju pravila i organizaciji različitih događaja (Lenzi i sur., 2014), a cijela škola promiče slobodu izražavanja svih dionika (Vieno i sur., 2005). Vrijednosti i načine djelovanja u demokratskim školama sumiraju Apple i Beane (1995) u knjizi *Demokratske škole*, gdje objašnjavaju kako je centralna misija demokratskih škola promovirati „sadržaj” demokracije. Oni demokraciju vide kao „idealiziran” set vrijednosti i normi koje moramo živjeti i koje nas moraju voditi. Pod sadržajem demokracije podrazumijeva se briga za dostojanstvo i prava individua i manjina te briga za „zajedničko dobro”. Demokratska škola potiče učenike na prihvaćanje različitosti (John i Osborn, 1992; prema Mellor i Elliot, 1996). Na temelju navedenih demokratskih vrijednosti i normi, demokratska je školska kultura prožeta specifičnim odnosima. U njoj se njeguju međusobno povjerenje i pozitivni odnosi između svih školskih aktera te se razgovara o temama koje su važne i značajne za društvo (Homana, Barber i Torney-Purta, 2006). U demokratskim školskim kulturama njeguje se sloboda izražavanja mišljenja i potiče razvoj i primjena kritičkoga mišljenja te se stvara otvoreni prostor za iznošenje i implementaciju ideja (Apple i Beane, 1995). U demokratskoj školskoj kulturi demokratske su vrijednosti i prakse integrirane u kurikulum, organizaciju učenja i poučavanja i školsko vođenje. Hyde i LaPrad (2015) opisuju demokratsku školsku kulturu kao onu u kojoj učitelji kritički interpretiraju nacionalni kurikulum. U demokratskim školskim kulturama odgovornost oko donošenja odluka dijeli se na sve u školskoj zajednici, što onemogućuje samovolju pojedinih dionika (Mintz, 2005). Od učitelja, roditelja, predstavnika lokalne zajednice i ostalih građana očekuje se kritičko sudjelovanje u razvijanju školskih politika i programa (Apple i Beane, 1995).

Demokratsko školsko vođenje

Rezultati istraživanja demokratske školske kulture (Delgado, 2014; Dorczak, 2014; Gülbeher, 2016; Harber i Trafford, 1999; Jwan, Anderson i Bennet, 2010; Kensler i sur., 2009; Normore i Jean-Marie, 2008) ukazuju na važnost uloge ravnatelja škola kao ključnih nositelja i inicijatora promjena, a posebna pozornost istraživača fokusirana je na iznalaženje onih obilježja ravnateljskoga vođenja koja značajno doprinose jačanju demokratske školske kulture. Većina autora suglasna je u stavu da se demokracija odnosno demokratska školska kultura može razvijati ako se praktično potiče i primjenjuje u svakodnevnim školskim situacijama (Hope, 2012; Moos, 2011; Riley, 2003; Woods, 2004; Woods, 2005), a posebice kada se zaposlenike škole i učenike primjereno uključuje u aktivnosti školskoga vođenja odnosno procese donošenja odluka (Parham, 1944; Riley, 2003; Woods, 2005). Drugim riječima, od ravnatelja se očekuje prakticanje obilježja demokratskoga školskog vođenja.

Rezultati provedenih istraživanja otkrivaju brojne mogućnosti operacionalizacije demokratskoga školskog vođenja, vidljive kroz različite inicijative ravnatelja i drugih dionika, a moguće ih je sumirati kroz tri dimenzije djelovanja: *osnaživanje dionika za demokraciju, stvaranje uvjeta za demokraciju* i svakodnevno “*modeliranje*” demokracije (Pažur i Kovač, 2019)⁵. Kao ilustraciju takvih inicijativa Woods (2005) ističe da učiteljima, učenicima i drugim dionicima treba uputiti jasne smjernice o načinu uključivanja u donošenje odluka o svakodnevnom funkcioniranju škola, a naglašava i važnost primjene „mekših“ mjera, poput upućivanja pohvala za uspješno obavljene zadatke, čime se postiže jačanje motivacije i samopouzdanja za preuzimanje inicijativa (Møller, 2006). Hope (2012) predlaže implementaciju novih institucijskih struktura upravljanja koje mogu osnažiti prakticiranje demokratskoga donošenja odluka (primjerice, imenovanje jednog ili više zamjenika ravnatelja, formiranje privremenih ili stalnih tijela upravljanja kojima se povjerava donošenje određenih odluka). Snažno se preporučuju aktivnosti vođenja kojima ravnatelji modeliraju demokratske vrijednosti vlastitim primjerom, primjerice, rješavanjem sukoba dijalogom između svih uključenih aktera (Begley i Zaretsky, 2004; Riley, 2003) ili stvaranjem situacija u kojima se njeguje slobodno izražavanje mišljenja i otvoreni razgovor (Rusch, 1995; Woods, 2007).

Rezultati dosadašnjih istraživanja upućuju na brojne pozitivne efekte koje prakticiranje određenih dimenzija demokratskoga školskog vođenja ima na škole, učitelje i učenike (Chi Keung, 2008; Magner i Nowak, 2012; Quinn i Owen, 2016 i dr.; Rice i Schneider, 1994; Smylie, Lazarus i Brownlee-Conyers, 1996)⁶. Ipak, valja primijetiti da nema dovoljno empirijskih podataka koji mogu doprinijeti boljem razumijevanju okolnosti u kojima će efekti demokratskoga školskog vođenja na jačanje demokratske školske kulture biti snažniji, pozitivniji i imati više smisla. Moguće je pretpostaviti da neke organizacijske karakteristike škola, primjerice veličina ili geografska lokacija, mogu djelovati kao okolnosti koje potiču ili otežavaju razvijanje određenih dimenzija demokratske školske kulture (Genc, 2008; Hope, 2012). Također, određena obilježja ravnatelja (primjerice, duljina iskustva na funkciji ravnatelja) mogu djelovati na njihovu sposobnost prakticiranja demokratskoga školskog vođenja (Delgado, 2014).

Radi stjecanja uvida u razvijenost obilježja demokratske školske kulture i obilježja demokratskoga školskog vođenja i utvrđivanja prirode njihove povezanosti, provedeno je empirijsko istraživanje u kojem su sudjelovali učitelji zaposleni u dvadeset osnovnih škola u Hrvatskoj.

⁵ Detaljnom analizom istraživanja fokusiranih na demokratsko školsko vođenje, Pažur i Kovač (2019) sumiraju ključne elemente unutar kojih se operacionaliziraju obilježja ovoga tipa vođenja: *circulirajuće vođenje* (u vođenju naizmjenično sudjeluju pojedinci i/ili grupe, izuzeti iz hijerarhijski postavljenih struktura, koji osmišljavaju i/ili preuzimaju inicijative za razvoj škole i njenih specifičnih ciljeva i zadataka); *prakticiranje demokracije* (stvaranje svakodnevnih situacija koje potiču i osnažuju pojedince da ostvaruju svoje pravo na sudjelovanje u procesima donošenja odluka, pravo na slobodu izražavanja i pravo na vlastiti osobni i profesionalni razvoj) te *razvoj demokracije* (svi dionici kroz aktivno sudjelovanje u procesima vođenja te razvoju demokracije u školskoj zajednici s vremenom razvijaju znanja, vještine i sposobnosti koje ih čine aktivnim i odgovornim građanima).

⁶ Osim naglašenih pozitivnih efekata demokratskoga školskog vođenja na škole, učenike i učitelje, ne treba umanjiti važnost rasprava koje upozoravaju na izazove i nedostatke demokratskoga školskog vođenja (vidjeti Pažur i Kovač, 2019., str. 55).

Ciljevi istraživanja

U provedenom istraživanju postavljeni su sljedeći ciljevi:

1. Utvrditi kako učitelji osnovnih škola percipiraju razvijenost određenih obilježja demokratske školske kulture i demokratskoga školskog vođenja.
2. Utvrditi postoji li povezanost između učiteljskih procjena obilježja demokratske školske kulture i njihovih procjena obilježja demokratskoga školskog vođenja.
3. Utvrditi povezanost između učiteljske procjene obilježja demokratskoga školskog vođenja, određenih karakteristika škola (veličina, geografska pozicija), učitelja (duljina radnog iskustva) i ravnatelja (duljina obavljanja dužnosti) s obilježjima demokratske školske kulture.

Metodologija

Uzorak i prikupljanje podataka

U istraživanju je sudjelovao ukupno 651 učitelj iz 20 osnovnih škola iz područja Grada Zagreba i Zagrebačke županije. Uzorak škola u kojima je provedeno istraživanje temeljio se na slučajnom odabiru škola proporcionalnom s osnovnim karakteristikama obilježja škola na području Grada Zagreba i Zagrebačke županije (Tablica 1)⁷.

Tablica 1.

Osim obilježja škola, nezavisne varijable u istraživanju bile su duljina radnoga iskustva učitelja i duljina obavljanja dužnosti aktualnoga ravnatelja. U 20 škola uključenih u istraživanje u odnosu na ove dvije nezavisne varijable uzorak je sačinjavalo 47,3 % učitelja koji rade u školama u kojima je aktualni ravnatelj na toj poziciji između 1 i 5 godina, njih 35,5 % u školama u kojima je ravnatelj na toj poziciji između 6 i 9 godina, a njih 17,2 % u školama gdje je ravnatelj na toj poziciji 10 ili više godina. Ispitani učitelji imaju radnoga iskustva između nekoliko mjeseci rada do 42 godine rada u školi, od čega je njih 31,2 % zaposleno u školi između nekoliko mjeseci i 9 godina, 30 % između 10 i 19 godina, 23,7 % između 20 i 29 godina, a 12,3 % 30 godina i više.

Prikupljanje podataka odvijalo se u siječnju i veljači 2019. Podatci su prikupljeni u školama koje su prethodno iskazale interes za sudjelovanje u istraživanju putem *online* obrasca. Prije prikupljanja podataka ravnatelj je potpisao informirani pristanak o sudjelovanju škole u istraživanju. Također, svi su učitelji upućeni u svrhu istraživanja, zajamčena im je anonimnost i objašnjeno kako će se prikupljeni podatci koristiti.

⁷ Zbog nepostojanja prethodnih istraživanja u Republici Hrvatskoj koja bi sugerirala regionalne razlike u odnosu na obilježja demokratskoga školskog vođenja i demokratske školske kulture, u istraživanje su uključene dvije županije: Grad Zagreb i Zagrebačka županija. Realna distribucija učitelja na području Grada Zagreba i Zagrebačke županije razvijala se na temelju broja učenika u školama, polazeći od pretpostavke kako je broj učenika u školama proporcionalan s brojem učitelja u tim školama, s obzirom na to da je broj učenika po razrednom odjelu definiran Državnim pedagoškim standardom osnovnoškolskog sustava odgoja i obrazovanja (NN 63/2008), a broj učitelja u školama ovisi o broju razrednih odjela. Ukupan broj učenika na području Grada Zagreba i Zagrebačke županije je 76837, od čega je njih 73 % na području Grada Zagreba, a 27 % na području Zagrebačke županije.

Sudjelovanje učitelja u istraživanju bilo je dobrovoljno. Podatci su prikupljeni na početku sastanaka Učiteljskih vijeća (55 %) ili su šifrirani upitnici poslani školama poštom (45 %).

Instrumenti

Upitnik primijenjen u istraživanju sastoji se od skale za mjerenje obilježja demokratske školske kulture i skale za mjerenje obilježja demokratskoga školskog vođenja. Osim navedenih mjera, prikupljeni su podatci o radnom iskustvu učitelja, veličini škola (broj učenika), lokaciji škole prema kriteriju urbano – prigradsko te duljini obavljanja dužnosti aktualnoga ravnatelja u školi. Ovi demografski podatci izabrani su zato jer ranija istraživanja pokazuju ove karakteristike škola značajnima za razvoj demokratske školske kulture i demokratskoga školskog vođenja (Delgado, 2014; Hope, 2012; Genc, 2008).

Za mjerenje obilježja demokratske školske kulture korišten je instrument koji je prethodno primijenjen u tri istraživanja (Batareló i sur., 2010; Spajić-Vrkaš i sur., 2014; Spajić-Vrkaš i sur., 2016). Izvorni se instrument sastoji od 32 tvrdnje. Uz svaku tvrdnju ponuđena je skala Likertova formata s pet verbaliziranih skalnih točaka, pri čemu procjena 1 podrazumijeva potpuno neslaganje, a 5 potpuno slaganje s pripadajućom tvrdnjom.

Na prikupljenim podacima provedena je faktorska analiza s *varimax* rotacijom kojom je dobiveno 7 faktora koji ukupno objašnjavaju 56 % varijance. Na temelju analize iz daljnega postupka uklonjeno je 6 čestica čije je faktorsko opterećenje bilo izraženo na nekoliko različitih faktora. Ponovljena faktorska analiza s *oblimin* rotacijom polučila je 5 faktora koji prikazuju latentne tipove razvoja školskih kultura s izraženim različitim obilježjima demokratičnosti – Školska kultura orijentirana prema društvenima temama, Školska kultura s pretežno autoritarnim obilježjima, Školska kultura orijentirana prema nenasilnom rješavanju sukoba, Školska kultura orijentirana prema učeničkoj participaciji u radu škole. Instrumentom je objašnjeno 52,1 % varijance ($\alpha = .816$). S obzirom na cilj istraživanja u ovom radu korištena je samo podskala Školska kultura s pretežito demokratskim obilježjima (u daljnjem tekstu koristi se skraćeni naziv *Demokratska školska kultura*). Cronbachova alpha za ovu podskalu iznosi $\alpha = .823$. Ova podskala sastoji se od sedam čestica koje se odnose na školsku kulturu u kojoj: učenici poštuju svoje učitelje, a učitelji paze da ne povrijede dostojanstvo svojih učenika; učitelji naglašavaju pozitivne, a ne negativne strane učenika; razvija se osjećaj zadovoljstva; učenici imaju snažan osjećaj pripadnosti školi i njihov je glas važan prilikom donošenja odluka; učitelji od njih traže da kritički propitaju ono što uče.

Instrument kojim su mjerena obilježja demokratskoga školskog vođenja posebno je konstruiran za potrebe ovoga istraživanja⁸ i sadrži 32 tvrdnje koje opisuju tipična

⁸ Prije završne primjene instrumenta u ovom istraživanju, provedena je iscrpna teorijska operacionalizacija konstrukta, ekspertna validacija s ciljem utvrđivanja sadržajne valjanosti konstrukta te metrijska validacija na probnom uzorku od 77 učitelja (više detalja vidjeti u: Pažur, 2019).

obilježja ravnatelja koji prakticira demokratsko školsko vođenje. Učitelji su na ljestvici od 1 do 5 procijenili u kojoj se mjeri svaka tvrdnja odnosi na njihova ravnatelja⁹. Na prikupljenim podacima provedena je faktorska analiza kako bi se utvrdila struktura upitnika. Izlučena su u 2 faktora, koja su u *oblamin rotaciji* u međusobnoj visokoj korelaciji ($r = 0,726$) i zajedno objašnjavaju 67 % varijance. Cronbachov α koeficijent pouzdanosti za čitav instrument iznosi $\alpha = .981$. Ovim instrumentom može se mjeriti jedan opći faktor koji opisuje fenomen demokratskoga školskog vođenja s obzirom da su potvrđene sve hipoteze koje trebaju biti zadovoljene da bi instrument ukazivao na jednodimenzionalnost predmeta mjerenja (Carmines i Zeller, 1979)¹⁰.

Rezultati

Rezultati istraživanja otkrivaju da su prosječne vrijednosti procjena razvijenosti obilježja demokratskoga školskog vođenja u promatranim školama razmjerno visoke ($M = 4,16$; $SD = 0,723$), dok procjene obilježja demokratske školske kulture odražavaju srednje vrijednosti ($M = 3,74$; $SD = 0,59$). Od predloženih obilježja demokratskoga školskog vođenja, najviše vrijednosti procjene učitelji pridaju tvrdnji da njihovi ravnatelji omogućuju svim članovima školske organizacije da im se slobodno obraćaju kada trebaju njihovu pomoć ($M = 4,42$, $SD = 0,87$). Nadalje, visoko procjenjuju tvrdnje da ravnatelji komuniciraju s donositeljima odluka i zalažu se za pokretanje pozitivnih promjena u školi ($M = 4,38$, $SD = 0,85$) te da prihvaćaju inicijative koje su predložili učitelji ($M = 4,36$, $SD = 0,86$). U odnosu na obilježja demokratske školske kulture, učitelji pridaju najviše vrijednosti tvrdnji da učitelji paze da ne povrijede dostojanstvo učenika ($M = 4,13$, $SD = 0,73$) te da traže od učenika kritičko propitivanje onoga što uče ($M = 3,85$, $SD = 0,84$). Također, učitelji procjenjuju da učenici u njihovim školama imaju snažan osjećaj pripadnosti školi ($M = 3,76$, $SD = 0,79$). Iako ove rezultate valja uzeti s oprezom, budući da uzorak čine škole čiji su ravnatelji iskazali interes za sudjelovanjem u istraživanju i vjerojatno su skloniji prakticiranju demokratskoga vođenja, ipak se može uočiti trend poticanja demokratizacije škola.

Da bi se odgovorilo na pitanje postoji li povezanost između percepcije učitelja o obilježjima demokratskoga školskog vođenja i njihove percepcije demokratske školske kulture izračunat je Pearsonov koeficijent korelacije (Tablica 2). Rezultati ukazuju na statistički značajnu visoku pozitivnu povezanost između učiteljske percepcije razvijenosti obilježja demokratske školske kulture i demokratskoga školskog vođenja u promatranim osnovnim školama ($R = 0,625$; $F(5,501) = 72,85$; $p < 0,001$). Drugim riječima, ravnatelji koji prakticiraju demokratsko školsko vođenje značajno više

⁹ Primjeri čestica koji opisuju obilježja demokratskoga školskog vođenja su: ravnatelj stvara atmosferu međusobnoga poštovanja i suradnje; prilikom donošenja odluka ravnatelj sa svima uključenima razmatra relevantne činjenice potrebne da bi se donijela odluka; ravnatelj razvija atmosferu u kojoj ljudi iznose svoje stavove i mišljenja bez straha od posljedica; prilikom podjele školskih zadataka ravnatelj daje priliku svakome da se u njih uključi.

¹⁰ Radi se o sljedećem: 1) proporcija varijance prvog dobivenog faktora objašnjava 62 % varijance; 2) sljedeći faktori objasnili su približno jednake proporcije preostale varijance, uz postupno smanjivanje; 3) sve ili većina čestica imaju relativno visoke saturacije na prvom faktoru (od 0,861 do 0,603); 4) sve ili većina čestica imaju veće saturacije na prvom faktoru nego na faktorima koji slijede.

doprinosu razvoju demokratske školske kulture u svojim školama. Pritom demokratsko školsko vođenje objašnjava 39,1 % varijance demokratske školske kulture (Grafikon 1).

Tablica 2.

Grafikon 1.

Kako bi se bolje objasnio odnos između učiteljske percepcije demokratske školske kulture i ostalih varijabli uključenih u istraživanje (demokratsko školsko vođenje, radno iskustvo učitelja, veličina škole, lokacija škole prema kriteriju urbano-prigradsko, duljina obavljanja dužnosti ravnatelja u školi), provedena je višestruka regresijska analiza. Veličina efekta (Tablica 3) pokazuje kako je modelom demokratskoga školskog vođenja i demokratske školske kulture zajedno s nezavisnim varijablama objašnjeno 42,1 % varijance ($R^2 = 0,421$).

Tablica 3.

Rezultati regresijske analize, osim već utvrđene korelacije između demokratskoga školskog vođenja i demokratske školske kulture, ukazali su na još nekoliko statistički značajnih pokazatelja (Tablica 4). Utvrđena je niska negativna povezanost ($R = -0,175$; $p < 0,001$) između broja učenika u školi i demokratske školske kulture, odnosno u školama s manjim brojem učenika uočena je veća razvijenost obilježja demokratske školske kulture. Nadalje, škole koje su smještene u urbanom okruženju pohađa veći broj učenika ($R = 0,339$; $p < 0,001$). Rezultati ukazuju i na nisku negativnu statistički značajnu povezanost između duljine obavljanja dužnosti aktualnoga ravnatelja i razvijenosti obilježja demokratskoga školskog vođenja ($R = -0,164$; $p < 0,001$). Rezultati ne otkrivaju značajnu povezanost između duljine radnoga iskustva učitelja i njihove percepcije razvijenosti obilježja demokratskoga školskog vođenja i demokratske školske kulture.

Tablica 4.

U Tablici 5 vidljivo je kako se jačina povezanosti između učiteljske percepcije demokratskoga školskog vođenja i demokratske školske kulture mijenja u odnosu na duljinu obavljanja dužnosti aktualnoga ravnatelja. Naime, u školama čiji ravnatelji obavljaju tu funkciju između jedne i pet godina povezanost iznosi $R = 0,619$, dok je u školama čiji ravnatelji obnašaju dužnost 10 i više godina ta povezanost značajno veća, odnosno $R = 0,769$. Intenzitet učiteljeve percepcije povezanosti između demokratske školske kulture i demokratskoga školskog vođenja značajno se ne mijenja ovisno o tome procjenjuju li ga učitelji različitoga radnog iskustva u školi.

Tablica 5.

Interpretacija rezultata

Rezultati procjena učitelja uključenih u istraživanje obilježja demokratskoga školskog vođenja i demokratske školske kulture u hrvatskim školama otkrivaju nekoliko značajnih

trendova. Procjene prisutnosti obilježja demokratske školske kulture pokazuju da postoji značajan prostor za njezin daljnji razvoj. Ovo je osobito značajno zbog toga što demokratska školska kultura nije samo cilj po sebi, nego je kontekst koji olakšava ostvarivanje aktualnih preporuka globalne, europske i hrvatske odgojno-obrazovne politike. Tim preporukama je zajednički zahtjev da se demokratske prakse i demokratske vrijednosti implementiraju u odgojno-obrazovne ustanove (Hrvatski sabor, 2014; Vijeće Europe, 2010). U Strategiji znanosti, obrazovanja i tehnologije (2014., str. 50) naglašeni su sljedeći odgojno-obrazovni ciljevi: „odgajati i obrazovati učenike u skladu s općim kulturnim i civilizacijskim vrijednostima, ljudskim pravima te pravima djece, osposobiti ih za življenje u multikulturnom svijetu, za poštovanje različitosti i toleranciju te za aktivno i odgovorno sudjelovanje u demokratskomu razvoju društva.“ Ostvarivost ovih ciljeva moguća je samo u školama u kojima se njeguje demokratska školska kultura i u kojima svi dionici sudjeluju u njezinom razvoju.

Na deficit demokratskih praksi i obilježja odgojno-obrazovnih ustanova u Hrvatskoj ukazali su i rezultati nekih prethodno provedenih istraživanja (Pažur, 2016; Spajić-Vrkaš i sur., 2016), pa se može zaključiti da je razvoj demokratske kulture u školama složen i dugotrajni proces na koji se može djelovati s više različitih razina i na niz različitih načina. Poticanje obilježja demokratskoga školskog vođenja samo je jedan čimbenik u tome procesu, čija važnost i snagu djelovanja potkrepljuju i rezultati ovoga istraživanja.

Valja podsjetiti da su rezultati koji potvrđuju visoku pozitivnu povezanost između procijenjene razvijenosti obilježja demokratskoga školskog vođenja i demokratske školske kulture u hrvatskim školama u skladu s raspravama koje ističu da su ravnatelji važni akteri koji svojim namjernim i nenamjernim djelovanjem mogu doprinosti oblikovanju određenih obilježja školske kulture, uključujući i demokratska obilježja (Delgado, 2014; Dorczak, 2014; Gülbeher, 2016; Harber i Trafford, 1999; Jwan, Anderson i Bennet, 2010; Kensler i sur., 2009; Normore i Jean-Marie, 2008). Razmjerno visoka razvijenost obilježja demokratskoga školskog vođenja o kojoj izvještavaju anketirani učitelji zasigurno opisuju aktualne trendove ravnateljskoga vođenja koje vrijedi i dalje osnaživati¹¹. U budućim istraživanjima ipak valja dodatno provjeriti kojim aspektima demokratskoga školskog vođenja ravnatelji značajnije doprinose razvijenosti obilježja demokratske školske kulture: osnaživanjem drugih dionika, stvaranjem uvjeta za demokratsko vođenje ili modeliranjem demokracije (Pažur i Kovač, 2019).

Nadalje, povezanost između razvijenosti obilježja demokratske školske kulture i demokratskoga školskog vođenja je veća kada procjenjuju učitelji zaposleni u školama čiji ravnatelji dulje obnašaju svoju ravnateljsku dužnost. Uz pretpostavku da se određena obilježja školskoga vođenja prakticiraju dulje vrijeme, može se očekivati je da se efekti takvog vođenja na jačanje školske kulture primjećuju tek tijekom kasnijih

¹¹ Ovi su nalazi u skladu s istraživanjem u čijem su fokusu bila obilježja distribuiranoga školskog vođenja, čiji rezultati ukazuju visoke prosječne vrijednosti onih obilježja koja opisuju sudjelovanje učitelja i drugih članova kolektiva u formalnim tijelima upravljanja školom, kao i ona koja ukazuju na primjerene forme interakcije među dionicima tijekom odlučivanja (Buchberger, Kovač i Ažić-Bastalić, 2018).

mandata ravnatelja. Objašnjenje za takve efekte mogu potkrijepiti Fullanovi nalazi (2005) koji ističu da je rad na promjeni školske kulture dugotrajan i težak proces, pa se efekti prakse ravnatelja u prvom mandatu još ne mogu primijetiti. Ove nalaze također valja staviti u kontekst planiranja ponude programa trajnoga profesionalnog razvoja ravnatelja i voditi računa da se razvijanje kompetencija za primjenu demokratskoga školskog vođenja osigura ravnateljima već od početka preuzimanja dužnosti.

Duljina radnoga iskustva učitelja ne doprinosi promjeni u intenzitetu povezanosti između učiteljeve procjene razvijenosti obilježja demokratske školske kulture i demokratskoga školskog vođenja. Ovi rezultati mogu se staviti u kontekst istraživanja koja prate profesionalni razvoj učitelja i njegov odnos prema različitim aktivnostima u školi ovisno o njegovom radnom iskustvu (primjerice, Huberman, 1989). Učitelji u središnjoj fazi karijere profesionalno su zreliji i skloniji su eksperimentirati s novim načinima rada od početnika te žele unaprijediti svoju karijeru kroz suradnju s drugima i njihovim povratnim informacijama o svojem radu. Moguće je pretpostaviti da ovi učitelji očekuju veći stupanj sudjelovanja u donošenju odluka i drugim procesima školskoga vođenja, nego što to očekuju učitelji početnici koji su usmjereniji na razvijanje primarnih učiteljskih kompetencija. Uključivanje ove skupine učitelja u procese donošenja odluka važna je poruka ravnateljima budući da iskusniji učitelji mogu značajno doprinijeti oblikovanju kvalitetnijih odluka za unapređivanje rada škole, a veća participacija posredno može djelovati i na jačanje njihove motivacije i zadovoljstva poslom (Buchberger, Kovač i Ažić-Bastalić, 2018).

Zaključak i ograničenja istraživanja

Ovim istraživanjem utvrđena je visoka povezanost između učiteljskih percepcija demokratskoga školskog vođenja i demokratske školske kulture, odnosno objašnjeni su neki aspekti djelovanja demokratskoga školskog vođenja ravnatelja na razvijanje demokratske školske kulture. Prilikom interpretacije rezultata istraživanja važno je uzeti u obzir određena ograničenja koja se odnose na odabrani uzorak i na način prikupljanja podataka.

Uzorak istraživanja činili su učitelji osnovnih škola u Gradu Zagrebu i Zagrebačkoj županiji. Nadalje, istraživanje je provedeno u području Grada Zagreba i Zagrebačke županije u gradskim i prigradskim područjima, pa u budućim istraživanjima valja provjeriti postoje li regionalne razlike na razini Republike Hrvatske te valja uključiti škole smještane u ruralnim područjima.

Važno je uzeti u obzir rezultate drugih istraživanja školske kulture (Deal i Peterson, 1998; Prosser, 1999; Stoll, 1999) koji prilikom opisa obilježja školske kulture ističu potencijalne razlike u percepciji između različitih aktera, primjerice učitelja, učenika i roditelja što sugerira da u buduća istraživanja treba uključiti i navedene dionike i njihove perspektive.

Važno je napomenuti kako dobiveni podatci prikazuju trenutačno stanje zatečeno u školama, dok se razvoj demokratske školske kulture i demokratskoga školskog vođenja

promatra kao kontinuirani proces. Slijedom navedenoga, bilo bi poželjno pratiti ove elemente školskoga života kroz dulje razdoblje.

Rezultati provedenoga istraživanja mogu imati snažne implikacije na oblikovanje prakse školskoga vođenja, pogotovo u kontekstu daljega planiranja profesionalizacije ravnatelja i poticanja različitih mehanizama primjene kompetencija demokratskoga školskog vođenja. S druge strane, potrebno je osnaživati i učitelje za aktivno promišljanje i sudjelovanje u razvoju demokratske školske kulture.