Leadership Characteristics of Employees in School Systems in the Republic of Croatia and the Republic of Serbia

Milica Andevski[1], Jasmina Arsenijević[2] and Blago Spajić[3]
[1]Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, University of Novi Sad
[2]Pre-School Teacher Training College in Kikinda
[3]Independent Associate Researcher, Varaždin

Abstract

The aim of this research was to determine the presence of leadership characteristics and features in the employees of the educational institutions in Croatia and Serbia. Research tasks have been realized by comparing the answers of the respondents from Croatia and Serbia in relation to the evaluation of professional and leadership characteristics and personality traits, examined by the survey and scaling techniques, instruments in the form of a questionnaire and an attitude scale. The research population consists of elementary and secondary schools found on the territories of the entire Croatia and Serbia, while the research sample consists of 237 principals, teachers, professors, assistants in schools who have participated in the research in Croatia and 252 respondents who have participated in the research in Serbia. The statistical SPSS package was used for data processing (factor scores at Promax extracted dimensions, correlations and discriminant analysis). The data point to the more favourable results in the case of the participants from Croatia who, in relation to their colleagues in Serbia, show more expressed leadership characteristics[1].

Key words: *comparison; employees in school; leadership management in education*

Introduction and Framework of Research

Education management is present both in theoretical thought and practical verification. The interdisciplinary approach changes the responsibility of the employee in education in understanding the logic of time, imposes the need for predicting consequences of actions and reducing possible risks. The knowledge of management becomes a part of the general education that strengthens professional opportunities, social and individual improvement.

Even Klafki, a classicist of school and education, has pointed out that the young need direct "introduction to the world of economy and the world of work" (1994). The world of work and professions, problems of consumption, politics, economy, knowledge of controversies in the external environment, as well as the individual and family controversies, set specific requirements to education and pedagogical profession (Niedermair, 2008). Employees in schools cannot understand themselves or the world of their students and the context of their growing up, if they do not recognize the factors of their own influence, competences and entrepreneurship (at least in general terms). In the conjunction of the pragmatic intentions of *management* and humanistic, interpersonal interactions of *education,* the advocates of experiential learning and autonomy in education point out as their main goal the active, creative, authentic development of students, but also the ability of perception, designing, changing of the participants in the educational processes.

The basic functions of management which are recognizable in the school are: planning, organizing, leading and control. They are observed in this study through the concept of *leadership,* as a process that combines everything in a unique approach. It does not involve the recipe, uniformity, but the skill of providing help for those who teach and learn to use and develop their own potentials, motives, emotions in the creation of new values, the implementation of change, creation of the preconditions for achieving maximal results in personal development, but also the development of the environment, with the skill of combining vision, purposeful decision-making, effective communication, positive attitude towards common results, innovativeness, creativity, team spirit, willingness...

A contemporary school that prefers such an atmosphere and this concept of (self-) development, education is assigned new and complex tasks. We can point that out particularly for schools in Croatia and Serbia that are in the process of accelerated democratization, transformation, faced with the requirements of the contribution to the prosperity of education and culture, but also the definition of their own identities (Mušanović, 1998; Staničić, 2000; Peko et al., 2009; Vidović et al., 2009; Arsenijević, Andevski, 2010). The new role of the school as a developmental and autonomous institution is defined by many implicit, intangible and irrational moments, paradoxes of education that focus on *leadership* as opposed to ordering and control (Bratanić 2002; Arsenijević, Andevski, 2010).

Educational institutions today function in terms of strengthening their autonomy and assuming the care for the entire educational and pedagogical process, for all the students who participate in that process, their results, school existence in the strong requirements of high-quality and optimal work in the context of constant changes. For that reason, the effective work of an educational institution implies that employees have certain characteristics and knowledge, particular *competences.* In addition to the basic pedagogical and professional competences, leadership and organizational competences have become increasingly necessary in the people employed in education. Why?

In today's knowledge economy, leadership characteristics and entrepreneurship are not required only from managers, but all the employees, including those employed in education. Today, the responsibility of the employees in understanding the logic of time, the need for predicting the consequences of actions and reducing potential risks is also imposed. Thus the organizational knowledge becomes part of the general education that strengthens professional chances, social and personal progress. Furthermore, in order to retain their traditional position, educational institutions increasingly assume initiative and become the centre of social events, carriers of changes. Such educational institutions cannot be sustainable if their employees do not have basic leadership characteristics. And finally, the teaching staff, as part of the employees in institutions of education, need to have leadership characteristics for two reasons: basically, the teaching profession requires leadership skills primarily for teaching and working with students, parents and narrower and broader environment; on the other hand, there is the influence of the teaching staff on the students and their power to transfer leadership skills to them. As it is already known that leadership skills are acquired and learned, for the purpose of the development of the contemporary, responsible and enterprising society, it is necessary to learn leadership skills already at an early age, in school, as a content, as well as ad hoc[2]. If students are exposed to work with their teachers who posses these skills, they will later be able to develop such skills themselves. The very definition of education is changing today and the requirements increasingly move from content transfer to critical thinking building, the skill of problem-solving and interpersonal characteristics.

The starting points of this paper are the contemporary determinants of leadership (Kouzes-Posner, 2003; Piters, 2005; Pierce-Newstrom, 2008) as an interactive, social process of common activities and personal development. Leadership is not reserved for certain individuals, but is a possibility of each employee; it primarily represents personal development and responsibility (Kouzes, Posner 2003, p.90; Haas, Tamarkin, 1992). Bitel defines the leader as a person who has a vision of the organization, who knows how to communicate it to the others and motivate them to realize it

---

[2] In relation to this, Goleman (1995) was one of the first authors who pointed out the significance of the development of emotional intelligence (it is known to what extent leadership skills depend on emotional intelligence of an individual) and the capacity that its development has in school.

(1997, p. 28). In this research leadership is observed as a skill of unifying vision, purposeful decision-making, successful communication and positive attitude towards common results, innovativeness, creativity, team spirit, entrepreneurship, diligence and responsibility.

Review of the Literature

One of the most perceived achievements in the literature that refers to leadership in education is the publication "Leading Learning Communities: NAESP Standards for What Principals Should Know and Be Able to Do" by The National Association of Elementary School Principals (2001) in which six characteristics of instructional leadership were identified to help principals reflect on and improve their practice[3].

A big trace was left by Michael Fullan, the worldwide authority in educational reform, both in his major works, such as the books "The New Meaning of Educational Change" (2007a) and "Motion Leadership" (2010) and in smaller works in which he directly deals with the issues of leadership characteristics of school principals, such as "Leadership for the 21st Century" (1998) or "The Change Leader" (2002). His work includes deep insights at the macro level on the changes in education, school reform, change management, and leadership development in education.

In this field, much attention is also paid to the book "Leadership Characteristics that Facilitate School Change" by the author Méndez-Morse (1992). The author identifies six leadership characteristics that facilitate school change[4].

With the growing awareness of the importance of knowledge and the effectiveness of education, the number and depth of the studies on the leadership characteristics in education have grown, but the majority of studies are still oriented towards studying the management of educational institutions. For now, there are very few papers which study leadership characteristics of all the employees in education or those in the case of the teaching staff.

The study "Leadership Characteristics of Adult Educators" by Bartling and Bartlett (2005) assesses self-perceived leadership behaviours and related leadership styles practiced in a sample of adult educators in the Midwest of USA. Furthermore, studies of The Hay group (1999) should be mentioned, which have analysed the characteristics of highly effective principals in Australia as well as the study of Hay Management Consultants (2000) which compared 200 highly effective principals with 200 senior business executives in England.

---

[3] The characteristics include: (1) leading schools in a way that places student and adult learning at the center; (2) setting high expectations and standards for the academic and social development of all students and adults; (3) demanding content and instruction that ensure student achievement of the agreed-upon results; (4) creating a culture of continuous learning for adults tied to student learning and other school goals; (5) using multiple sources of data as diagnostic tools to assess, identify and apply instructional improvement; and (6) actively engaging the community to create shared responsibility for student and school success.

[4] The characteristics include: having vision, believing that schools are for students' learning, valuing human resources, communicating and listening well, being proactive, and being a risk-taker.

Stjepan Staničić (1998, 2000a, 2000b, 2002, 2006a, 2006b) has focused on the problems of managing educational activity in Croatia and Serbia, the countries in which we have compared the presence of leadership characteristics in the educational institutions. His hypothetical model of optimal school management, as well as the empirical model of the competence profile of the principal and the school counsellor was our main incentive to search for the criteria that need to be met by the managers and employees, in order for their activities to initiate the development of schools towards the higher levels of quality. In German and Anglo-Saxon literature, we have found no studies which would compare **two** countries, but the theorists of these countries have provided us with the basis of the theoretical foundation and the definitions of the basic concepts (Drucker, 2005; Northouse, 2001; Niedermair, 2008).

Subject, Problem, Objective, Hypotheses and Variables of the Research

In the literature, the authors claim (Staničić, 2002, 2006a, 2006b; Spajić, 2008; Andevski, 2007a, 2007b; Arsenijević, Andevski, 2010) that optimal leading, managing and leadership are the keys to the effectiveness of all institutions, including the educational ones. The subject of this research is the examination and definition of leadership competences that make the work in the domain of education more successful, and the results measurable. The research is interdisciplinary; the pedagogical sphere of activity is reflected in the sphere of management and organizational sciences. We observe management as a "liberal skill" (Drucker, 2005); "liberal" because it deals with the bases of knowledge, self-knowledge, wisdom and leadership, and "skill" because it deals with practice and application, uses knowledge and observations of humanities and social sciences, psychology and philosophy, ethics as well as the natural sciences.

The educational institutions in Croatia and Serbia today function in terms of strengthening their autonomy and assuming the care for the entire educational process, for all the individuals who participate in that process, for their results, for the existence of the school in the strict requirements of high-quality and optimal work. The research *problem* reflects the question: *To what extent are leadership characteristics present in the pedagogical institutions in Croatia and Serbia among the participants in the educational process? Are the workers in the educational activities leaders in their professional engagement?*

The objective of the research was to determine and compare the presence of leadership characteristics in the employees of the educational institutions of Croatia and Serbia.

The aim of the study was to investigate and compare the presence of leadership characteristics as well as to investigate differences in the recognition of professional characteristics, leadership characteristics and personality traits of the employees of the educational institutions in Croatia and Serbia.

The general hypothesis was that the pedagogical employees of the educational institutions of Croatia and Serbia would self-estimate that they posses leadership skills and abilities.

The first special hypothesis was that there would be a statistically significant difference found in the perception of one's own possession of leadership skills and characteristics between employees of the educational institutions in Croatia and Serbia.

There were also three special hypotheses of the research which were based in the assumption that there would be a statistically significant difference found between the respondents from Croatia and Serbia in the subdimensions of the factors of the professional characteristics, leadership characteristics and personality traits in order to obtain better information with more details on the various aspects of these three dimensions.

The second special hypothesis was that there would be a statistically significant difference found in the subdimensions (factors) of the professional characteristics between the employees of the educational institutions in Croatia and Serbia.

The third hypothesis was that there would be a statistically significant difference found in the subdimensions (factors) of leadership between the employees of the educational institutions in Croatia and Serbia.

The fourth hypothesis was that there would be a statistically significant difference found in the expression of personality traits between the employees of the educational institutions in Croatia and Serbia.

Research Variables

The independent variable in the research was the nationality of the respondents.

The group of *dependent variables* included: leadership, pedagogical professional characteristics and personality traits (BFI). All the variables observed were operationalized in a questionnaire and the *personality traits* were theoretically defined through the *five factors model* which assumes the existence of the five basic dimensions of personality traits: *neuroticism, extraversion, openness to experience, agreeableness, and conscientiousness.*

Research Instruments

We have used *four instruments* in this study:

The Questionnaire for the General information about the respondents refers to the personal data of the respondents: gender, age, educational institution in which the respondents work, work function that they perform, the field of education that they have and their work experience.

The Questionnaire for the Evaluation of pedagogical characteristics (EPC-25 items, modified, shortened version, according to Staničić 2000b). The questionnaire consisted of 25 claims, which the participants agreed or disagreed with by circling

numbers 1 to 5 on the Likert scale. The validity of the measuring instrument was verified by the Analysis of main components (factor analysis) which showed that the subject of measuring was included within four factors, while the reliability of the questionnaire was verified by Cronbach's Alpha coefficient (α=0.786), which is an acceptable reliability of instruments.

The Questionnaire for the Evaluation of leadership characteristics (L-36 items) consisted of 36 statements which the respondents agreed or disagreed with by circling the numbers 1 to 5 on the Likert scale. The validity of the measuring instrument was verified by the Analysis of the main components (factor analysis, showing that the object of the measurement was covered with four factors, while the reliability of the questionnaire was tested by Cronbach's Alpha coefficient that amounted to α=0.821, which quite satisfactorily represented the reliability of the instruments which were designed to measure the given problems.

The Questionnaire for the Evaluation of personality traits "Big Five" (Big Five - 44 items) that supports the hierarchical structure in the organization of personality traits, where there are five basic factors that are called the "big five": neuroticism, extraversion, openness, agreeableness, conscientiousness (Guilford, 1968; Cattel, 1995; Costa, McCrae, 1992; Digman, 1990). All five dimensions of personality were reduced according to the key to the main components and they had reliability coefficients (Cronbach's Alpha) in the range from 0.80 to 0.92, which is considered to be a satisfactory reliability.

Research Methods

The nature of the leadership phenomena as the subject of research, objective, tasks and hypotheses have contributed to the selection of methods based on the rational-deductive, analytical and synthetic, interpretative and empirical-inductive approaches to knowledge. *The comparative method and comparison* are in the focus as a category of thinking that explains the terms, specifies the conclusions, concluding and generalizing of the phenomenon of comparing. The focus is on the *descriptive* aspect and *horizontal direction* of comparing, by the scope this is a *micro-comparison* at the level of interstate analysis (Vrcelj, 2005; Mušanović, 2001) with the focus on comparing qualitative characteristics. The data were processed by a statistical method (SPSS application) and arranged by means of quantitative and qualitative analyses.

Research Sample

The research population consisted of elementary and secondary schools in Croatia and Serbia, while the research sample consisted of 237 principals, teachers, professors, assistants in schools that have agreed to participate in the research in Croatia and 252 in Serbia. The sample was *appropriate,* with the elements of *intentional,* therefore non-representative with the units of the basic set that were at disposal and that the researchers considered to be typical for the research. The results obtained in this way are considered to be valuable, but they cannot be generalized to a basic set (population).

Research Results

Factor Analysis of the Questionnaire for the Evaluation of Professional Characteristics

The analysis of the latent measuring space of the PPS questionnaire was carried out in a way that certain items of the questionnaire were subjected to the Analysis of the main components. On the basis of the Gutman-Kaiser and Katel Scree criterion with Promax rotation, **four factors** were extracted that together account for about 40% of total variance.

Table 1. *Excerpt from the matrix of the structure of the first Promax factor*

Confidence between associates is an important condition for the successful accomplishment of the planned professional tasks in educational institutions.	.653
In the institutions of education, different aspects of particular professional problems should be tolerated and different approaches in their solving should be allowed.	.655
It is good if the employees in education advocate the public emphasis on success and the results of their industrious colleagues.	.765
It is good for the employees in education to be able to recognize something that is the best in each colleague and to develop it for the benefit of their school.	.635
It is important for the employees in the school to understand well the laws of the interpersonal relations and to recognize the mechanism by which the school staff functions.	.566

The first Promax factor has collected the items that according to their content speak about good interpersonal relations as a precondition for successful work at school, such as the confidence among associates, tolerance, support to other people's success, etc. The respondents who have achieved high scores at this factor consider that public emphasizing of the success and results of their industrious colleagues is very important for the successful work at school, the confidence among associates and the tolerance of different aspects of particular professional problems and their solving, and that it is good for the employees in education to be able to recognize something that is the best in each colleague and to develop it for the benefit of their school. Based on all the above-mentioned, this factor was named **Good interpersonal relations.**

Table 2. *Excerpt from the matrix of the structure of the second Promax factor*

For the efficient activities of the educational institution, it is important for the employees to rapidly acquire and transmit relevant professional information.	.562
School employees should understand the meaning and importance of quality planning and programming and know how to apply it in their school.	.591
Employees should know the manners and procedures for the evaluation of achievements of their work and the achievement of the objective control of their work.	.578
It is necessary for the employees in education to know how to use a computer in their work.	.630
The employees in the school should know very well the thorough state legislative documents and regulations from the area of education.	.550
It is necessary for all the employees to be entirely included in each introduction of innovations into the educational process of their school.	.633
It is important for the employees in an educational institution to organize their job in a rational and good way.	.558

The second factor has been defined by the items that, according to their content, speak about the significance of planning, organization, information transfer and the introduction of innovations for the purpose of the successful work of school. The respondents who have achieved high scores at this factor believe that employees should obtain and transfer information rapidly, believe in the importance of good planning and organization, the necessity to be familiar with the legislative documents and regulations from the field of education as well as the necessity to introduce the innovations into the educational process, such as using computers and the necessity to include all the employees in these innovations in order for the work of school to be successful. This factor is called **Planning, information and innovation.**

Table 3. *Excerpt from the matrix of the structure of the third Promax factor*

Diligence at work is an extremely important pre-condition for the high-quality achievement of the educational activity.	.623
It is important for the employees to accept pedagogical principles and to know how to organize the educational process in their schools in accordance with them.	.695
It is necessary for all the employees at school to be familiar with the curriculum as well as the didactic-methodological principles of its achievement.	.832

The third factor has gathered statements which concern familiarity with pedagogical and didactic-methodological principles, and curricula. The respondents who have achieved high scores on this factor have pointed out that diligence at work and familiarity with the pedagogical principles, didactic-methodological principles as well as curriculum is very important for successful work in school. This factor is called **Good familiarity with the pedagogical and didactic-methodological principles.**

Table 4. *Excerpt from the matrix of the structure of the fourth Promax factor*

It is good when employees in education do not run from problems and crises leaving the others to solve them.	.487
It is not necessary for the employees in educational institutions to be burdened by conflict-solving when they will be solved sooner or later.	-.778
Communicativeness is an important characteristic of successful work in school.	.504
Good associates at school do not shut themselves into their offices; on the contrary, they are constantly in contact with each other.	.534
Employees in educational institutions should not be working behind the backs of their colleagues but rather should solve problems "face to face".	.579

The fourth factor has been determined by the statements that speak about good communicativeness and conflict-solving as important factors for the successful work in school. The respondents who have achieved high scores at this factor believe that it is important for the employees in a school to have good interpersonal communication and to solve the conflicts among themselves openly and directly. This factor is called **Communicativeness and success in conflict-solving.**

Based on the implemented factor analysis, we can see that the first and the fourth factor (Good interpersonal relations and Communicativeness and success in conflict-solving refer to the interpersonal relations – the establishment and maintenance

of high-quality interpersonal relations. On the other hand, the second and third factor (Planning, information and innovation in teaching and Good familiarity with pedagogical and didactic-methodological principles) have their focus on the qualifications of the employees for jobs in education: the familiarity with the principles of practice and tendency towards its development. The teaching vocation is, therefore, an exceptionally social profession on one hand, but also a profession that requires professional knowledge on the other hand; it is precisely illustrated by these factors.

Factor Analysis of the Questionnaire for the Evaluation of Leadership Characteristics

Using the same statistical procedure, we have analyzed the measuring space of the questionnaire for the self-evaluation of leadership characteristics by Gutman-Kaiser and Katel Scree criterion with Promax rotation. **Four factors** have been extracted that together account for 40% of the total variance.

Table 5. *Excerpt from the matrix of the structure of the first Promax factor*

Content of items	r
3. I have a low opinion of myself.	.581
5. I wait for others to show the way.	.473
8. I am easily discouraged.	.511
10. I do not say much.	.641
13. It is difficult for me to include others in teamwork.	.555
16. I cannot show emotions.	.495
17. I am not good at taking responsibility for a group.	.553
22. I find it difficult to approach others.	.596
23. I see myself as a good leader.	-.403
24. I am not good at planning the activities of a group.	.522
26. I have a high opinion of myself.	-.501
32. I find it easy to introduce myself.	-.596
33. I am afraid of drawing attention.	.643
34. I am not strongly motivated to succeed.	.440

The first Promax factor has gathered the items that speak about low expressed leadership characteristics of the respondents by their content. Persons who have achieved high scores on this factor have a low opinion of themselves, they do not easily express what they think and feel. They find it difficult to establish contact with other people, they are not ambitious and do not see themselves as good leaders. This factor is called **Low expressed leadership characteristics.**

Table 6. *Excerpt from the matrix of the structure of the second Promax factor*

Content of the items	r
4. I love to dominate the others.	.745
7. I have a strong need for power.	.710

9. I try to lead the others.	.670
11. I know how to attract people.	.475
14. I take initiative.	.469
18. I impose myself on others easily.	.547
21. They say I am a strict but just leader.	.472
23. I see myself as a good leader.	.481

The second factor was defined by the statements that by their content speak about the expressed leadership characteristics in the sense of dominating the others. Persons who achieved high scores on this factor love to dominate the others, have the expressed will for power, believe that they know how to attract people and impose themselves, and often take initiative. They think that they are good leaders, strict but just. This factor is called **Expressed leadership characteristics with a dominant will for power.**

Table 7. *Excerpt from the matrix of the structure of the third Promax factor*

Content of the items	r
14. I take initiative.	-.431
19. I am easy to scare.	.568
25. I wait for others to lead.	.687
28. I let the others make decisions.	.409
29. I am the first one who reacts.	-.471
31. I do not like to take responsibility.	.584
35. I want to be responsible.	-.543

The third factor has been defined by the items that by their content speak about the tendencies of the respondents to be led by someone else. The respondents who have achieved high scores on this factor do not take initiative, they are easily scared, they do not like to make decisions and take responsibility so they leave that to others. This factor is called **Tendency of respondents to be led by someone else.**

Table 8. *Excerpt from the matrix of the structure of the fourth Promax factor*

Content of the items	r
2. I try to make group members happy.	.439
6. I believe that our human nature makes us unite towards common goals.	.498
15. I treat everyone equally.	.411
20. I believe that leaders should allow everyone to say what the group should do.	.630
36. I want to be sure that everyone has been included in the group.	.536

The fourth factor has gathered items that by their content speak about the spirit of togetherness and tolerance. Persons who have achieved high scores on this factor believe that the welfare of all group members is very important, that everyone within an organization should be treated equally, that everyone should be included in the work of organization and that everyone has the right to express their opinion. Although this factor is not illustrated by the items that refer to assuming the responsibility and

initiative, it is clear that it is characterized by the need to homogenize the group and make it happy (which partially makes the call of the leader), as well as to respect democratic values. This factor is called **Democratic orientation with leadership elements.**

These four factors can be classified into two categories: some characterize, the others do not the leadership characteristics of the respondents. The factors that characterize the features of leadership (the second and fourth factors) include both the democratic characteristics with the leadership element and the leadership characteristics, but driven by the desire for domination and power. Therefore, the second factor is illustrated by initiative, charisma and self-confidence, as well as the need for domination. The second group of factors (the first and third) is characterized by the lack of leadership characteristics: Low expressed leadership characteristics and Tendency of respondents to be led by someone else. Here it is interesting that the first factor is modelled by items that are more related to the lack of self-confidence, organizational skills and desire for success and responsibility, and less by the items that explicitly illustrate the human need to be led. In the case of the third factor, the explicit desire to be led is combined by the lack of initiative and fear of responsibility.

Achievements of the Respondents on the Questionnaire for Leadership and Differences in the Arithmetic Means of Sum Scores of the Respondents

With the aim to verify the hypothesis of research referring to the way in which respondents from Croatia and Serbia self-evaluate their leadership characteristics, we have carried out the study of the respondents' achievements on the questionnaire for leadership. The questionnaire had 25 questions and the maximum score for each question was 5, so the total score for the whole questionnaire was 180.

The Achievement of the Respondents from Serbia on the Questionnaire for Leadership

Table 9. *Minimum and maximum values, arithmetic mean and standard deviation*

	Minimum	Maximum	Arithmetic mean	Standard deviation
Total leadership	83,00	159,00	129,0319	14,16612

The Achievement of the Respondents from Croatia on the Questionnaire for Leadership

Table 10. *Minimum and maximum values, arithmetic mean and standard deviation*

	Minimum	Maximum	Arithmetic mean	Standard deviation
Total leadership	103.00	168.00	131.5443	12.16914

Out of 180 points on the test for the expression of leadership potentials, the respondents from Serbia have achieved about 129 points on average and the respondents from Croatia somewhat more, about 131.5 points.

Differences in Arithmetic Means of the Sum Scores on the Questionnaire of Leadership between the Respondents from Serbia and Croatia

The statistical significance of the differences in the arithmetic means of sum scores on the questionnaire of leadership between the respondents from Serbia and Croatia has been verified by t-test for independent samples.

Table 11. *T-test for independent samples*

	t-test	Df-degrees of freedom	p-significance level	Difference of arithmetic means	Standard error of difference
Total leadership	-2.096	486	.037	-2.5124	1.19865

The result obtained shows that this difference on the given sample between the respondents from Serbia and Croatia is statistically significant in favour of the respondents from Croatia (t=-2.096; p=0.037). The employees of the educational institutions in Croatia in relation to those from Serbia give a more positive self-evaluation of the presence of leadership skills and abilities. Based on the information obtained, **the first additional hypothesis** according to which it was expected that there would be a statistically significant difference found in the perception of possessing leadership skills and abilities among the employees in the educational institutions of Croatia and Serbia **can be confirmed.**

Differences in Structure and Expression of Leadership Characteristics, Professional Features and Personality Traits in the Case of Respondents from Serbia and Croatia

In order to determine differences in the case of the respondents from Serbia and Croatia in the aspect of professional characteristics, leadership features and personality traits, three canonical discriminant analyses have been carried out. In all groups, the variable was the home country of the respondents, and the set of quantitative variables consisted of the factor scores on the first components of the BFI subscales, the factor scores on the Promax factors set aside in measuring the space of the Questionnaire for the evaluation of professional features and factor scores on Promax factors set aside in measuring the space of the Questionnaire for the evaluation of leadership characteristics.

Canonical discriminant analysis (the set of quantitative variables consisted of the factor scores on Promax factors set aside in measuring the space of the Questionnaire for the evaluation of PROFESSIONAL FEATURES)

Table 12. *Characteristics of the discriminant function*

	Characteristic root	Rc	Wilks' Lambda	χ^2	Number of degrees of freedom	p
0	2.223(a)	.830	.310	544.171	4	.000

The discriminant function was statistically significant at the level p<0.01. The coefficient of the canonical correlation was Rc=0.830 and pointed to a high intensity of intergroup differences.

Table 13. *Structure of the discriminant function*

Good familiarity with pedagogical and didactic-methodological principles	.950
Planning, information and innovation	.100
Communicativeness and success in conflict-solving	.054
Good interpersonal relations	-.022

Within the discriminant function, a significant share has only the factor called *Good familiarity with pedagogical and didactic-methodological principles* on the positive pole, while the negative pole of the function is poorly defined.

Table 14. *Centroids of groups*

Croats	1.504
Serbs	-1.472

Based on the values and direction of the centroids of groups (Table 14), we observe that respondents from Croatia are on the positive pole of the discriminant function, while the respondents from Serbia are on the negative pole of the function, i.e. the respondents from Croatia attribute higher significance to *good familiarity with pedagogical and didactic-methodological principles* than the respondents from Serbia. Based on the information obtained, **the second additional hypothesis** predicting a statistically significant difference on the subdimensions of professional features among the employees in the educational institutions of Croatia and Serbia – **can be confirmed.**

Canonical Discriminant Analysis (the Set of Quantitative Variables Consisted of the Factor Scores on the Promax Factors Set aside in the Measuring Space of the Questionnaire for the Evaluation of LEADERSHIP CHARACTERISTICS)

Table 15. *Characteristics of the discriminant function*

	Characteristic root	Rc	Wilks' Lambda	χ^2	Number of degrees of freedom	p
0	0.163	0.374	0.860	66.581	4	0.000

The discriminant function was statistically significant at the level p<0.01. The coefficient of the canonical correlation was Rc=0.374 and it pointed to a moderate intensity of intergroup differences.

Table 16. *Structure of discriminant function*

Democratic orientation with elements of leadership	.600
Low expressed leadership characteristics	.425
Tendency of respondents to be led by someone else	-.341
Expressed leadership characteristics with a dominant desire for power	.130

The positive pole of the discriminant function was well defined by the factors *Democratic orientation with elements of leadership* and *Low expressed leadership characteristics,* while the negative pole of the function was more weakly determined by the factor *Tendency of respondents to be led by someone else.*

Table 17. *Centroids of groups*

Croats	.379
Serbs	-.428

Based on the values and direction of the centroids of groups (Table 17), we observe that the respondents from Croatia have a more expressed *democratic orientation with elements of leadership* and *low expressed leadership characteristics,* while the respondents from Serbia show a greater *tendency to be led by someone else* than the respondents from Croatia. Based on the information obtained, **the third additional hypothesis** expecting that there would be a statistically significant difference on the subdimensions of leadership between the employees of the educational institutions in Croatia and Serbia **can be confirmed.**

Canonical Discriminant Analysis (the Set of Quantitative Variables Consisted of the Factor Scores on the First Main Components of the BFI Subscales)

Table 18. *Characteristics of the discriminant function*

	Characteristic root	Rc	Wilks' Lambda	χ^2	Number of degrees of freedom	p
0	0.034	0.280	0.968	14.957	5	0.011

The discriminant function was statistically significant at the level $p<0.05$. The coefficient of the canonical correlation was $Rc=0.280$ and it pointed to a low intensity of intergroup differences.

Table 19. *Structure of the discriminant function*

Openness	.491
Extraversion	.473
Neuroticism	-.345
Agreeableness	-.307
Conscientiousness	.134

The positive pole of the discriminant function was defined by the dimensions *Openness* and *Extraversion,* while the negative pole of the function was determined by the dimensions *Neuroticism* and *Agreeableness.*

Table 20. *Centroids of groups*

Croats	-.177
Serbs	.188

Based on the results obtained, we can say that the respondents from Croatia have shown somewhat more expressed *neuroticism* and *agreeableness* than the respondents from Serbia, while the respondents from Serbia have shown somewhat more expressed *openness* and *extraversion* than the respondents from Croatia. Based on the results presented, **the fourth additional hypothesis** according to which a statistically significant difference was expected in the expression of personality traits of the employees in the educational institutions in Croatia and Serbia **can be confirmed.**

Conclusion

On the basis of the presented results (Tables 9 and 10), the general **hypothesis** of the research – that the pedagogical employees of the educational institutions in Croatia and Serbia would self-evaluate that they posses leadership skills and abilities – **is accepted.** Further, the results of the differences in the arithmetic means of sum scores on the leadership questionnaire (Table 11) have shown that there is a statistically significant difference between the respondents from Serbia and Croatia in the self-evaluation of their leadership skills, in favour of the Croatian respondents, so that **the first additional hypothesis is confirmed**. The respondents from Croatia have shown better results than the respondents from Serbia. Croatian respondents have also reflected leadership characteristics in a more creative and constructive life attitude, the belief that they are more willing to improve the quality of personal and school life, and find themselves in team and common work.

The information obtained by analyzing the differences in the structures and the expression of the three dependent variables of this study in the case of the respondents from Serbia and Croatia, have shown that there are differences and that they are statistically significant in all three cases: the respondents from Croatia attribute much greater significance to good familiarity with pedagogical and didactic-methodological principles than the respondents from Serbia (Table 14). Then, some respondents from Croatia show democratic orientation with elements of leadership unlike the respondents from Serbia who self-evaluate that they like to be led by someone else (Table 17). The respondents from Croatia show more expressed neuroticism and agreeableness than those from Serbia, while the employees in Serbian education show a more expressed openness and extraversion than those from Croatia (Table 20). Therefore, **the second, third and fourth additional hypotheses are confirmed.**

It is beyond doubt that democracy with elements of leadership, familiarity with pedagogical and didactic-methodological principles, and agreeableness are the

characteristics valuable in education and this research has shown that respondents from Croatia precede the respondents from Serbia. In this study the respondents from Serbia have shown somewhat higher interest for interpersonal relations than expertise as well as a more expressed extraversion (in relation to their colleagues from Croatia) which is logically related to interpersonal relations, but still insufficient and not directed in a way to develop leadership characteristics from it, but more as a "need for external stimulation and obtaining positive feedback" (Čolović et al., 2005, p. 75). The development of extraversion into leadership characteristics in Serbian respondents was not helped by the openness to experience, which is logically related to innovation and invention as a pre-condition for leadership. True leadership requires, in addition to good interpersonal relations (extraversion, charisma, communicativeness, agreeableness), expertise, initiative, willingness to assume responsibility, conflict solving, democratic character and conscientiousness. The respondents from Croatia have shown somewhat more expressed agreeableness, which is logically related both to interpersonal relations and democratic orientation. Therefore, we can say that respondents from Croatia have the significant pre-conditions of leadership in education both in the aspect of personality traits (agreeableness), professional features (good familiarity with pedagogical and didactic-methodological principles) as well as the very leadership characteristics (democratic orientation). However, in their case also, in addition to their democratic orientation, there is a somewhat less expressed presence of low expressed leadership characteristics (due to the lack of self-confidence and motivation for success as it has been interpreted above) which can be interpreted as a potential influence of neuroticism (emotional insecurity, nervousness and sensitivity).

From all the above-mentioned we can conclude that, when it comes to professional features, the employees in education in Croatia should pay more attention to interpersonal relations and improve leadership characteristics when it comes to leadership. Serbs, however, should be oriented to professionalism and interpersonal relations, but also they should significantly improve their leadership features.

When it comes to differences between personality traits of the respondents from Serbia and Croatia, although it appears that there are many similarities between these two nations, particularly when compared to the nations from other parts of the world, still there are differences conditioned by many factors, such as different history and religion. Heritage that has been left by different historical frameworks, particularly the enormous impact of Austro-Hungarian and Turkish cultures has certainly left its trace on personality traits. Religion largely forms value systems and thus affects personality traits. This paper's task, however, is not to discuss the origin of different personality traits of these two nations, which has sociological-cultural-psychological epithets, but also to establish the differences in the context of leadership and professional characteristics.

Better results of Croatian employees in education regarding professional and leadership characteristics are largely the result of the better general organization of

the Republic of Croatia, which it has recently confirmed by meeting all the conditions necessary for joining the European Union. Higher level of organization of Croatian over Serbian country can be noticed in various dimensions. Croatia precedes Serbia in competitiveness: the "position of Serbia in competitiveness ranking, according to WEF report 2010/2011, is at 93rd place from 139 ranked countries... in comparison to these countries, Croatia is at the higher, 77th place" (Arsenijević et al., 2011, p. 13177); Croatia precedes Serbia in the share of the highly educated population "Croatia has 15%, and Serbia 6.5%" (Arsenijević et al., 2011, p. 13180); and Croatia precedes Serbia in the position in the Pisa international external evaluation of education: in 2006, Serbia has assumed the 42nd and Croatia the 26th place (retrieved from web site: http://www.nacional.hr/clanak/40960/pisa-test-mijenja-skolstvo) and a higher position of Croatian education is continued in the later Pisa reports (retrieved from web site: www.pisaserbia.org*). Democratic character and professionalism are the characteristics that are developed, that are learned – the same happens with leadership* (Haas, Tomarkin, 1992). Leadership is not reserved for certain individuals, but it is a possibility of each employee; it primarily represents personal development and responsibility (Kouzes, Posner, 2003, p. 90; Haas, Tomarkin, 1992).

The topic discussed in this paper has not yet been studied in the context of international comparison. The author who dealt with these problems most and the one to whom we referred to most in the creation of the questionnaire and data interpretation is Stjepan Staničić (2000b, 2002, 2006a, 2006b). He was the one who developed the concept of leading educational activity in school for this region. Without the starting point of this author it is difficult to determine the leadership role, tasks, structures of the jobs of the principal and the pedagogue. In addition, the author has defined the competences of ideal leadership as a stronghold and vision of empirical tendencies.

The findings of the research show that in the educational institutions, it is necessary to implement the permanent education of the employees in order to develop the inhibited abilities. The employees in education actually need to become the leaders of their own self in order to be able to encourage it within others, both colleagues and students. With the aim of all the employees in education to develop their potentials and abilities, it is necessary to implement general education and improve the educational process, and thus the countries themselves, both Croatia and Serbia (Pastuović, 2006). It will pay off greatly to invest in the formation and education of a successful leader in school who will lead himself, inspire the others by his own example, create the environment in which love is greater than fear, who will be honest, diligent, open for cooperation, with a clear vision, who will introduce innovations, be familiar with the educational process and didactic principles.

And if we start with the *Model of successful leadership* (Staničić, 2000a) in the educational institutions which represents a person that has a clear vision, changes continuously and positively, introduces innovations, knows how to work with people,

motivates them, successfully solves conflicts that prevent the implementation of the school programme, is honest, full of confidence, open for cooperation, diligent, intensively committed to work, familiar with the principles upon which the educational process as a whole is based as well as the didactic principles of teaching as a foundation of the educational process, there is a new dilemma and question: *How far away are we from this ideal?*

References

Andevski, M. (2007a). Menadžment obrazovanja. Novi Sad: CEKOM books.

Andevski, M. (2007b). Novi model menadžmenta škole kao osnova za reformu škole. Pedagogija: prema cjeloživotnom obrazovanju i društvu znanja, svezak. 2. Zagreb: Hrvatsko pedagogijsko društvo.

Arsenijević, J., Andevski, M. (2010). Menadžment obrazovanja za društvo koje uči. Novi Sad: Filozofski fakultet u Novom Sadu i Visoka škola strukovnih studija za obrazovanje vaspitača u Kikindi.

Arsenijević, J., Tot V., Nikolić, M., Milin, D. (2011). The Gap between Science, Education and Economy of Serbia and Developed Countries. African Journal of Business Management, 5 (34), 13176-13186.

Bartling, F. P. & Bartlett, K. R. (2005). Leadership characteristics of adult educators. Retrieved March 10, 2009, from: https://idea.iupui.edu/dspace/bitstream/1805/632/1/03.pdf

Bitel, L. (1977). Liderstvo: stilovi i tehnike. Beograd: Clio.

Bratanić, M. (2002). Paradoks odgoja. Studije i eseji. Zagreb: Hrvatska sveučilišna naklada.

Cattel, R.B. (1995). The Fallacy of Five Factors in the Personality Sphere. The Psychology, 8, 207-208.

Čolović, P., Mitrović, D., Smederevac, S. (2005). Evaluacija modela pet velikih u našoj kulturi primenom upitnika fibi. Psihologija, 38 (1), 55-76.

Costa, P.T., McCrae, R.R. (1992). Revised NEO Personality Inventory (NEO-PI-R) and NEO Five-Factor Inventory (NEO-FFI) manual. Odessa: Psychological Assessment Resources.

Digman, J.M. (1990). Personality structure: Emergence of the five-factor model. Annual Review of Psychology, 41, 417–440.

Drucker, P. (2005). Najvažnije o menadžmentu. Zagreb: M.E.P. Consult.

Fullan, M. (1998). Leadership for the 21st century: Breaking the Bonds of Dependency. Educational Leadership, 55 (7), 6-10.

Fullan, M. (2002). The Change Leader. Educational Leadership, 59 (8), 16-20.

Fullan, M. (2007). The New Meaning of Educational Change. New York: Teachers' College Press.

Fullan, M. (2010). Motion Leadership: The Skinny on Becoming Change Savvy. Thousand Oak, CA: Corwin Press.

Guilford, J.P. (1968). The Nature of Human Intelligence. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co.

Haas, H., Tamarkin, B. (1992). The Leader Within. New York: Harper Business.

Hay Management Consultants (2000). The Lessons of Leadership. London: Hay Management Consultants Ltd.

Klafki, W. (1994). New Basic Education for All – Future of the Idea of Education. In: Intelligence Service of German Protestant Society, 2, 6-10.

Kouzes, J., Posner, Z. (2003). Leadership Challenge. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Matijević, M. (2001). Alternativne škole (Didaktičke i pedagoške koncepcije), II dopunjeno izdanje. Zagreb: TIPEX.

Méndez-Morse, S. (1992). Leadership Characteristics that Facilitate School Change. Austin: Southwest Educational Development Laboratory (SEDL).

Mušanović, M. (1998). Konstruktivistička paradigma kvalitete osnovnog obrazovanja. U: Kvaliteta u odgoju i obrazovanju. Rijeka: Pedagoški fakultet u Rijeci, 84-97.

Mušanović, M. (2001). Pedagogija profesionalnog obrazovanja. Rijeka: Graftrade.

National Association of Elementary School Principals (2001). Leading Learning Communities: NAESP Standards for What Principals Should Know and Be Able to Do. Alexandria: NAESP.

Niedermair, G. (2008). Betriebliche Personalentwicklung: der Lage Weg zur Profession. Odgojne znanosti, 10 (2), 447- 461.

Northouse, P.G. (2001). Leadership: Theory and Practice, Second Edition. London: Sage Publication.

Pastuović, N. (2006). Kako do društva koje uči. Odgojne znanosti, 8 (2), 421-441.

Peko A., Mlinarević V., Gajger, V. (2009). Učinkovitost vođenja u osnovnim školama. Odgojne znanosti, 8 (2), 515-533.

Peters, T. (2005). Tom Peters essentials: Leadership. New York: DK Publishing.

Pierce, J., Newstrom, J. (2008). Leadership Process. New York: Mc Graw-Hill.

Razdevšek-Pučko, C. (2007). Kakvog učitelja/nastavnika treba (očekuje) škola danas (i sutra)? Ljubljana: Pedagoški fakultet Sveučilišta u Ljubljani.

Ristić, D. i sar. (2008). Odabrana poglavlja iz menadžmenta. Priručnik za upravljanje karijerom. Novi Sad: CEKOM books.

Spajić, B. (2008). Liderske karakteristike u obrazovnim institucijama, (doktorska disertacija). Novi Sad: Fakultet za Menadžment, Privredna akademija.

Staničić, S. (1998). Školski ravnatelj u europskim zemljama. Školski priručnik 1998./99. Zagreb: Znamen, 174-178.

Staničić, S. (2000a) Stilovi vođenja školskog ravnatelja. Školski priručnik 2000/2001. Zagreb: Znamen, str.155-163.

Staničić, S. (2000b). Vođenje odgojno-obrazovne djelatnosti u školi (doktorska disertacija). Rijeka: Filozofski fakultet u Rijeci, Sveučilište u Rijeci.

Staničić, S. (2001). Kompetencijski profil ravnatelja. Školski priručnik 2001/2002. Zagreb: Znamen, 179-185.

Staničić, S. (2006a). Menadžment u obrazovanju. Rijeka: Vlastita naklada.

Staničić, S. (2006b). Upravljanje ljudskim potencijalom u školstvu. Odgojne znanosti, 8 (2), 515-533.

Staničić, S. i dr. (2002). Upravljanje i rukovođenje u odgojno-obrazovnom sustavu. U: Strugar, V. (ured.) Koncepcija promjena odgojno-obrazovnog sustava u Republici Hrvatskoj: projekt Izvorište. Zagreb: Ministarstvo prosvjete i športa.

The Hay Group (1999). Excellence in School Leadership. Victoria: Department of Education, Employment & Training.

Vidović, B., Matas, V., Puljiz, M. (2009). Strateški menadžment u školstvu. Ravnatelj škole – upravljanje - vođenje. Zagreb: Agencija za odgoj i obrazovanje, 12-40.

Vrcelj, S. (2005). U potrazi za identitetom. Iz perspektive komparativne pedagogije. Zagreb: Graftrade.

Milica Andevski
Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences,
University of Novi Sad
Dr Zorana Đinđića 2, 21 000 Novi Sad, Serbia
andevski@ff.uns.ac.rs

Jasmina Arsenijević
Pre-School Teacher Training College in Kikinda
Svetosavska 57, 23300 Kikinda, Serbia
minapane@open.telekom.rs

Blago Spajić
Independent Associate Researcher, Varaždin, Croatia
blagospajic@yahoo.com

Liderske karakteristike zaposlenih u školstvu na području Republike Hrvatske i Republike Srbije

Sažetak

U radu se polazi od humanističko-razvojne, prema pojedincu orijentirane koncepcije odgoja i obrazovanja, odgoj se shvaća kao komunikacijski interaktivni proces kojega definiraju implicitni, neuhvatljivi i iracionalni momenti, kao i nova uloga škole fokusirana fenomenom liderstva. Populaciju istraživanja čine osnovne i srednje škole na teritoriju Hrvatske i Srbije, dok istraživački uzorak čini 237 ravnatelja, učitelja, nastavnika, stručnih suradnika škola koji su se odazvali istraživanju u Hrvatskoj i 252 ispitanika u Srbiji. Cilj istraživanja je utvrđivanje prisutnosti liderskih svojstava i osobina kod zaposlenih u obrazovnim ustanovama Hrvatske i Srbije, a zadatci istraživanja realizirani su komparacijom odgovora ispitanika s teritorija Hrvatske i Srbije u odnosu na procjenu profesionalnih svojstava, liderskih karakteristika, osobina ličnosti, ispitivanih tehnikom anketiranja i skaliranja, instrumentima u vidu upitnika i skala stavova. Dobiveni podatci obrađeni u statističkom SPSS paketu (deskriptivna analiza, faktorska analiza na ekstrahiranim Promax dimenzijama, korelacije i diskriminantne analize) ukazuju na povoljnije rezultate kod ispitanika iz Hrvatske koji, u odnosu na kolege u Srbiji, bolje prepoznaju liderske osobine.

Ključne riječi: *Hrvatska; komparacija; liderstvo; menadžment u obrazovanju; Srbija; zaposleni u školi*

Uvodnik – teorijska polazišta i okvir ispitivanja

Menadžment obrazovanja aktualan je u teorijskoj misli i praktičnoj provedbi, interdisciplinarni pristup mijenja odgovornost zaposlenika u obrazovanju u razumijevanju logike vremena, nameće potrebu za predviđanjem posljedica djelovanja i smanjivanjem potencijalnih rizika. Znanje o menadžmentu postaje dio općeg obrazovanja koje jača profesionalne šanse, socijalno i osobno napredovanje.

Još je Klafki, klasičar škole i obrazovanja, isticao da je mladima potrebno izravno "uvođenje u svijet privrede i svijet rada" (1994). Svijet rada i zanimanja, problemi

potrošnje, politike, gospodarstva, spoznaja kontroverzi u vanjskom okruženju, ali i onih osobnih i obiteljskih, postavljaju specifične zahtjeve obrazovanju i pedagoškoj profesiji (Niedermair, 2008). Zaposlenici u školi ne mogu razumjeti sebe, pa ni svijet učenika i kontekst njihovog odrastanja, ukoliko ne prepoznaju čimbenike vlastitog utjecaja, kompetencija i poduzetništva (makar u osnovnim crtama). U spoju pragmatičnih intencija *menadžmenta* i humanističkih, međuljudskih interakcija *obrazovanja*, zagovornici iskustvenog učenja i autonomije u odgoju i obrazovanju, kao osnovni cilj ističu aktivnu, stvaralačku, autentičnu razvojnost učenika, ali i sposobnost uviđanja, osmišljavanja, mijenjanja aktera odgojno-obrazovnog procesa.

Osnovne funkcije menadžmenta, koje su prepoznatljive u školi: planiranje, organiziranje, vođenje i kontrola, u ovom istraživanju promatramo kroz koncept *liderstva,* kao procesa koji sve objedinjuje u jedinstvenom pristupu, ne podrazumijeva recept, jednoobraznost, nego vještinu pomoći onima koji poučavaju i koji uče, da iskoriste i razviju vlastite potencijale, motive, emocije u stvaranju novih vrijednosti, provođenju promjena, stvaranju preduvjeta za dostizanje maksimalnih rezultata u osobnom razvoju, ali i razvoju okruženja, uz umijeće objedinjavanja vizije, svrsishodnog odlučivanja, učinkovite komunikacije, pozitivnog stava prema zajedničkim rezultatima, inovativnosti, kreativnosti, timskog duha, poduzetnosti.

Suvremena škola, koja preferira ovakvo ozračje i ovu koncepciju (samo)razvoja, odgoja i obrazovanja, dobiva nove i složene zadatke. To posebno možemo istaknuti za škole u Hrvatskoj i Srbiji koje su u procesu ubrzane demokratizacije, transformacije, pred zahtjevima doprinosa prosperitetu obrazovanja i kulture, ali i definiranja identiteta (Mušanović, 1998; Staničić, 2000b; Peko i sur., 2009; Vidović i sur. 2009; Pastuović, 2006, Arsenijević, Andevski, 2010). Novu ulogu škole, kao razvojne i autonomne ustanove, definiraju i mnogi implicitni, neuhvatljivi i iracionalni momenti, paradoksi odgoja koji u fokus stavljaju *liderstvo* koje je prvenstveno demokratski opredijeljeno, nasuprot autokratskom upravljanju (Bratanić, 2002; Arsenijević, Andevski, 2010).

Obrazovne ustanove danas funkcioniraju u uvjetima jačanja autonomije škola i preuzimanja brige za cjelokupni obrazovni i odgojni proces, za sve sudionike koji participiraju u tom procesu, za njihove rezultate, za egzistenciju škole u snažnim zahtjevima kvalitetnog i optimalnog rada u kontekstu stalnih promjena. Efektivni rad odgojne ustanove zato podrazumijeva da zaposlenici imaju određene karakteristike i znanja, određene *kompetencije.* Osim osnovnih: pedagoških i stručnih kompetencija, sve više su potrebne liderske i organizacijske kompetencije zaposlenima u obrazovanju. Zašto?

U današnjoj ekonomiji zasnovanoj na znanju, liderske karakteristike i poduzetništvo ne traže se samo od menadžera, već od svih zaposlenika, pa tako i od onih u odgoju i obrazovanju. Danas se mijenja i odgovornost zaposlenika u razumijevanju logike vremena, nameće se potreba za predviđanjem posljedica djelovanja i smanjivanjem potencijalnih rizika. Organizacijska znanja tako postaju dio općeg odgoja i obrazovanja koje jača profesionalne šanse, socijalno i osobno napredovanje. Dalje, da

bi zadržale svoju tradicionalnu poziciju, obrazovno-odgojne ustanove danas sve više preuzimaju inicijativu u svojem okruženju i postaju centar društvenih događanja, nosioci promjena. Takve obrazovno-odgojne ustanove ne mogu biti održive ukoliko njihovi zaposlenici nemaju osnovne liderske karakteristike. I, konačno, nastavno osoblje, kao dio zaposlenih u obrazovanju mora imati liderske karakteristike iz dva razloga: u osnovi, nastavnički poziv zahtijeva liderske vještine prvenstveno pri vođenju nastave i radu s učenicima, roditeljima i užim i širim okruženjem; s druge strane, tu je utjecaj nastavnog osoblja koje imaju na učenike i moć da liderske vještine prenesu na njih. Kako je već poznato da se liderske vještine stječu i uče; za razvoj suvremenog, odgovornog i poduzetnog društva potrebno je da se liderstvo uči od malih nogu, u školi, kao sadržaj ali i ad hoc[5]. Ukoliko su učenici izloženi radu s nastavnicima koji raspolažu ovim vještinama, kasnije će ih lakše moći i kod sebe razviti. Čak i sama definicija odgoja i obrazovanja danas se mijenja i zahtjevi koje oni treba ispunjavati sve više se pomiču s prenošenja sadržaja na izgradnju kritičkog mišljenja, vještine rješavanja problema te interpersonalnih odnosa.

U radu smo pošli od suvremenih odrednica liderstva (Kouzes-Posner, 2003; Piters, 2005; Pierce-Newstrom, 2008) kao interaktivnog, socijalnog procesa zajedničkih aktivnosti i osobnog razvoja. Liderstvo nije rezervirano za određene pojedince, već je mogućnost svakog zaposlenog; prvenstveno predstavlja osobni razvoj i odgovornost (Kouzes, Posner 2003, str.90; Haas, Tomarkin, 1992). Bitel definira lidera kao osobu koja ima viziju budućnosti organizacije, koji je zna prenijeti na druge i motivira ih da je realiziraju (1997, str. 28). U ovom istraživanju liderstvo promatramo kao vještinu objedinjavanja vizije, svrsishodnog odlučivanja, uspješne komunikacije i pozitivnog stava prema zajedničkim rezultatima, inovativnosti, kreativnosti, timskom duhu, poduzetnosti, marljivosti te odgovornosti.

Pregled literature

Jedan od najviše primijećenih dostignuća u literaturi o liderstvu u odgoju i obrazovanju je publikacija "Leading Learning Communities: NAESP Standards for What Principals Should Know and Be Able to Do" (2001) u izdanju Nacionalnog udruženja ravnatelja osnovnih škola (The National Association of Elementary School Principals) u kojem je definirano šest karakteristika ravnatelja koje će im pomoći unaprijediti vlastitu praksu[6].

Veliki doprinos daoje Michael Fullan, svjetski autoritet u području školske reforme, kako u svojim većim djelima poput knjiga "The New Meaning of Educational

---

[5] S tim u svezi Goleman (1995) je među prvima istaknuo značenje razvoja emocionalne inteligencije (a poznato je u kojoj mjeri je sposobnost liderstva ovisna o emocionalnoj inteligenciji pojedinca) i kapacitet koji ima njezin razvoj upravo u školi.

[6] Karakteristike uključuju: (1) voditi školu postavljajući učenika u centar aktivnosti; (2) postaviti visoka očekivanja i standarde za akademski i društveni razvoj svih učenika; (3) zahtijevati sadržaj i upute koje će omogućiti postavljene rezultate učenika; (4) kreirati kulturu kontinuiranog usavršavanja zaposlenika vođenim boljim rezultatima učenika i drugim ciljevima škole; (5) koristiti se s više izvora informacija za procjenu i promjenu rezultata rada i (6) aktivno uključivati okruženje i lokalnu zajednicu i stvarati zajedničku odgovornost za rezultate škole.

Change" (2007) i "Motion Leadership" (2010); tako i u manjim tekstovima u kojima se neposredno bavi problematikom liderskih karakteristika ravnatelja škola kao što su: "Leadership for the 21st Century" (1998) ili "The Change Leader" (2002). Njegov rad obuhvaća duboke uvide na makro razini o promjenama u obrazovanju, školskoj reformi, upravljanju promjenama i razvoju liderstva u obrazovanju.

U ovom području vrlo je zapažena i knjiga "Leadership Characteristics that Facilitate School Change" autorice Méndez-Morse (1992). Autorica identificira šest liderskih karakteristika koje pomažu uvođenju promjena u školi (imati viziju, vjerovati da škole prije svega postoje radi učenja učenika, vrednovati ljudske resurse, dobro komunicirati i slušati, biti proaktivan te riskirati).

Kako raste svijest o sve većoj važnosti znanja i učinkovitosti odgoja i obrazovanja, broj i dubina istraživanja o liderskim karakteristikama u obrazovanju raste, ali se većina studija i dalje orijentira na istraživanje menadžmenta odgojno-obrazovne ustanove. Za sada je malo radova o istraživanju liderskih karakteristika svih zaposlenika u obrazovanju ili onih kod nastavnog osoblja.

Studija „Leadership Characteristics of Adult Educators" autora Bartling i Bartlett (2005) procjenjuje percepciju liderskog ponašanja i stilova vođenja koji se prakticiraju na uzorku zaposlenika u obrazovanju odraslih u regiji Srednji zapad u SAD-u. Ovdje je važno napomenuti i studiju The Hay group (1999) u kojoj su analizirane karakteristike izrazito učinkovitih ravnatelja u Australiji, kao i Hay Management Consultants (2000) koja komparira 200 visoko učinkovitih ravnatelja s 200 viših poslovnih rukovoditelja u Engleskoj.

Problematikom vođenja odgojno-obrazovne djelatnosti na prostorima u kojima smo komparirali prisutnost liderskih svojstava u odgojno-obrazovnim ustanovama, a to su Hrvatska i Srbija, najviše se bavio Stjepan Staničić (1998, 2000a, 2000b, 2002, 2006a, 2006b). Njegov hipotetički model optimalnog vođenja škole, kao i empirijski model kompetencijskog profila ravnatelja i školskog pedagoga, bio nam je glavni poticaj da tragamo za kriterijima kojima bi trebali udovoljavati (ruko)voditelji i zaposlenici, da bi njihovo djelovanje pokrenulo razvoj škola prema višim razinama kvalitete. U njemačkoj i anglosaksonskoj literaturi nismo naišli na istraživanja u vidu komihneriranja **dviju** zemalja, ali su nam teoretičari ovih zemalja pružili osnove teorijskog utemeljenja i definiranja osnovnih pojmova (Drucker, 2005; Northouse, 2001; Niedermair, 2008).

Predmet, problem, cilj, zadaci, hipoteze i varijable ispitivanja

U literaturi autori tvrde (Staničić, 1998, 2002, 2006a, 2006b; Vidović i sur. 2009; Spajić, 2008; Andevski, 2007a, 207b; Arsenijević, Andevski, 2010) da su optimalno vođenje, upravljanje i liderstvo ključ učinkovitosti svih, pa i obrazovnih ustanova. Predmet ovog istraživanja je ispitivanje i definiranje liderskih kompetencija koje rad u području odgoja i obrazovanja čine uspješnijim, a rezultate mjerljivim. Istraživanje je interdisciplinarno, pedagoška sfera djelatnosti reflektira se kroz sferu menadžmenta

i organizacijskih znanosti. Menadžment promatramo kao „liberalnu vještinu" (Drucker, 2005); „liberalnu" jer se bavi osnovama znanja, samospoznajom, mudrošću i liderstvom, „vještinu" jer se bavi praksom i primjenom, primjenjuje znanja i opažanja humanističkih i društvenih znanosti, psihologije i filozofije, etike i prirodnih znanosti.

Odgojno-obrazovne ustanove u Hrvatskoj i Srbiji funkcioniraju danas u uvjetima jačanja autonomije i preuzimanja brige za cjelokupni odgojno-obrazovni proces, za sve sudionike koji participiraju u tom procesu, za njihove rezultate, za egzistenciju škole u snažnim zahtjevima kvalitetnog i optimalnog rada. Istraživački *problem* reflektira pitanje: *Koliko su u pedagoškim ustanovama i Hrvatske i Srbije prisutne liderske karakteristike među sudionicima odgojno-obrazovnog procesa? Jesu li zaposlenici odgojno-obrazovnih aktivnosti lideri u svom profesionalnom angažiranju?*

Cilj istraživanja je utvrđivanje i kompariranje prisutnosti liderskih svojstava kao i utvrđivanje razlika u prepoznavanju profesionalnih svojstava, liderskih karakteristika i osobina ličnosti kod zaposlenika u odgojno-obrazovnim ustanovama Hrvatske i Srbije.

Opća hipoteza glasi: Pedagoški zaposlenici u odgojno-obrazovnim institucijama Hrvatske i Srbije samoprocjenjuju da posjeduju liderske vještine i sposobnosti.

Prva posebna hipoteza glasi: postoji statistički značajna razlika u percepciji posjedovanja liderskih vještina i sposobnosti između zaposlenih u odgojno-obrazovnim institucijama Hrvatske i Srbije.

Postavljene su i tri posebne hipoteze istraživanja koje polaze od pretpostavke da postoji statistička razlika među ispitanicima iz Hrvatske i Srbije na subdimenzijama faktora profesionalnih svojstava, liderskih karakteristika i osobina ličnosti, kako bi se dobile detaljnije i kvalitetnije informacije o različitim aspektima ove tri dimenzije.

Druga posebna hipoteza glasi: postoji statistički značajna razlika na subdimenzijama (faktorima) profesionalnih svojstava između zaposlenih u odgojno-obrazovnim institucijama Hrvatske i Srbije.

Treća posebna hipoteza glasi: postoji statistički značajna razlika na subdimenzijama (faktorima) liderstva između zaposlenih u odgojno-obrazovnim institucijama Hrvatske i Srbije.

Četvrta posebna hipoteza glasi: postoji statistički značajna razlika u izraženosti osobina ličnosti između zaposlenih u odgojno-obrazovnim institucijama Hrvatske i Srbije.

Varijable istraživanja

Nezavisna varijabla istraživanja je nacionalnost ispitanika.

Grupu *zavisnih varijabli* čine: liderstvo, pedagoška profesionalna svojstva i osobine ličnosti (BFI). Sve promatrane varijable operacionalizirane su upitnikom, a *osobine ličnosti* teorijski su definirane *petofaktorskim modelom* koji pretpostavlja postojanje pet temeljnih dimenzija osobina ličnosti: *neuroticizam, ekstraverzija, otvorenost, suradljivost, savjesnost.*

Instrumenti istraživanja

U istraživanju smo se koristili s *četiri instrumenta*:

Upitnik za opće podatke o ispitanicima odnosi se na osobne podatke ispitanika: spol, godine starosti, odgojno-obrazovna ustanova u kojoj ispitanici rade, radna funkcija koju obavljaju, područje obrazovanja koje imaju i radno iskustvo.

Upitnik za procjenu profesionalnih svojstava (PS-25 čestica, modificirana, skraćena verzija, prema Staničić 2000). Upitnik sadrži 25 tvrdnji s kojima je trebalo izraziti slaganje ili neslaganje zaokruživanjem brojeva od 1 do 5 na skali Likertovog tipa. Validnost mjernog instrumenta je provjeravana Analizom glavnih komponenti (faktorska analiza) koja je pokazala da je predmet mjerenja obuhvaćen s četiri faktora, dok je pouzdanost upitnika provjeravana Cronbach Alpha koeficijentom koji iznosi α=0,786 što predstavlja prihvatljivu pouzdanost instrumenta.

Upitnik za procjenu liderskih karakteristika (L-36 čestica) sastojao se od 36 čestica s kojima su ispitanici izražavali svoje slaganje ili neslaganje zaokruživanjem brojeva od 1 do 5 na skali Likertovog tipa. Validnost mjernog instrumenta je provjeravana analizom glavnih komponenti (faktorska analiza) koja je pokazala da je predmet mjerenja obuhvaćen s četiri faktora, dok je pouzdanost upitnika provjeravana Cronbach Alpha koeficijentom koji iznosi α=0,821, što predstavlja sasvim zadovoljavajuću pouzdanost instrumenta koji je koncipiran da pouzdano mjeri danu problematiku.

Upitnik za procjenu karakteristika ličnosti „Velikih pet" (Big Five-44 čestice) podržava hijerarhijsku strukturu u organizaciji crta ličnosti pri čemu ima pet temeljnih faktora koje nazivamo „velikih pet": neuroticizam, ekstraverzija, otvorenost, slaganje, savjesnost (Guilford, 1968; Cattel, 1995; Costa, McCrae, 1992; Digman, 1990). Svih pet dimenzija ličnosti svedene su prema ključu na glavne komponente i imaju koeficijente pouzdanosti (Cronbach Alpha) u rasponu od 0,80 do 0,92, što možemo smatrati zadovoljavajućom pouzdanošću.

Metode istraživanja

Priroda fenomena liderstva kao predmeta istraživanja, cilj, zadaci i hipoteze, uvjetovali su izbor metoda zasnovanih na racionalno-deduktivnim, analitičko-sintetičkim, interpretativnim i empirijsko-induktivnim pristupima spoznaje. U fokusu je *komparativna metoda* i *komparacija* kao kategorija mišljenja koja razjašnjava pojmove, precizira sud, zaključivanje i generaliziranje fenomena komapariranja. Težište je na *deskriptivnom* aspektu i *horizontalnom smjeru* komapariranja, po opsežnosti ovo je *mikrokomparacija* na razini međudržavnih analiza (Vrcelj, 2005; Mušanović, 2001) s težištem na komapariranju kvalitativnih obilježja. Podatci su obrađivani statističkom metodom (aplikacije SPSS-a) i sređivani kvantitativnom i kvalitativnom analizom.

Uzorak istraživanja

Populaciju istraživanja čine osnovne i srednje škole na teritoriju Hrvatske i Srbije, dok istraživački uzorak čini 237 ravnatelja, učitelja, nastavnika, stručnih suradnika

škola koji su se odazvali istraživanju u Hrvatskoj i 252 u Srbiji. Uzorak je *prigodan,* s elementima *namjernog,* dakle nereprezentativan, s jedinicama osnovnog skupa koje su bile na raspolaganju i koje su istraživači smatrali tipičnim za istraživanje. Rezultati ovako dobiveni smatraju se vrijednim, ali se ne mogu generalizirati na osnovni skup (populaciju).

Rezultati i istraživanja

Faktorska analiza upitnika za procjenu profesionalnih svojstava

Analiza latentnog prostora mjerenja Upitnika PPS izvršena je tako što su čestice upitnika podvrgnute analizi glavnih komponenti. Guttman-Kaiserovim i Cattellovim Scree kriterijem uz kosokutnu Promax rotaciju, ekstrahirana su **četiri faktora** koji zajedno objašnjavaju oko 40% ukupne varijance.

Tablica 1.

Prvi Promax faktor okuplja čestice koje po svom sadržaju govore o dobrim međuljudskim odnosima kao preduvjetu za uspješan rad u školi, kao što su povjerenje među suradnicima, tolerancija, podrška tuđem uspjehu i sl. Ispitanici koji postižu visoke rezultate na ovom faktoru smatraju da je javno isticanje uspjeha i rezultata svojih vrijednih kolega veoma bitno za uspješan rad u školi, kao i povjerenje među suradnicima i tolerancija različitih viđenja pojedinih stručnih problema i njihovog rješavanja, te da je dobro da zaposlenici u odgoju i obrazovanju znaju prepoznati nešto što je najbolje u svakom kolegi te da to razvijaju za dobrobit svoje škole. Na osnovi navedenog faktor je nazvan **Dobri međuljudski odnosi.**

Tablica 2.

Drugi faktor definiraju čestice koje po svom sadržaju govore o značenju planiranja, organiziranja, prijenosa informacija i uvođenja inovativnosti za uspješan rad škole. Ispitanici koji postižu visoke rezultate na ovom faktoru smatraju da zaposlenici trebaju brzo pribavljati i prenositi informacije, vjeruju u važnost dobra planiranja i organiziranja, nužnost poznavanja zakonskih dokumenata i propisa iz područja odgoja i obrazovanja te nužnost uvođenja inovacija u odgojno-obrazovni proces, primjerice korištenje računala, i nužnost uključivanja svih zaposlenika u inovacije da bi rad škole bio uspješan. Ovaj faktor je nazvan **Planiranje, informiranost i inovativnost**.

Tablica 3.

Treći faktor okuplja tvrdnje koje se tiču poznavanja pedagoških i didaktičko-metodičkih načela, nastavnog plana i programa. Ispitanici koji na ovom faktoru postižu visoke rezultate ističu da je marljivost u radu i dobro poznavanje pedagoških načela, didaktičko-metodičkih načela, kao i nastavnog plana i programa veoma bitno za uspješan rad u školi. Ovaj faktor smo nazvali **Dobro poznavanje pedagoških** i **didaktičko-metodičkih načela.**

Tablica 4.

Četvrti faktor određuju tvrdnje koje govore o dobroj komunikativnosti i razrješavanju konflikta kao bitnim čimbenicima za uspješan rad u školi. Ispitanici koji postižu visoke rezultate na ovom faktoru smatraju da je bitno da zaposlenici u školi imaju kvalitetnu međusobnu komunikaciju i da otvoreno i direktno među sobom razrješavaju konflikte. Ovaj faktor je nazvan **Komunikativnost i uspješnost u razrješavanju konflikta.**

Na osnovi provedene faktorske analize možemo primijetiti da se prvi i četvrti faktor (Dobri međuljudski odnosi i Komunikativnost i uspješnost u razrješavanju konflikta) odnose na međuljudske odnose – na uspostavljanje i održavanje kvalitetnih međuljudskih odnosa. Drugi i treći faktor (Planiranje, informiranost i inovativnost u nastavi i Dobro poznavanje pedagoških i didaktičko-metodičkih načela) imaju težište u stručnosti zaposlenih za rad u odgoju i obrazovanju: poznavanje načela prakse i tendencija ka njezinom razvoju. Prosvjetni poziv je dakle, kao izrazito socijalna profesija s jedne strane, ali i profesija u kojoj je potrebno stručno znanje, s druge, točno oslikan tim faktorima.

Faktorska analiza upitnika za procjenu liderskih osobina

Istim statističkim postupkom analiziran je prostor mjerenja upitnika za samoprocjenu liderskih osobina Guttman-Kaiserovim i Cattellovim Scree kriterijem uz kosokutnu Promax rotaciju, ekstrahirana su **četiri faktora** koji zajedno objašnjavaju oko 40% ukupne varijance.

Tablica 5.

Prvi Promax faktor okuplja čestice koje po svom sadržaju govore o nisko izraženim liderskim osobinama ispitanika. Osobe koje postižu visoke rezultate na ovom faktoru imaju nisko mišljenje o sebi, ne izražavaju lako što misle i osjećaju, teško uspostavljaju kontakt s drugim ljudima, nisu ambiciozne i ne vide sebe kao dobrog vođu. Ovaj faktor je nazvan **Nisko izražene liderske osobine.**

Tablica 6.

Drugi faktor definiraju tvrdnje koje po svom sadržaju govore o izraženim liderskim karakteristikama u smislu dominacije nad drugima. Osobe koje postižu visoke rezultate na ovom faktoru vole dominirati nad drugima, imaju izraženu volju za moći, za sebe misle da znaju privući ljude i nametnuti im se te često preuzimaju inicijativu. Misle da su dobre vođe, strogi ali pravedni. Faktor je nazvan **Izražene liderske karakteristike s dominantnom voljom za moći.**

Tablica 7.

Treći faktor definiraju čestice koje po svom sadržaju govore o sklonostima ispitanika da ih netko drugi vodi. Ispitanici koji postižu visoke rezultate na ovom faktoru ne preuzimaju inicijativu, lako se uplaše, ne vole donositi odluke i preuzimati odgovornost te to prepuštaju drugima. Ovaj faktor je nazvan **Sklonost ispitanika da ih neko drugi vodi.**

Tablica 8.

Četvrti faktor okuplja čestice koje po svom sadržaju govore o duhu zajedništva i tolerancije. Osobe koje postižu visoke rezultate na ovom faktoru smatraju da je dobrobit svih članova grupe veoma bitna te da svi unutar organizacije trebaju biti jednako tretirani, da se svatko treba uključiti u rad organizacije i da svatko ima pravo iznijeti svoje mišljenje. Iako ovaj faktor ne oslikavaju čestice koje se odnose na preuzimanje odgovornosti i inicijative, jasno je da je karakteriziran potrebom da se grupa homogenizira i učini sretnom (što djelomično čini poziv lidera) te da se njeguju demokratske vrijednosti. Ovaj faktor je nazvan **Demokratska orijentacija sa elementima liderstva.**

Ova četiri faktora mogu se svrstati u dvije kategorije: jedni karakteriziraju, a drugi ne, liderska svojstva sudionika. Faktori koji karakteriziraju svojstva vođenja (drugi i četvrti), uključuju kako demokratska svojstva s elementima liderstva, tako i liderska svojstva, ali pokretana željom za dominacijom i moći. Stoga je drugi faktor oslikan inicijativom, karizmom i samopouzdanjem, ali i potrebom za dominacijom. Druga grupa faktora (prvi i treći) odlikuje se nedostatkom liderskih karakteristika: Nisko izražene liderske osobine i Sklonost ispitanika da ih netko drugi vodi. Ovdje je zanimljivo to što prvi faktor oblikuje čestice koje su više vezane uz nedostatak samopouzdanja, organizacijskih sposobnosti i želje za uspjehom i odgovornosti; a manje česticama koje eksplicitno oslikavaju ljudsku potrebu da budu vođeni. Kod trećeg faktora je pak eksplicitna želja da se bude vođen, kombinirana s nedostatkom inicijative i strahom od odgovornosti.

Postignuća ispitanika na upitniku za liderstvo i razlike u aritmetičkim sredinama sumativnih rezultata ispitanika

S ciljem provjere hipoteza istraživanja, koje se odnose na to kako ispitanici iz Hrvatske i Srbije samoprocjenjuju svoja liderska svojstva, proveli smo ispitivanje postignuća ispitanika na upitniku za liderstvo. Upitnik sadrži 25 pitanja, a maksimalni rezultat za svako pitanje je 5, te je ukupni rezultat za cijeli upitnik 180.

Postignuće ispitanika iz Srbije na upitniku za liderstvo

Tablica 9.

Postignuće ispitanika iz Hrvatske na upitniku za liderstvo

Tablica 10.

Od mogućih 180 bodova na testu za izraženost liderskih potencijala ispitanici iz Srbije postižu u prosjeku oko 129 bodova, a ispitanici iz Hrvatske nešto više, oko 131,5 bodova.

Razlike u aritmetičkim sredinama sumativnih rezultata na upitniku liderstva između ispitanika iz Srbije i Hrvatske

Statističku značajnost razlike u aritmetičkim sredinama sumativnih rezultata na upitniku liderstva između ispitanika iz Srbije i Hrvatske provjerili smo t-testom za nezavisne uzorke.

Tablica 11.

Dobiveni rezultat pokazuje da je ova razlika na danom uzorku između ispitanika iz Srbije i Hrvatske statistički značajna u korist ispitanika iz Hrvatske (t=-2,096; p=0,037). Zaposlenici u odgojno-obrazovnim ustanovama Hrvatske u odnosu na one iz Srbije bolje samoprocjenjuju prisutnost liderskih vještina i sposobnosti. Na osnovi dobivene informacije **prvu pomoćnu hipotezu** koja glasi: postoji statistički značajna razlika u percepciji posjedovanja liderskih vještina i sposobnosti između zaposlenih u odgojno-obrazovnim institucijama Hrvatske i Srbije **možemo potvrditi**.

Razlike u strukturi i izraženosti liderskih osobina, profesionalnih svojstava i osobina ličnosti kod ispitanika iz srbije i hrvatske

U cilju utvrđivanja razlika kod ispitanika iz Srbije i Hrvatske u pogledu profesionalnih svojstava, liderskih osobina i osobina ličnosti, provedene su tri kanoničke diskriminantne analize. U svim je grupama varijabla bila zemlja iz koje su ispitanici, a skup kvantitativnih varijabli činili su faktorski rezultati na prvim glavnim komponentama subskala BFI, faktorski rezultati na Promax faktorima izdvojenima u prostoru mjerenja Upitnika za procjenu profesionalnih svojstava i faktorski rezultati na Promax faktorima izdvojenima u prostoru mjerenja Upitnika za procjenu liderskih osobina.

Kanonička diskriminantna analiza (skup kvantitativnih varijabli činili su faktorski rezultati na Promax faktorima izdvojenima u prostoru mjerenja Upitnika za procjenu PROFESIONALNIH SVOJSTAVA)

Tablica 12.

Diskriminantna funkcija je statistički značajna na razini p<0,01. Koeficijent kanoničke korelacije Rc=0,830 i ukazuje na visok intenzitet međugrupnih razlika.

Tablica 13.

U sklopu diskriminantne funkcije značajno sudjeluje jedino faktor nazvan *Dobro poznavanje pedagoških i didaktičko-metodičkih načela* na pozitivnom polu, dok je negativni pol funkcije slabo definiran.

Tablica 14.

Na temelju vrijednosti i smjera centroida grupa (Tablica 14) uočavamo da se ispitanici iz Hrvatske nalaze na pozitivnom polu diskriminantne funkcije, dok se ispitanici iz Srbije nalaze na negativnom polu funkcije, odnosno da ispitanici iz

Hrvatske pridaju znatno veće značenje *dobrom poznavanju pedagoških i didaktičko-metodičkih načela* od ispitanika iz Srbije. Na osnovi dobivenih informacija **drugu posebnu hipotezu** koja glasi: postoji statistički značajna razlika na subdimenzijama profesionalnih svojstava između zaposlenih u odgojno-obrazovnim institucijama Hrvatske i Srbije – **možemo potvrditi**.

Kanonička diskriminantna analiza (skup kvantitativnih varijabli činili su faktorski rezultati na Promax faktorima izdvojenima u prostoru mjerenja Upitnika za procjenu LIDERSKIH OSOBINA)

Tablica 15.

Diskriminantna funkcija je statistički značajna na razini p<0,01. Koeficijent kanoničke korelacije Rc=0,374 i ukazuje na umjeren intenzitet međugrupnih razlika.

Tablica 16.

Pozitivni pol diskriminantne funkcije je dobro definiran faktorima *Demokratska orijentacija s elementima liderstva* i *Nisko izražene liderske osobine*, dok je negativni pol funkcije slabije određen faktorom *Sklonost ispitanika da ih neko drugi vodi*.

Tablica 17.

Na temelju vrijednosti i smjera centroida grupa (Tablica 17) uočavamo da ispitanici iz Hrvatske imaju izraženiju *demokratsku orijentaciju s elementima liderstva* i *Nisko izražene liderske osobine*, dok ispitanici iz Srbije pokazuju veću *sklonost da ih netko drugi vodi* od ispitanika iz Hrvatske. Na osnovi dobivenih informacija **treću posebnu hipotezu** koja glasi: postoji statistički značajna razlika na subdimenzijama liderstva između zaposlenih u odgojno-obrazovnim institucijama Hrvatske i Srbije **možemo potvrditi.**

Kanonička diskriminantna analiza (skup kvantitativnih varijabli činili su faktorski rezultati na prvim glavnim komponentama subskala BFI)

Tablica 18.

Diskriminantna funkcija je statistički značajna na razini p<0,05. Koeficijent kanoničke korelacije Rc=0,280 i ukazuje na nizak intenzitet međugrupnih razlika.

Tablica 19.

Pozitivni pol diskriminantne funkcije je definiran dimenzijama *Otvorenost* i *Ekstraverzija*, dok je negativni pol funkcije određen dimenzijama *Neuroticizam* i *Suradljivost*.

Tablica 20.

Na osnovi dobivenih rezultata možemo reći da ispitanici iz Hrvatske pokazuju nešto izraženiji *neuroticizam* i *suradljivost* od ispitanika iz Srbije, dok ispitanici iz Srbije pokazuju nešto izraženiju *otvorenost* i *ekstraverziju* od ispitanika iz Hrvatske. Na osnovi dobivenih rezultata **četvrtu posebnu hipotezu** koja glasi: postoji statistički značajna razlika u izraženosti osobina ličnosti između zaposlenih u odgojno-obrazovnim institucijama Hrvatske i Srbije **možemo potvrditi.**

Zaključak

Na temelju prikazanih rezultata iz četvrtog poglavlja (Tablica 9 i 10) zaključujemo da je opća **hipoteza** istraživanja: pedagoški zaposlenici u odgojno-obrazovnim institucijama Hrvatske i Srbije samoprocjenjuju da posjeduju liderske vještine i sposobnosti - **prihvaćena**. Dalje, rezultati razlika u aritmetičkim sredinama sumativnih rezultata na upitniku liderstva (Tablica 11) pokazali su da postoji statistički značajna razlika između ispitanika iz Srbije i Hrvatske u samoprocjeni liderskih osobina, i to u korist hrvatskih ispitanika, te je **prva pomoćna hipoteza potvrđena.** Ispitanici u Hrvatskoj pokazali su bolje rezultate od ispitanika iz Srbije, liderske osobine reflektiraju u kreativnijem i konstruktivnijem životnom stavu, uvjerenju da su spremniji unaprijediti kvalitetu osobnog i školskog života, pronaći sebe u timskom i zajedničkom radu.

Podatci koje smo dobili analizom razlika u strukturi i izraženosti triju zavisnih varijabli ovog istraživanja kod ispitanika iz Srbije i Hrvatske pokazali su da razlike postoje i da su statistički značajne u sva tri slučaja: ispitanici iz Hrvatske pridaju daleko veće značenje dobrom poznavanju pedagoških i didaktičko-metodičkih načela od ispitanika iz Srbije (Tablica 14). Zatim, dio ispitanika iz Hrvatske pokazuje demokratsku orijentaciju s elementima liderstva za razliku od ispitanika iz Srbije koji samoprocjenjuju da su skloniji da ih netko drugi vodi (Tablica 17). Ispitanici iz Hrvatske pokazuju izraženiji neuroticizam i suradljivost od onih iz Srbije, dok zaposlenici u odgoju i obrazovanju Srbije pokazuju nešto izraženiju otvorenost i ekstraverziju od onih iz Hrvatske (Tablica 20). Stoga su **druga, treća i četvrta posebna hipoteza potvrđene**.

Nesumnjivo da su demokratičnost s elementima liderstva, poznavanje pedagoških i didaktično-metodičkih načela i suradljivost osobine koje su u odgoju i obrazovanju dragocjene i ovim istraživanjem pokazalo se da ispitanici iz Hrvatske ovdje prednjače u odnosu na ispitanike iz Srbije. Sudionici iz Srbije su u ovom istraživanju pokazali nešto veće zanimanje za međuljudske odnose od stručnosti, kao i izraženiju ekstraverziju (u odnosu na kolege iz Hrvatske) što je u logičnoj vezi s međuljudskim odnosima, ali ipak nedovoljno i neusmjereno na način da se iz nje razviju liderska svojstva, već više kao „potreba za vanjskom stimulacijom i dobivanjem pozitivnog feed-back-a" (Čolović i sur., 2005, str. 75). Prerastanju ekstraverzije u liderske karakteristike kod srpskih ispitanika nije pomogla niti otvorenost prema iskustvu, koje je u logičnoj vezi sa inovativnošću i inventivnošću, kao preduvjet liderstva. Istinsko liderstvo

zahtijeva, osim dobrih međuljudskih odnosa (ekstraverzija, karizma, komunikativnost, suradljivost) i stručnost, inicijativu, spremnost za preuzimanje odgovornosti, rješavanje sukoba, demokratičnost i savjesnost. Ispitanici iz Hrvatske su pokazali nešto izraženiju suradljivost, koja je opet u logičkoj vezi kako s međuljudskim odnosima, tako i s demokratskom orijentacijom. Stoga možemo reći da ispitanici iz Hrvatske imaju bitne preduvjete liderstva u obrazovanju, kako u pogledu osobina ličnosti (suradljivost), profesionalnih svojstava (dobro poznavanje pedagoških i didaktičko-metodičkih načela), tako i samih liderskih karakteristika (demokratska orijentacija). Ipak, kod njih je također, pored demokratske orijentacije, nešto manje izražena i prisutnost nisko izraženih liderskih osobina (uslijed nedostatka samopouzdanja i motivacije za uspjehom, kako je gore interpretirano), što možemo tumačiti kao potencijalni utjecaj neuroticizma (emocionalne nesigurnosti, nervoze i osjetljivosti).

Iz svega navedenog možemo zaključiti da zaposlenici u odgoju i obrazovanju Hrvatske trebaju, u pitanju profesionalnih svojstava, njegovati međuljudske odnose; kao i u pitanju liderstva još više unaprijediti liderske osobine. Srbi se, ipak, trebaju orijentirati na profesionalizam i međuljudske odnose te isto tako i značajno unaprijediti liderska svojstva.

Kada su u pitanju razlike između osobina ličnosti između ispitanika iz Srbije i Hrvatske, iako djeluje da ima mnogo sličnosti između ovih naroda, naročito u odnosu na narod s drugih krajeva svijeta, ipak postoje razlike koje su uvjetovane mnogim faktorima, poput različite povijesti i vjeroispovijesti. Nasljeđe koje su ostavili različiti povijesni okviri, posebno utjecaj austrougarske odnosno turske kulture, ogromno je i sigurno da ostavlja trag na osobine ličnosti. Vjeroispovijest, dalje, u velikoj mjeri oblikuje sustave vrijednosti te samim tim utječe i na osobine ličnosti. Ovom radu, ipak, nije zadatak da raspravlja o porijeklu različitosti osobina ličnosti ova dva naroda, koje ima sociološko-kulturološko-psihološke epitete, već da ustanovi različitost u kontekstu liderskih i profesionalnih svojstava.

Bolji rezultati hrvatskih zaposlenika u odgoju i obrazovanju u pitanju profesionalnih i liderskih svojstava u velikoj mjeri duguju prvenstveno boljoj općoj uređenosti hrvatske države, koja je nedavno potvrđena ispunjavanjem svih neophodnih uvjeta za pristupanje Europskoj Uniji. Veći stupanj uređenosti hrvatske države od Srbije može se uočiti na raznim dimenzijama, pa Hrvatska prednjači po konkurentnosti: „pozicija Srbije u rangiranju konkurentnosti, po izvještaju WEF 2010/2011, je na 93 mestu od 139 rangiranih zemalja... u poređenju sa ovim zemljama, Hrvatska je na višem, 77. mestu" (Arsenijević i sur., 2011: 13177); po udjelu visokoobrazovnog stanovništva: „Hrvatska ima 15%, a Srbija 6,5%" (Arsenijević i sur., 2011: 13180); kao i po poziciji s Pisa međunarodne vanjske evaluacije obrazovanja: 2006 godine, Srbija je zauzela 42. a Hrvatska čak 26. mjesto (preuzeto s: http://www.nacional.hr/clanak/40960/pisa-test-mijenja-skolstvo) i viša pozicija hrvatskog odgoja i obrazovanja se nastavlja i u kasnijim Pisa izvještajima (preuzeto s: www.**pisaserbia**.org). Demokratičnost, kao i profesionalizam, su osobine koja se razvijaju, koje se uče - isto je i s liderstvom (Haas,

Tomarkin, 1992). Liderstvo nije rezervirano za određene pojedince, već je mogućnost svakog zaposlenog; prvenstveno predstavlja osobni razvoj i odgovornost (Kouzes, Posner, 2003, str. 90; Haas, Tomarkin, 1992).

Tema kojom smo se bavili nije još istražena u kontekstu međunarodne usporedbe. Autor koji se najviše bavio ovom problematikom i na koga smo se najviše pozivali u kreiranju upitnika i interpretaciji podataka je Stjepan Staničić (2000b, 2002, 2006a, 2006b). Upravo on je na ovim prostorima razradio koncept vođenja odgojno-obrazovne djelatnosti u školi. Bez polazišta ovog autora teško je utvrditi lidersku ulogu, zadatke, strukturu poslova ravnatelja i pedagoga. Uz to, autor je definirao i kompetencije idealnog vođenja kao uporište i viziju empirijskih stremljenja.

Nalazi istraživanja pokazuju da je u odgojno-obrazovnim ustanovama nužno provoditi permanentnu edukaciju zaposlenika kako bi razvili svoje inhibirane sposobnosti. Zaposlenici u prosvjeti zapravo trebaju postati lideri svoje vlastitosti kako bi to poticali i kod drugih, kolega i učenika (Spajić, 2008). S ciljem da svi zaposlenici u prosvjeti razviju svoje potencijale i sposobnosti nužno je provesti opću edukaciju i unaprijediti odgojno-obrazovni proces, pa time i samu državu, kako Hrvatsku, tako i Srbiju (Pastuović, 2006). Ulaganje sredstava u oblikovanje i edukaciju uspješnog lidera u školi, koji će nadahnjivati druge svojim primjerom, stvarati okružje u kojem je ljubav veća od straha, biti iskren, marljiv, otvoren za suradnju, s jasnom vizijom, uvoditi inovacije, poznavati odgojno-obrazovni proces i didaktička načela - višestruko bi se isplatila.

I ako pođemo od *Modela uspješnog vođenja* (Staničić, 2000b, str. 419) u ustanovama odgoja i obrazovanja, koji pretpostavlja osobu koja ima jasnu viziju, trajno se i pozitivno mijenja, uvodi inovacije, zna raditi s ljudima, motivirati ih, uspješno rješavati konflikte koji ometaju ostvarenje školskog programa, iskrena je, puna povjerenja, otvorena za suradnju, marljiva, intenzivno predana radu – posvećena, dobro poznaje načela na kojima je utemeljen odgojno-obrazovni proces u cjelini kao i didaktička načela na kojima se održava nastava kao temelj odgojno-obrazovnog procesa, nameće se nova dilema i pitanje: *Koliko smo udaljeni od tog ideala?*