Characteristics of Participation of Secondary School Students with Respect to Their Education Programme and Academic Achievement

Andrea Ćosić and Ivana Borić
*University of Zagreb, Faculty of Education and Rehabilitation Sciences,
Department of Behavioural Disorders*

Abstract

Student participation in school is considered an important value and part of every school's culture, not only in terms of improvement of school as a community, but also as an opportunity to put into practice civic skills and political literacy. The aim of this paper is to determine if there are differences in certain characteristics of participation in terms of the secondary school education programmes and academic achievement, as well as to determine the level of interaction between these variables and characteristics of participation. The examined characteristics of participation included awareness about the right to participation, readiness to participate, participation satisfaction in school and perception of teacher support for student participation. The research was conducted on a sample consisting of 1,545 students from 20 secondary schools in the Republic of Croatia. The results indicate that students with lower academic achievement tend to be less informed and less ready to participate. They also seem to be dissatisfied with opportunities for participation and perceive a lower level of teacher support for student participation, in comparison with students with very good or excellent academic achievement. It was revealed that students in vocational and art schools perceive a higher level of teacher support for student participation in comparison with students in grammar schools. The results also indicate insufficiently used student's potential for participation. In further efforts to ensure the right to participation, it is important to examine the current methods of student participation

> *and make it more inclusive, especially for students with lower academic achievement, regardless of their education programme. Secondary schools, regardless of the type and duration of the education programme, should create more opportunities for participation of all students, offer various participation activities and promote quality forms of dialogue between teachers and students.*

Keywords: *academic achievement; participation; secondary school.*

Introduction
Definition and importance of student participation

Student participation in school is based on the participation rights of children defined in the Convention on the Rights of the Child (1989), primarily in Article 12 which states that "the children have the right to express their opinions freely on all issues that affect them". Apart from Article 12, participation rights of children include other civil rights, such as the right to free expression (Article 13), the right to choose thoughts, opinions and religion (Article 14), the right to join groups and organizations (Article 15), the right to access to information (Article 17) and the right to protection of privacy (Article 16). Student participation has also been set out in the Primary and Secondary School Education Act (Official Gazette, 87/08, 86/09, 92/10, 105/10-corr., 90/11, 16/12, 86/12, 94/13, 152/14, 7/17 and 68/18) and in the National Strategy for the Rights of the Child in the Republic of Croatia (2022-2026). Article 61 of the Primary and Secondary School Education Act stipulates the rights and obligations of the child, whereby the following rights are important in the context of participation: *the right to be informed about all issues affecting them; the right to have their opinions accepted; the right to submit complaints to the teachers, principal and School Board; the right to participate in the work of the Student Council; the right to suggest and implement school regulations* and *the right to offer suggestions for improvement of the teaching process*. In the National Strategy for the Rights of the Child (2022-2026), student participation in the field of education is pointed out as one of the key areas. It states that students should be included in all the processes in which they can and to which they have a legal right to express their opinions. The best-known formal forms of representative student participation in schools are student councils, the work of which is specified in Article 71 of the above-mentioned Act. However, apart from the formal way of student participation, there are other aspects of this concept, which include various other forms of student participation. Within the context of practice and everyday participation in school, Whitty and Wisby (2007) mention "student voice" and define participation as an opportunity for students to participate in school decision-making process regarding issues affecting them. That implies that students should have an active role in their own education and that school, that is, adults in school, should be more willing to accept students' opinions. Accepting student voice can have at least two benefits: developing responsible citizens and gathering information with the aim of improving schools from the perspective of students, who are as important as and equal to other adults in school.

Student participation in school can be defined as: *obtaining and sharing information; being asked about and consulted on the matters concerning life in the class and school; active participation in making decisions important for students; suggesting and implementing ideas and projects, with support and respect from adults and peers and in line with one's own interests and abilities* (Borić, 2019; p. 47). According to this definition, this paper deals with the following characteristics of student participation: *obtaining and sharing information* (operationalized as being informed about the right to participation and opportunities for students to participate actively), *active participation in making decisions important for students* (operationalized as student participation satisfaction in school), *participation according to one's own interests and abilities* (operationalized as one's own readiness to participate) and *student participation with support and respect from adults* (operationalized as teacher support). The body of research conducted so far, both in Croatia and abroad (regardless of the region or country), supports the importance and significance of student participation, but also mentions the factors which limit student participation (Acar Erdol, 2018; Anderson & Graham, 2016; Gibson, 2006; Griebler & Nowak, 2012; Mannion et al., 2020; Mati et al., 2016; Milić & Marojević, 2014; Mithans et al., 2017; Nwankwo et al., 2015; O'Connor, 2012; Osmak Franjić & Borić, 2019; Pereira et al., 2014; Rönnlund, 2014; Tomić, 2016). Pereira et al. (2014) point out that the idea about an important role students have in making decisions in various fields of education (curricular, organizational and cultural) is not a new one, but it has been frequently neglected in educational policies and practice. These authors believe that accepting student voice is important for ethical, political, epistemological, and socio-educational reasons. Ethical and political reasons imply participation rights guaranteed by the Convention on the Rights of the Child and other laws and regulations, and point out the democratization process in schools, and development of responsible citizens through joint responsibility for life in school. Apart from that, accepting voices from all students in school is also of utmost importance, as it reflects acceptance of differences and inclusion. Epistemological reasons imply understanding the phenomenon of school experience from various perspectives, whereby accepting student voices is a way of recognizing their legitimacy in the process of building knowledge. Socio-educational reasons imply acceptance of perceptions and opinions of children and young people on their school experience and considering these opinions during decision-making process in the education system. That places special importance on socio-educational reasons, as they promote the feeling of belonging to school and personal and social growth of students. The reasons described above make it clear why participation is important for the well-being of students and adults, as well as for introducing changes in the education system and society in general.

Characteristics of student participation in secondary schools

Ensuring student participation is important in every segment of education, starting from pre-school programmes. It gains even greater importance in secondary school, as an element of students' preparation for civic participation. Once they start secondary

school, young people become more mature, want to be autonomous and find it important to contribute to the community. Secondary schools should enable students to participate actively in school life, especially in the decision-making process, taking into consideration developmental characteristics of adolescents. Providing students with opportunities for active participation is also very important for associating participation with positive outcomes. For example, based on the analysis of empirical research on participation, Griebler and Novak (2012) conclude that participation has a positive impact on life skills, self-esteem, social status of students, democratic and civic skills, peer relationships, relationships between students and adults, and school ethos. However, there is a limited body of evidence of positive impact of student participation on academic achievement. Furthermore, research shows that students describe their well-being through their participation rights: they are asked about their opinion, their opinions are considered, they have their rights, and they are respected, which is extremely important for secondary school students (Anderson & Graham, 2016). Expressing opinions and listening to student voices creates well-being and promotes principles of equality, respect, security and values. Students have also pointed out that they feel disrespected in school when their opinions are not heard, valued, or accepted. In that sense, Andreson and Graham (2016) concluded that student participation in school goes beyond formal student representative bodies and that it is associated with students' personal needs and identity. Regardless of the positive impact of participation in school, Cruddas (2001) believes that children and young people have been a silenced or neglected group of education stakeholders throughout history, although they make up the majority. From that perspective, it is interesting to mention ethnographic research on student participation, conducted in secondary schools by Rönnlund (2014). The results revealed that, although students had been frequently invited to participate in the decision-making process at the level of their classes or Student Councils, their participation did not have any real impact and was mostly reduced to consultations. Students were not given the opportunity to participate in a dialogue and negotiations with adults nor to express their opinions and suggestions. In line with these results, Rönnlund (2014) points out three key shortcomings in approaching student participation in schools: (1) a narrow focus of topics/issues on which students are consulted (this is the opinion shared by Huddleston, 2007; Osmak Franjić & Borić, 2019; Yamashita & Davies, 2010); (2) student participation was mainly reduced to isolated and occasional situations, instead of being taken as a regular practice or process; (3) only some students or groups of students were involved in decision making. Research also indicates that a significantly lower number of students, in comparison with teachers, feel encouraged by teachers to take part in discussions. They also feel that teachers are not interested in their opinions and that they are not open to discussion on topics beyond those set in the curriculum (Milić & Marojević, 2014). Research on student participation in secondary schools in Croatia also revealed that secondary school students do not have much experience in participation at a school

level, especially in terms of having a real impact on decision making and changes in school (Borić et al., 2019). In addition, students feel that support from adults in their schools, which is frequently non-existent, is a key factor in increasing the level of student participation. When adults in schools do not value students' opinions, students decide not to participate. This leads to apathy and acceptance of the existing circumstances. Young people in Croatian schools feel that adults do not perceive them as competent, while they themselves perceive that their participation abilities increase as they mature (Borić et al., 2019). While investigating perceptions and experiences of Croatian secondary school students in terms of participation rights, Tomić (2016) noticed that students tend to participate much more in issues such as school trips and physical school refurbishment, while their participation is lower when it comes to class rules, school regulations and pedagogical measures. Students believe that teachers respect the rights of the students, encourage them to think about their achievements and notice and praise their active participation. However, two thirds of students are still not satisfied with their own participation in school.

Examination of characteristics of participation in terms of the education programmes and academic achievement

The results of national research will be presented with regard to differences in characteristics of participation and various types and peculiarities of education programmes in secondary schools. Research on student participation in secondary schools in Croatia revealed that adults (teachers and expert associates) feel that students in grammar schools tend to be more active and easier to work with (Borić et al., 2019). Students in vocational schools are not expected to show a higher level of activity and participation, which indicates a potential discrimination of students based on their type of education programme. Furthermore, Radetić-Paić (2020) examined the characteristics of satisfaction with school environment in students attending vocational schools and those attending grammar schools. The results revealed that vocational school students tend to be more satisfied and more at ease in their school environment, while grammar school students tend to be more focused on studying and their academic competencies. In addition, research has shown that vocational school students, unlike grammar school students, feel that teachers encourage their creativity more, respect them and their opinions, and that the school itself encourages them to think and come up with new ideas. The most recent research on political literacy of senior students (Baketa et al., 2021) shows that the level of political student participation in various social and political activities is relatively low. The majority of students have never participated in any kind of demonstrations, have never boycotted some products and have never engaged in the work of the school volunteer club. A positive counterbalance to the low level of participation in social and political issues is the fact that 60% of students have participated in humanitarian activities and volunteered in the community several times. The differences in attitudes between male and female students, as well

as grammar school students and vocational school students are also pointed out. Female students and grammar school students tend to be more tolerant and have attitudes more in line with the democratic political culture. When it comes to political knowledge, grammar school students have the best average result on the political knowledge test and are followed by vocational school students attending 4-year programmes, and those attending 3-year programmes. The authors state that the same tendency was noticed in research carried out in the school year 2014/2015, which indicates that the type of secondary school programme is still an important factor contributing to political knowledge, the state of being informed and political socialization of young people. In terms of readiness for active participation in school, research conducted in secondary schools in international context indicates that students have a relatively low level of motivation for participation (Acar Erdol, 2018; Nwankwo et al., 2015). The results also show that students were rarely allowed to participate in decision making, but both students and teachers agreed that a greater level of student participation is important for better management of schools (Nwankwo et al., 2015). In addition, the results reveal that student participation in making key decisions pertaining to their education also affects their motivation, the sense of "ownership", involvement in school life and responsibility for the learning process (Mati et al., 2016). It also helps students follow the rules more efficiently, increases their motivation for achieving individual and common goals, and increases their academic achievement. The results also indicate that the majority of students think that their participation in student representative bodies (Student Councils) does not have much influence on decisions made at school and that a significant number of students do not wish to be representatives in the Student Council. Students feel that their role in school is underappreciated, but that it has a positive impact on their personal growth (Pereira et al., 2014). Furthermore, Mannion et al. (2020) investigated the relationship between the right to participation and good academic achievement and well-being in school. It was revealed that the following elements were of key importance in exercising the right to participation: intergenerational dialogue and acceptance, relevant topics, and the possibility to influence decisions. Research has also shown that it is important for students to participate in everyday activities, so the authors are in favour of creating more opportunities for student participation outside the scope of formal student councils. Silva (2001) carried out a study on a sample comprising students from marginalized groups, who did not have good experiences with school and who had low academic achievement. It is interesting to note that these groups of students are motivated to participate by the wish to stand up to the traditional decision-making processes in schools. Therefore, their participation is activist in nature, as they did not wish to participate in formal and ordinary aspects. The author points out that formal (and declarative) ways of student participation are neither attractive nor attainable for these groups of students. The usual efforts invested in recognizing students' rights to participation can only additionally strengthen the hierarchy of power and privileged status of some groups. That is why Flynn and Hayes (2021) argue for ensuring authentic

student voices and pluralization of the forms of student participation, as within student population in schools there are specific, sometimes even neglected groups, such as ethnic and religious minorities, students with disabilities, and those with problem behaviours. Similarly, Perry-Hazan (2021) states that adults are more prone to paying attention to children whose "voices" are articulate and polite, who are better at expressing themselves and who are closer to adults in terms of expressing their opinions and forms of participation. In that way, participation becomes non-inclusive and almost elitist (in formal sense, students with better academic achievement tend to participate more). Rönnlund (2014) discusses the problems associated with inclusion and participation of all students, especially those from vulnerable/marginalized groups. She believes that student participation in schools should be increased and deepened in the sense that it sets more realistic expectations for student participation, placing emphasis on the following questions: what are the issues students can and should influence, and what kind of participation is reasonable and just for all parties involved? In her study, O'Connor (2012) also states that students with emotional and behaviour problems are often deemed "challenging" for the teachers and their education path is very chaotic. They are also frequently excluded from the decision-making process in the formal environment. Students with poorer academic achievement believe that what hinders their participation is a lack of support provided by adults and peers, as well as not being adequately informed about participation opportunities (Jeđud Borić et al., 2018). Various studies also point out a relative uniformity of representative student bodies when compared with children who are not included in these bodies, i.e., a lower level of participation of students from minority groups, which are frequently marginalized as well (Collins et al., Augsberger, 2016; Borić & Osmak Franjić, 2019; Flynn, 2019; Perry-Hazan, 2021). Students from certain vulnerable or minority groups, students with lower academic achievement and students who are not socially successful are frequently excluded from representative student bodies. In that way, two groups are formed: privileged students, who frequently participate, and marginalized students, who are excluded from participation. In line with that, there is a danger that intense activities of children who are already very active in student participation reduce the level of participation of marginalized children. Borić and Osmak Franjić (2019) claim that student participation can have various forms, but in practice, it is normally reduced to one form – participation "by a show of hands", which mostly suits students who are intellectually stronger and whose academic achievement is better.

As is evident in the examples mentioned above, there is a vast body of research on student participation (although not as vast in Croatia as in other countries). Generally, research results indicate that participation in secondary school is low and limited, although it is considered very important for development of young people. Also, it is evident that students with better academic achievement tend to participate more in various activities, while those with lower academic achievement face challenges in exercising their right to participation. It can also be noticed that there are fewer studies focused on the differences in characteristics of student participation in secondary

schools in terms of academic achievement and the type of education programme. It is surprising, as it is frequently pointed out in studies, that academic achievement and the type of education programme are factors which can limit opportunities for participation in school. Therefore, this research is focused on participation of students in secondary schools and differences in terms of the type of education programme and academic achievement, in order to provide a better understanding of the relationship between these factors and some characteristics of exercising the right to participation in school, such as awareness about the right to participation, participation satisfaction, perceived adult support and readiness to participate.

Methodology
The aim of the research

The aim of this research was to examine differences in student participation in secondary schools in terms of their education programme and academic achievement. In line with the research aim, the following research problems and hypotheses were formed:

Hypothesis 1: It is assumed that there will be no statistically significant difference between students in terms of their type of education programme, and there will be no difference in their awareness about the right to participation in terms with regard to their academic achievement.

Examine the differences in students' readiness for active participation in terms of their type of education programme and their academic achievement and determine the significance of that interaction.

Hypothesis 2: Students with very good and excellent academic achievement will exhibit more readiness for active participation than students with poorer academic achievement, regardless of their education programme.

Determine the differences in school participation satisfaction in terms of the type of education programme and academic achievement and examine the significance of that interaction.

Hypothesis 3: It is assumed that there will be no statistically significant difference between students attending various types of secondary schools, by which participation satisfaction will not differ in terms of their academic success.

Determine the differences in perceived teacher support for participation in terms of the type of education programme and academic achievement and examine the significance of that interaction.

Hypothesis 4: It is expected that students with excellent and very good academic achievement will perceive a higher level of teacher support, while students whose academic achievement is lower will perceive a lower level of teacher support for participation, regardless of the education programme attended.

Participants

The research was conducted within the project Participation of children in the education system, carried out by the Office of the Ombudsman for Children of the Republic of Croatia and a team of researchers from the Department of Behavioural Disorders of the Faculty of Education and Rehabilitation Sciences and Department of Pedagogy of the Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences in Zagreb, in the period between February and June 2018. It was a comprehensive type of research in which the mixed-method design was applied, and it involved students from primary and secondary schools, as well as adult stakeholders in the education system (classroom teachers, subject teachers and expert associates). This paper presents the data obtained in quantitative research conducted in secondary schools. The research was carried out in 20 secondary schools across Croatia, on a sample comprising 1,545 students. The sample was convenient, but the researchers made sure that schools from all Croatian counties were included and that they were diverse in terms of size, urban/rural location, and the type of education programme. The sample included state-run secondary schools, founded by the Republic of Croatia or by local/regional authorities. Various types of secondary school education programmes were included: grammar schools, vocational schools and art schools. Grammar schools offer four-year education programmes in which students gain general knowledge and competencies. This creates a quality basis for further education at higher education institutions. Vocational and art schools are secondary schools which offer education programmes lasting from one to five years. They equip students with knowledge and skills necessary for a certain profession or qualification. Upon completion of these schools, students can either enter the labour market or continue their education at higher education institutions. In the sample comprising 1,545 secondary school students, 57.5% were females, 41.7% were males, while 5 participants preferred the term "other" (0.3%). The sample comprised students in the second grade (48.8%) and in the third grade (50.6%) of secondary school. The participants' ages ranged between 15 and 22 years, while the average age was M = 16.75, and dispersion SD = 0.70. In terms of academic achievement and the type of education programme, sample categorization was performed. Categorization of students based on their academic achievement consisted of three categories – those with lower, very good and excellent academic achievement. There was a methodological reason for this. The categorization was performed to obtain approximately equal categories of academic achievement (the sample contained the lowest number of students with insufficient academic achievement, followed by those with sufficient and good academic achievement, and those with very good and excellent achievement). The second reason was the assumption that students in all secondary schools had high academic achievement, so the intention was to test if there were differences between very good and excellent students. The category 'lower academic achievement' included the students who had completed the previous grade with an insufficient, a sufficient or a good grade. The category 'very good academic achievement' included the students

who had completed the previous grade with a very good grade, while the category 'excellent academic achievement' included the students who completed the previous grade with an excellent grade. Categorization of students based on the type of their education programme was performed in the following way: students attending all vocational (three-year, four-year and five-year programmes) and art schools were joined in one category – vocational and art programme (n = 924, 59.8%), while students attending grammar schools make up the second category of the education programme (n = 619, 40.2%). The sample, based on the type of education programme and academic achievement from the previous grade, as well as the total number of participants in certain categories, is presented in Table 1.

Table 1

Sample description in terms of education programme and academic achievement

		Education programme					
		Vocational and art programme		Grammar school programme		Total sample	
		N	%	N	%	N	%
Academic achievement	Low	394	82.4	84	17.6	478	100
	Very good	382	53.7	330	46.3	712	100
	Excellent	140	40.6	205	59,4	345	100
Total sample		916	59.8	619	40.2	1535	100

Legend: N=sample size, % – frequency.

Procedure

The questionnaire was administered in schools, in classes comprising up to 30 students, using the paper-pencil method. The research was carried out in line with the Ethical Code of Research with Children in Croatia (Ajduković & Kolesarić 2003; Ajduković & Kolesarić 2020). Schools had been informed about the research and sent the parents' and children's approval forms. The students had signed their own approval forms before the questionnaire was administered, and the parents had been informed about the research in a letter. Before the questionnaire was administered, students had been informed about the purpose and aim of the research, as well as about their rights regarding participation in the research (voluntary participation, anonymity, the right to withdraw from the research without any consequences). The time planned for filling in the questionnaire was 35 minutes, and students were offered assistance in a form of additional explanations pertaining to certain questions. The questionnaire was administered by the research team members and counsellors from the Office of the Ombudsman for Children.

Research instruments

Within the previously mentioned project, a research instrument was designed – The Children Participation in School Survey. It was created for the purpose of the research,

based on the results of the qualitative part of the research. The factor structure and reliability of certain measurements were tested in a pilot study. The survey consists of various scales and questions relating to the following areas: awareness about the right to participation, formal forms of participation, readiness for active participation, knowledge about the Student Council, the importance of the Student Council, informal forms of participation, incentives for a higher level of active participation, and additional questions which were used to collect sociodemographic data on the participants. The entire survey is available in the publication *Children Participation in School* (Osmak Franjić & Borić, 2019) and is free to use with the authors' approval. For the purpose of this paper, in order to collect data necessary to achieve the set aim and provide answers to the formed research problems and hypotheses, the following parts of the research instrument were used:

Sociodemographic data, which contain general questions about gender, age, education programme and academic achievement in the previous grade. Data on gender and age were collected in a form of answers to open-ended questions. Data on academic achievement were collected in a form of answers to multiple choice questions (students circled numbers: 1 (insufficient), 2 (sufficient), 3 (good), 4 (very good) and 5 (excellent)). Data on education programme were collected as answers to the questions offering grammar school, a four-year vocational school, a three-year vocational school, and art school.

Awareness about the right to participation, which measures how students perceive being informed about their participation rights by the teachers and other adults in school. It is a one-dimensional construct, and the scale contains 7 items. Examples of the items are: "in my school, we learn about the rights of the child"; "in my school, we are informed that children and young people have the right to express their opinions"; "in my school, we are informed about who we can turn to when we have ideas for a project or activities". Students respond to the items using a 5-point scale (1 – never; 5 – always). A higher score indicates a higher level of self-assessment of being informed about active participation in school. The total score on the scale is calculated as the total average result for all items. Internal consistency reliability is high (α=.84).

Readiness for active participation, which is a scale used for assessing students' perceptions of their own readiness for active participation in making important decisions in schools and suggesting projects and activities. It is a one-dimensional construct, and the scale comprises 5 items. Some item examples are: "I wish I could participate in school and class projects and activities"; "I think I have sufficient knowledge and skills to participate in all class and school activities I wish"; "I would like to be my class representative in the Student Council". Students expressed their level of agreement with the items on a 5-point scale (1 – I completely disagree, 5 – I completely agree). A higher score indicates a higher level of readiness for active participation in school. The total result on the scale is calculated as the total average result for all items. Internal consistency reliability is high (α=.77).

School participation satisfaction was examined using a single global measure in which students assessed their satisfaction with participation in school on a 7-point scale (1 – not satisfied at all; 7 – completely satisfied).

Student participation support is a scale which measures students' perceptions of adult support and other students' support for active participation. It consists of two dimensions – teacher support and student support. For the purpose of this research, a part of the scale was applied consisting of 10 questions used to examine student perceptions of teacher support for active participation in school. The examples of items are: "teachers encourage us to express our opinions during the teaching process"; "teachers encourage us to participate in making decisions which affect us"; "adults (teachers, expert associates, the principal) in my school try hard to accept students' proposals". Students assessed the level of their agreement with the items using a 5-point scale (1 – I completely disagree, 5 – I completely agree). A higher score indicates a higher level of perceived support. The total result on the scale is calculated as the total average result for all items. Internal consistency reliability is high (α=.92).

Data processing

In order to achieve the aims of this research, all statistical analyses were performed using the SPSS Statistic for Windows software, Version 21.0. During data processing, the following analyses and methods were also applied: descriptive statistics, the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test, complex variance analysis and a post-hoc test. The Kolmogorov-Smirnov test was used to verify the normality of the results distribution for the examined characteristics of participation in terms of both types of education programmes and categories of academic achievement. This means that for each characteristic of participation (awareness about the right to participation, readiness for participation, teacher support and participation satisfaction) respectively, three Kolmogorov-Smirnov tests were applied to check the normality of distribution of grammar school programme and three Kolmogorov-Smirnov tests to verify the normality of distribution of vocational school programme with regard to three categories of academic achievement (lower, very good and excellent). Distributions for all characteristics of participation, all types of education programmes and all categories of academic achievement are normal (p>0.05). Also, before conducting variance analysis, the variance homogeneity test had been performed, that is, Levene's test, which did not prove to be significant with regard to the examined variables (p>0.05). The values obtained by Levene's test will be presented in the results section. Therefore, in further analysis, the preconditions were created for performing variance analysis. A complex two-way analysis tested the significance of the differences between the independent variables (types of education programmes and academic achievement) and the dependent variables (characteristics of participation), as well as interaction between those two independent variables with regard to dependent variables (previously mentioned characteristics of participation).

A post-hoc test (Scheffe), which was performed later, tested the significance of the differences between three categories of academic achievement (lower, very good and excellent).

Results
Awareness about the right to participation

Within the first research problem it was important to determine the differences in the awareness about the right to participation among students attending various education programmes in terms of their academic achievement, as well as to examine the significance of interaction between the type of education programme and academic achievement in terms of the awareness about the right to participation. The hypothesis was that there would be no statistically significant difference in secondary school students with regard to these variables. It is evident in Table 2 that students' awareness about the right to participation was slightly below the average value, both with regard to the type of education programme and academic achievement. Since Levene's test (F(5.1497)=2.129=0.059) did not prove to be statistically significant, further variance analysis was made possible.

Table 2

Descriptive indicators and complex variance analysis results for the Awareness about the Right to Participation Scale in terms of the education programme and academic achievement

		Descriptive indicators			ANOVA		
		N	M	SD	F	DF	Partial η²
Education programme	Grammar school	609	2.71	0.80	3.369	1.1497	0.002
	Vocational and art school	894	2.74	0.83			
Academic achievement	Lower	467	2.56	0.82	11.110**	2.1497	0.015
	Very good	699	2.77	0.80			
	Excellent	337	2.85	0.81			
Type of education programme *academic achievement					0.978	2.1497	0.001

Legend: N - sample size, M - means, SD - standard deviations, ANOVA - complex variance analysis, F - F ratio, Df - degrees of freedom, Partial η² - partial eta squared.
**=p<.01

The complex variance analysis results presented in Table 2 indicate a statistically significant difference in the awareness about the right to participation in students with different academic achievement, while there is no statistically significant difference in terms of the type of school or interaction between academic achievement and the type of school. A significant effect of academic achievement is small. A subsequent post-hoc

test (Scheffe) revealed that students who, regardless of their education programme, have a lower academic achievement (M=2.56, SD=0.81) tend to have a significantly lower level of awareness about the right to participation in comparison with students with good (M=2.77, SD=0,80; MD=-0.2121, p=0.000) and excellent (M=2.85, SD=0.81; MD=-0.2922, p=0.000) academic achievement.

Readiness for active participation

With regard to the second research problem, we wanted to determine the difference in the readiness for active participation. We predicted differences relating to academic achievement, regardless of the type of education programme, whereby we expected that students with lower academic achievement would be less ready to participate, in comparison with students with very good and excellent academic achievement. In terms of their chosen school, students feel that their level of readiness for active participation in school life is medium. The average result for students in grammar school was M=3.36 (SD=0.82), while that of students in vocational and art schools was M=3.19 (SD=0.88). The average results obtained for readiness for participation were obtained for academic achievement as well. On the Readiness for Active Participation Scale, the students with lower academic achievement had the average result M=3.02 (SD=0.83), the students with very good academic achievement had the average result M=3.27 (SD=0.86), while those with excellent academic achievement had the average result M=3.53 (SD=0.82) (Table 3). As was the case with the previous research problem, Levene's test (F(5.1509)=3.022=0.010) did not prove to be statistically significant, so further variance analysis was made possible.

Table 3

Descriptive indicators and complex variance analysis results for the Readiness for Active Participation Scale with regard to education programme and academic achievement

		Descriptive indicators			ANOVA		
		N	M	SD	F	DF	Partial η²
Education programme	Grammar school	616	3.36	0.82	1.293	1.1509	0.001
	Vocational and art school	899	3.19	0.88			
Academic achievement	Lower	465	3.02	0.83	24.984**	2.1509	0.032
	Very good	708	3.27	0.86			
	Excellent	342	3.53	0.82			
Type of education programme *academic achievement					0.003	2.1509	0.000

Legend: N - sample size, M - means, SD - standard deviations, ANOVA - complex variance analysis, F - F ratio, Df - degrees of freedom, Partial η2 - partial eta squared.
**=p<.01

The complex variance analysis results revealed a significant difference in the readiness for participation in terms of academic achievement, while there is no statistically significant difference in terms of the type of education programme or interaction of education programme and academic achievement. A significant effect of academic achievement small. A subsequent post-hoc test (Scheffe) showed that in terms of academic achievement, the significantly highest level of readiness for active participation in school was determined in students with excellent academic achievement (M=3.53, SD=0.82; MD_{low}=-0.5117, p=0.000; MD_{vg}=0.2596, p=0.000), then in students with very good academic achievement (M=3.27, SD=0.86; MD_{low}=-0.2521, p=0.000; MD_{exc}=-0.25961, p=0.000), followed by the lowest reported readiness for participation in students with lower academic achievement (M=3.02 SD=0.83; MD_{vg}=-0.2521, p=0.000; MD_{exe}=-0.5117, p=0.000).

Satisfaction with participation in school

With regard to student participation satisfaction in school, the hypothesis was that there would be no statistically significant difference in terms of education programme and students' academic achievement. According to the data presented in Table 4, it is evident that students in all education programmes are, on average, satisfied with their participation (both groups, M=3.93, SD_{gra}=1.57, SD_{voc}=1.64). The same is also reported by students in terms of the grades they have, whereby the average value for students with lower academic achievement is M=3.72 (SD=1.63), for those with very good academic achievement it is M=3.98 (SD=1.60), while for students with excellent academic achievement it is M=4.10 (SD=1.56). As Levene's test (F(5.1517)=0.894=0.484) did not prove to be statistically significant, further variance analysis was made possible.

Table 4

Descriptive indicators and complex variance analysis results for the Participation Satisfaction in School Scale with regard to education programme and academic achievement

		Descriptive indicators			ANOVA		
		N	M	SD	F	DF	Partial η²
Education programme	Grammar school	617	3.93	1.57	0.646	1.1517	0.000
	Vocational and art school	906	3.93	1.64			
Academic achievement	Lower	473	3.72	1.63	3.427*	2.1597	0.004
	Very good	708	3.98	1.60			
	Excellent	342	4.10	1.56			
Type of education programme *academic achievement					1.670	2.1597	0.002

Legend: N - sample size, M - means, SD - standard deviations, ANOVA - complex variance analysis, F - F ratio, Df - degrees of freedom, Partial η2 - partial eta squared.
*=p<.05 **=p<.01

The complex variance analysis revealed a significant difference in the level of participation satisfaction in students with different academic achievement, while the differences in terms of the type of education programme, and the interaction between academic achievement and the type of education programme are not statistically significant (Table 4). The significant main effect of academic achievement is low. A subsequent post-hoc test (Scheffe) revealed that the students with the lowest academic achievement (M=3.72, SD=1.63) have reported the lowest level of participation satisfaction in school, in comparison with students with good (M=3.98, SD=1.60; MD=0.2260, p=0.001) and excellent academic achievement (M=4.10, SD=1.56; MD=0.4287, p=0.000).

Teacher support for student participation

Within the scope of the last research problem, we wanted to establish how students perceive the level of teacher support for their active participation. The starting hypothesis was that there would be no statistically significant differences between students in terms of their education programme, but that there would be statistically significant differences in terms of their academic achievement. The average values on the scale are presented in Table 5. Students are moderately satisfied with the level of teacher support, both with regard to the type of their education programme and academic achievement. In terms of these variables, Levene's test (F(5.1396)=1.935=0.086) did not prove to be statistically significant, so further variance analysis was made possible.

Table 5

Descriptive indicators and complex variance analysis results for the Teacher Support for Student Participation Scale with regard to education programme and academic achievement

		Descriptive indicators			ANOVA		
		N	M	SD	F	DF	Partial η^2
Education programme	Grammar school	569	3.02	0.87	29.858**	1.1396	0.021
	Vocational and art school	833	3.23	0.92			
Academic achievement	Lower	427	2.98	0.93	15.632**	2.1396	0.022
	Very good	659	3.17	0.89			
	Excellent	316	3.30	0.88			
Type of education programme *academic achievement					0.205	2.1396	0.000

Legend: N - sample size, M - means, SD - standard deviations, ANOVA - complex variance analysis, F - F ratio, Df - degrees of freedom, Partial η2 - partial eta squared.
**=p<.01

The complex variance analysis (Table 5) showed a statistically significant difference in the perceived teacher support for student participation in terms of education programme and academic achievement, but the interaction between the type of school and academic achievement is not significant. Students in vocational and art schools (M=3.23, SD=0.92) perceive a higher level of teacher support than students in grammar schools (M=3.02, SD=0.87). It is important to note here that these differences (effects) are small. In terms of academic achievement, with a subsequent post-hoc test (Scheffe) it was determined that students with the lowest academic achievement (M=2.98, SD=0.93) tend to perceive a significantly lower level of teacher support for active participation in school in comparison with students with good (M=3.17, SD=0.89; MD=-0.1868, p=0.003) and excellent (M=3.,30, SD=0.88; MD=-0.3103, p=0.000) academic achievement, while there is not statistically significant difference between students with good and excellent academic achievement.

Discussion

In terms of the first examined characteristic of participation, the awareness about the right to participation, the obtained results confirm Hypothesis 1. The results indicate that there is no statistically significant difference in the awareness about the right to participation between grammar school students and vocational school students, in terms of their academic achievement. These results are in line with previously conducted research in Croatia, which also revealed that students in all secondary schools in Croatia need additional information about the right to participation, as well as the ways and opportunities for participation in school (Spajić-Vrkaš & Horvat, 2016). A lower level of students' awareness about their rights also points to potential oversights regarding a range of the children's rights. Apart from the right to participation (Article 12, Convention on the Rights of the Child), the opportunities to exercise the rights from Article 42 of the Convention on the Rights of the Child are also brought into question. This article emphasises the right of the child to be informed about his/her rights and the responsibility of the adults to inform them. It is important to point out a noticeable discrepancy in the awareness about the right to participation between students with lower and higher academic achievement (very good and excellent). Statistically significant differences obtained in terms of academic achievement are in line with previous research which also revealed that students with lower academic achievement feel that they are less familiar with the rights of the child in general (Širanović, 2016; Youniss et al., 2002) and that they are less engaged in formal forms of participation in school, such as the Student Council (Borić & Osmak Franjić, 2019; Collins et al., 2016; Flynn, 2019; Perry-Hazan, 2021). Unless all students have equal opportunities and access to information about their rights, schools can become places which additionally marginalize certain groups of children, and places where children do not have equal opportunities to participate actively and to realize their participation potential (Wood, 2014). A low level of awareness about participation in students with

lower academic achievement is also problematic because it prevents them from exercising their rights; that is, if they are not aware of their rights, they are also prevented from exercising them (Liebel, 2012). Therefore, apart from legal responsibility, schools also have social and moral responsibility to encourage learning and to promote and exercise children's rights for all students equally. Rönnlund (2014) claims that, if we are governed by the social justice principle, it is necessary to create a model of student participation which will help students be continuously informed about and encouraged to participate in the decision-making process at the class and school levels, regarding the issues they themselves perceive as relevant. This kind of participative practice would probably have a positive impact on students' interest in participation and a higher number of students who would choose to participate. The second research problem was focused on examining the differences in readiness for active participation in terms of the type of education programme and the achieved academic success. The hypothesis was formed based on academic achievement, whereby it was expected that students with lower academic achievement would be less ready to participate in comparison with students with very good and excellent academic achievement, regardless of the education programme attended. This hypothesis was confirmed. In the analysis, a statistically significant difference was found only in terms of academic achievement, while there was no statistically significant difference in terms of the education programme or the interaction of the type of education programme and academic achievement. It is important to note here that regarding this research problem as well, the analysis revealed that there is a statistically significant difference between students with lower academic achievement and those with higher academic achievement. The obtained results are in line with the results of the previously conducted research, which showed that in the current education system, students who are more successful tend to be more ready to participate. There are many explanations for that. For example, Rönnlund (2014) explains that students perceive participation of individual students or groups of students in class discussions as reserved for those students whose academic achievement is better and who have better communication skills. Therefore, a lower level of interest in participation in students with lower academic achievement can be associated with insufficiently developed participation skills (Mithans et al., 2017). Regarding the opportunities for participation, Percy-Smith (2010) states that not all students will be ready to participate in the same way, and that it is necessary to develop as many forms of and opportunities for participation as possible. For example, students with lower academic achievement can have wonderful talents and abilities in peer relationships. However, if their knowledge and skills are assessed only through formal grading, the students infer that they are not competent enough, which subsequently leads to a lower level of motivation for expressing opinions and for participation (Percy-Smith, 2010). The level of motivation for participation in students with lower academic achievement can be reduced if they feel that their opinions are not as widely accepted as those of their peers with better academic achievement (Cruddas, 2001; Flynn, 2019; Manefield et al., 2007). A study conducted by Burger (2017) indicates

that if students feel that various groups of children are equally respected in school, they will be more ready to participate and express their opinions. The obtained results relating to a gradual decrease in the motivation level between students with excellent, very good and lower academic achievement can be associated with the results of a longitudinal research conducted by Finn and Zimmer (2012). The authors believe that participation is associated with previous experiences of inclusion, by which a greater level of motivation is found in students with better academic achievement in previous grades of school and who were praised by their teachers for their work and active participation. Fielding (2001) points out that student voice is not unique, as some students or groups of students are more ready to speak and are more encouraged by their environment to do so. However, it makes one wonder whether these representative voices are legitimate enough to speak on the behalf of all students. Therefore, it is necessary to devise the ways of including all children by developing inclusive forms of participation which will include those whose voices are not "articulate and polite". The third research problem was about examining students' satisfaction with participation in school, and the third hypothesis was confirmed. The results revealed no statistically significant difference between students in various types of education programmes in terms of the grades students earn. However, the results indicate that students with lower academic achievement have a significantly lower level of participation satisfaction in comparison with students with very good and excellent academic achievement. Similar results relating to school participation were obtained by Burger (2017), according to whom the assessment of school participation satisfaction in students in higher grades of primary school did not differ between classes, schools or part of the city, but it was significantly associated with the psychosocial characteristics of students. Some of the significant students' psychosocial resources for greater school participation satisfaction were: a better perception of subjective well-being and sense of security, a reliable person in school, and perceived non-discriminatory climate regarding various characteristics of students, such as disabilities, problem behaviour, lower academic achievement, etc. (Burger, 2017). Regarding the difference in results which was detected in terms of academic achievement, Karakuş (2017) also found that students with better academic achievements tend to report a greater level of participation satisfaction, a better perception of democratic school climate and a sense of community in comparison with students with lower academic achievement. Similarly, the research conducted in primary schools in Croatia showed that students attending remedial classes[2] after school tend to participate less in school, they are not encouraged to participate and they have fewer opportunities for participation due to their lower academic achievement (Jeđud Borić et al., 2018). Apart from that, a vast body of research indicates a positive relationship between school participation and better academic achievement (Catalano et al., 2004; González et al., 2021; Malecki & Elliot, 2002).

---

[2] These are the students involved in the half-day programmes carried out in primary schools. One of the enrolment criteria is lower academic success.

The last, fourth research problem examines the extent to which students perceive the level of teacher support for their active participation. The results indicate that the fourth hypothesis is confirmed, but a statistically significant difference in the perception of teacher support for student participation was found in terms of the type of the education programme and academic achievement. In terms of the type of education programme, it was found that students in grammar schools perceive a lower level of teacher support in comparison with students in vocational schools, who perceive a higher level of teacher support for student participation. An explanation of these results can be found in the differences in education programmes and competencies acquired by students in grammar, vocational and art schools. Grammar school programmes are more focused on gaining broad general knowledge, while vocational and art schools are focused on certain professions and qualifications (Baketa et al., 2020). Due to practical work students perform within their education programme and focus on skills development, students can have more opportunities for developing good relationships with teachers. Lee and Smith (2001) believe that students attending schools in which they do not have an opportunity to get to know their teachers better and form mentoring and positive relationships, tend to be less included in and motivated for the education process. Similar has been claimed by Hafen et al. (2011), who stress the importance of the perceived level of student autonomy in promoting participation. Students who reported a higher level of the perceived and encouraged autonomy by the teachers at the beginning of the school year also participated more actively in the teaching process at the end of the school year (they asked questions more frequently, offered information, participated in various activities, etc.). That is why based on the obtained results the questions for further research can be posed – how does a certain type of secondary school education programme promote student autonomy and how does it affect the perceived teacher support for student participation? In addition, Vrcelj et al. (2017) found that grammar school students, in comparison with vocational school students in 3- and 4-year programmes, tend to assess academic achievement based on the faculty enrolment options, that is, based on the dominant economic dimension of academic achievement (Winton, 2013). Therefore, grades are more important for grammar school students, as they have an important role in their plans for the future. They also feel pressure to achieve good academic success, which is likely to leave them less time for school participation. In a qualitative study conducted on a sample of secondary school students it was revealed that the things which interfere with their participation are the overload with subject content and the rigid education programme, as they do not provide students with opportunities, time or energy for meaningful participation (Borić et al., 2019). Free and skill-focused forms of studying, which seem to be more frequent in vocational and art schools, can indirectly lead to a more positive school environment and teacher-student relationship, which are the factors that prove to be very important in promoting school participation (Fatou & Kubizewski, 2018; John-Akinola & Nic-Gabhainn, 2014; Radetić-Paić, 2020; Simmons et al., 2015). A lower level

of the perceived teacher support by students with lower academic achievement points to several key obstacles for implementing student participation, which can be found in recent literature. The first one refers to inclusive participation (Sinclair, 2004), as it seems that only those children who are very active and who have developed social skills, as well as excellent academic achievement, have an opportunity for participation. They are often unjustly deemed representatives of all groups of children (Flynn, 2019; Pavlović, 1998; Perry-Hazan, 2021; Tisdall, 2013; West, 2004). The second obstacle stems from the assumptions that adults have about children; that is, adults frequently underestimate children's competencies and abilities to participate in decision making (Lansdown, 2001). A study conducted in Swedish schools, involving classroom teachers, subject teachers, and parents, revealed that there are differences in the way in which students and teachers describe the relationship between participation and academic achievement, whereby students view participation from the dimension of relationships with adults and peers in school, while teachers associate participation exclusively with better academic achievement and students' activities in school (Niia et al., 2015). In other words, according to the obtained results, a possible explanation for a lower level of the perceived teacher support for students with lower academic achievement is that teachers perceive them as less competent for participation. On the other hand, there is an explanation that students with lower academic achievement perceive themselves as less competent, or they feel they do not have sufficiently developed participation skills (Rönnlund, 2014). For this reason, future studies should explore in more detail the interrelationships between participation and the perceived teacher support, children's perceptions of their own competencies for participation, and the attitudes the teachers have to certain groups of students and their participation skills. As has already been mentioned in previous studies, perception of non-discriminatory school climate regarding various characteristics of children and the presence of a trustworthy adult are positively associated with a greater level of participation and a higher level of the perceived exercise of participation rights in school (Burger, 2017; Cremin et al., 2011; Uziely, 2015). The results of this research are in line with other studies which showed that students who perceive a higher level of teacher support are more likely to participate, unlike the students who perceive a lower level of teacher support (Klem & Conell, 2004; Wang & Eccless, 2012). In addition, the research conducted by Larrivee et al. (1997) on a sample comprising teachers and students in schools revealed that those students working with teachers who encouraged a holistic development of children (academic achievement and socioemotional development) reported a higher level of participation and experience of being appreciated as individuals in their schools. Through research on school participation, a quality and supportive relationship between teachers and students has frequently been pointed out as a key contextual factor in promoting student participation (Kodele, 2017; Larrivee et al., 1997; Mantzicopoulos & Neuharth-Pritchett, 2003; McCormack et al., 2019; Skinner & Pitzer, 2012; Voelkl, 1995; Wang & Eccless, 2012). Providing students with support for participation is of

extreme importance because students who feel they can contribute by expressing their own opinions develop a sense of belonging, commitment, and responsibility for their own school environment (Lansdown, 2001). That is why the obtained results are interesting, as they point to differences both in terms of the type of education programme and academic achievement, whereby we should bear in mind that in terms of all the research hypotheses and results described above the differences (effects) were small.

Conclusion

The results of this research indicate that, in terms of the examined characteristics of student participation in secondary schools, there is the main effect of academic achievement, meaning that lower academic achievement is associated with a lower level of awareness about the right to participation, readiness for participation, participation satisfaction and teacher support. Such results raise an important question regarding the inclusivity (or elitism) of participation. Although the obtained effect differences regarding academic achievement are small, research results show that students with lower academic achievement are less aware of their right to participation and are less ready to participate, and that they perceive a lower level of teacher support in their efforts to participate. These insights should by all means be explored in more detail, especially through discussions with young people. Yet, based on the obtained results it is justified to wonder if participation is a privilege reserved only for some students. Do all students have equal opportunities and encouragement to express their opinions, to be consulted on the matters affecting them, to engage in the work of Student Councils and to participate in decision making? This research indicates that in the actual school practice this is not the case. It is a frequent practice in schools that forms of participation are formal, representative, and uniform, and as such, they do not suit all students. Representative positions in schools are mostly reserved for students with better academic achievement and in the future, this non-inclusive practice should be changed. Furthermore, in terms of the type of education programme, it was revealed that vocational school students perceive a higher level of teacher support for various participation activities in comparison with grammar school students. It is also important to point out that students attending grammar and vocational schools do not differ in any other examined characteristic of participation. In further discussion on the ways of increasing student participation (and, consequently, political literacy and civic participation) it is important to mention that, according to research results, it is necessary to use the potential detected in both types of programmes in secondary schools: the knowledge and content delivered in grammar school and a greater level of teacher support detected in vocational schools. Secondary schools should therefore, regardless of the duration and type of education programme, create more opportunities for student participation, which would also create more space and time for dialogue and development of new relationships which would not be based on authoritarian principles, but on collaboration between teachers and students instead.

The characteristics of participation examined in this research did not show significant interactions in terms of the type of education programme and academic achievement. That is why, based on all the obtained results, it can be concluded that secondary schools in general (even more than primary schools, due to the students' age) should be more focused on promoting and developing student autonomy, responsibility, and participation. Participation is the feature with good emancipatory potential, and it enables a gradual approach and a choice of the manner in and extent to which students wish to participate. Encouraging students to participate and act changes the relationship between students and adults in school and questions the existing power relations. In that way, student participation has a potential to become an integral part of transformative educational practices. In that sense, transformative participation in secondary schools could be reflected in three aspects: *transformation of the persons involved* (skills development, gaining experience, expansion of social contacts, new and changed relationships between children and adults); *transformation as impact* (for example, impact on decision making), and *broader social transformation* (as the result of the first two aspects) (Tisdall, 2013). That is why the aim of this paper is to contribute to and raise new questions about characteristics of student participation in secondary schools, bearing in mind the transformative potential of schools as educational institutions which can lead the way in promoting and enabling inclusion and participation for everyone.

Limitations of the research and guidelines for future research

This paper deals with a topic on which not much research has been conducted, especially in Croatia. It provides initial insight into some characteristics of student participation in secondary schools. In terms of the complexity of research on student participation with regard to the characteristics of participation, the impact of individual and environmental conditions (such as age, gender, surroundings, political and broader social conditions, and differences in understanding the concept of participation, as a process and/or outcome) and in terms of the forms of student participation in schools (Jeđud Borić et al., 2018), the presented research has some methodological limitations and guidelines for future research. The first methodological limitation of this research is that the sample used for data collection is convenient, which means that the data cannot be generalised for the entire population of secondary school students in Croatia. In data analysis, it is important to point out that the sample was heterogenous in terms of regional representation, the type of education programme and school size. The second methodological limitation is related to the instrument itself, that is, its form of self-report approach, which increases the possibility of giving desirable answers. Also, the problem with self-report might also be associated with insufficient knowledge about the topic and the fact that some participants actually thought about student participation for the first time. This could also have influenced the results. The problem of self-report is also associated with retrospective aspect,

meaning that student participation can be influenced by temporary mood, gaps in human memory and other cognitive factors related to the moment of retrospective. The third methodological limitation is associated with the categorization of the sample in terms of academic achievement. In terms of individual academic achievement, the sample categories were not fit for comparison due to uneven representation of particular grades and were categorized into three categories of grades which were fit for mutual comparison. This could have had an impact on the result analysis. In the future, research on participation should examine in more detail the contribution of individual contextual factors (school climate, class size, school size, equipment in the classrooms) important for the types of education programmes and characteristics of participation. Also, it would be important to examine in what way individual education programmes support formal and informal student participation and if there are differences in this respect. Furthermore, it would also be important to examine whether there are differences between students in their readiness for participation with regard to various form of participation in school (for example, formal participation in Student Councils or informal participation in various activities at a class or school level) and academic achievement. In future research, it would also be important to focus on the personal characteristics of students which affect their participation, as well as characteristics of the teachers who support student participation. The potential of this topic in future research lies in the application of participatory research methods, which enable a more active involvement of children during the research process and include the methods which are suitable for children and which respect children's rights and well-being (for example, visual, creative and expressive methods, as well as the usage of digital technologies). Some examples from previously conducted studies (Cruddas, 2001; Gibson, 2006; Hunter & O'Brien, 2018; O'Connor, 2012; Rönnlund, 2014; Silva, 2001) prove the effectiveness of such methods, not only in research, but also in promoting participation in schools.

Acknowledgment

References

Acar Erdol, T. (2018). An Analysis of High School Students' Participation in Decision Making Mechanisms in Terms of Gender. *Education and Science*, 43(196), 151-170. http://dx.doi.org/10.15390/EB.2018.7645

Ajduković, M., & Keresteš, G. (2020). *Etički kodeks istraživanja s djecom* [The Code of Ethic for Research with Children], https://mrosp.gov.hr/UserDocsImages/dokumenti/Socijalna%20plitika/Obitelj%20i%20djeca/Eti%C4%8Dki%20kodeks%20istra%C5%BEivanja%20s%20djecom%20-%20integrirani%20tekst%20s%20prilozima.pdf

Ajduković, M., & Kolesarić, V. (2003). *Etički kodeks istraživanja s djecom* [The Code of Ethic for Research with Children]. https://www.ufzg.unizg.hr/wp-content/uploads/2020/02/Eticki-kodeks-istrazivanja-s-djecom.pdf

Anderson, D. L., & Graham, A. P. (2016). Improving student wellbeing: having a say at school. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement*, 27(3), 348-366. https://doi.org/10.1080/09243453.2015.1084336

Baketa, N., Bovan, K., & Matić Bojić, J. (2021). *Istraživanje političke pismenosti učenika završnih razreda srednjih škola u Republici Hrvatskoj - istraživački izvještaj za 2021. godinu* [Research on the political literacy of final grade high school students in the Republic of Croatia - research report for 2021.]. Institut za društvena istraživanja u Zagrebu. http://idiprints.knjiznica.idi.hr/994/1/Istra%C5%BEivanje%20politi%C4%8Dke%20pismenosti%20u%C4%8Denika%20zavr%C5%A1nih%20razreda%20srednjih%20%C5%A1kola%20u%20Republici%20Hrvatskoj.pdf

Baketa, N., Dedić, Z. R., & Jokić, B. (2020). Jednaki i jednakiji: perspektive ravnatelja o državnoj maturi mogućnostima ostvarivanja visokoškolskih aspiracija učenika strukovnih i gimnazijskih programa u Hrvatskoj [All Are Equal, But Some Are More Equal Than Others: Secondary School Principals' Perspectives on the State Matura Exams and Issues of Equity and Equality of Access to Tertiary Education for Pupils from Grammar Schools and VET in Croatia]. *Revija za sociologiju*, 50(2), 223-251. https://doi.org/10.5613/rzs.50.2.4

Borić, I. (2019). Metodološki okviri istraživanja Participacija djece u sustavu odgoja i obrazovanja [Methodological frameworks of research Children's participation in the education system]. In Osmak Franjić, D., Borić, I. (Eds.), *Participacija djece u školi* (pp. 46-50). Ombudsman for Persons with Disabilities, Republic of Croatia and Faculty of Education and Rehabilitation Sciences, University of Zagreb.

Borić, I., Mirosavljević, A., & Ćosić, A. (2019). Metodologija i rezultati kvalitativnog dijela istraživanja [Methodology and results of the qualitative part of the research]. In Osmak Franjić, D., Borić, I. (Eds.), *Participacija djece u školi (pp*. 50-100). Ombudsman for Persons with Disabilities, Republic of Croatia and Faculty of Education and Rehabilitation Sciences, University of Zagreb.

Borić, I., & Osmak Franjić, D. (2019). Zaključci i preporuke [Conclusion and recomendations]. In Osmak Franjić, D., & Borić, I. (Eds.), *Participacija djece u školi* (pp. 153-158). Ombudsman for Persons with Disabilities, Republic of Croatia and Faculty of Education and Rehabilitation Sciences, University of Zagreb.

Burger, K. (2017). The role of social and psychological resources in children's perceptions of their participation rights. *Children and Youth Services Review, 79*, 139-147. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.childyouth.2017.06.019

Catalano, R. F., Haggerty, K. P., Oesterle, S., Fleming, C. B., & Hawkins, J. D. (2004). The importance of bonding to school for healthy development: Findings from the social development research group. *The Journal of School Health*, 74(7), 252–261. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1746-1561.2004.tb08281.x

Collins, M. E., Augsberger, A., & Gecker, W. (2016). Youth councils in municipal government: Examination of activities, impact and barriers. *Children and Youth Services Review*, 65, 140-147. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.childyouth.2016.04.007

Cremin, H., Mason, C., & Busher, H. (2010). Problematising pupil voice using visual methods: findings from a study of engaged and disaffected pupils in an urban secondary school'.

British Educational Research Journal, *37*(4), 585-603. https://doi.org/10.1080/01411926.2010.482977

Cruddas, L. (2001). Rehearsing for Reality: young women's voices and agendas for change, *FORUM*, 43(2), 62-66. https://doi.org/10.2304/forum.2001.43.2.7

Fatou, N., & Kubiszewski, V. (2018). Are perceived school climate dimensions predictive of students' engagement? *Social Psychology of Education*, 21, 427–446. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11218-017-9422-x

Fielding, M. (2001). Beyond the rhetoric of student voice: New departures or new constraints in the transformation of 21st century schooling?. *Forum for promoting comprehensive education*, 43(2), 100-109. https://doi.org/10.2304/forum.2001.43.2.1

Finn, J. D., & Zimmer, K. S. (2012). Student Engagement: What Is It? Why Does It Matter? In Christenson, S. L., Reschly, A. L., & Wylie, C. (Eds.), *Handbook of Research on Student Engagement. Springer Science+Business Media (pp*. 97.-131.). Springer New York. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4614-2018-7

Flynn, P. (2019). Listening, leadership and learning: Activating voices in the 'Learner Voice Space' framework. *ETBI Educational Journal*, 1(11) 37 – 42. https://www.yumpu.com/en/document/read/62931258/education-and-training-boards- ireland-etbi-journal-of-education-october-2019

Flynn, P., & Hayes, N. (2021). Student Voice in Curriculum Reform: Whose Voices, Who's Listening? In D. Murchan, & K. Johnston (Eds.), *Curriculum Change within Policy and Practice* (pp. 43-59). Palgrave Macmillan, Cham. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-50707-7_3

Gibson, S. (2006). Beyond a 'culture of silence': inclusive education and the liberation of 'voice'. *Disability* & *Society*, 21(4), 315-329. https://doi.org/10.1080/09687590600679956

González, C., Varela, J., Sánchez, P.A., Venegas, & De-Tazanos-Pinto, P. (2021). Students' Participation in School and Its Relationship with Antisocial Behavior, Academic Performance and Adolescent Well-Being. *Child Indicators Research,* 14, 269–282 https://doi.org/10.1007/s12187-020-09761-5

Griebler, U., & Nowak, P. (2012). Effects of student participation in decision making at school. A systematic review and synthesis of empirical research. *Educational Research Review,* 7(1), 38-61. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.edurev.2011.11.001

Hafen, C.A., Allen, J.P., Mikami, A.Y., Gregory, A., Hamre, B., & Pianta, R.C. (2012). The Pivotal Role of Adolescent Autonomy in Secondary School Classrooms. *Journal of Youth Adolescence,* 41, 245–255. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10964-011-9739-2

Huddleston, T. (2007). *From student voice to shared responsibility: Effective practice in democratic school governance in European schools*. Citizenship Foundation. https://rm.coe.int/CoERMPublicCommonSearchServices/DisplayDCTMContent?documentId=09000016802f7046

Hunter, J., & O'Brien, L. (2018). How do high school students create knowledge about improving and changing their school? A student voice co- inquiry using digital technologies. *International Journal of Student Voice,* 3(3), 2-32.

Jeđud Borić, I., Ćosić , A., Mirosavljević, A., & Kranželić, V. (2018). Child participation in schools – practical and methodological challenges. In Blažević I.,Radetić-Paić, I., Benassi, L. (Eds.), *Develomental determinants of preschool and school aged children* (pp. 51-87). Sveučilište Jurja Dobrile u Puli.

John-Akinola, Y. O., & Nic-Gabhainn, S. (2014). Children's participation in school: a cross-sectional study of the relationship between school environments, participation and health and well-being outcomes. *BMC public health*, *14*(1), 1-10. https://doi.org/10.1186/1471-2458-14-964

Karakuş, M. (2017). An Investigation of Students' Perceptions about Democratic School Climate and Sense of Community in School. *Universal Journal of Educational Research, 5(5)*, 787-790. https://doi.org/10.13189/ujer.2017.050511

Klem, A. M., & Connell, J. P. (2004). Relationships matter: Linking teacher support to student engagement and achievement. *Journal of School Health*, 74(7), 262-273. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1746-1561.2004.tb08283.x

Kodele, T. (2017). Participacija učencev v procesu reševanja njihovih učnih težav [Pupils participation in the process of solving their learining difficulties] [Doctoral dissertation, University of Ljubljana] COBISS database. http://pefprints.pef.uni-lj.si/4890/1/doktorska_disertacija_Kodele.pdf

Konvencija o pravima djeteta [Convention on the Rights of the Child], November 20, 1989, https://www.unicef.hr/wp-content/uploads/2017/05/Konvencija_20o_20pravima_20djeteta_full.pdf.pdf

Lansdown, G. (2001). Promoting Children's Participation in Democratic Decision Making. UNICEF Innocenti Research Centre. https://www.unicef-irc.org/publications/pdf/insight6.pdf

Larrivee, B., Semmel, M. I., & Gerber, M. M. (1997). Case studies of six schools varying in effectiveness for students with learning disabilities. *The Elementary School Journal*, 98(1), 27-50.

Lee, V. E., & Smith, J. (2001). *Restructuring high schools for equity and excellence: What works*. Teachers College Press.

Lewis, A. (2010). Silence in the Context of 'Child Voice. *Children & Society*, *24*(1), 14-23. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1099-0860.2008.00200.x

Liebel, M. (2012). *Children's rights from below: Cross-cultural perspectives*. Springer.

Malecki, C., & Elliot, S. (2002). Children's social behaviors as predictors of academic achievement: A longitudinal analysis. *School Psychology Quarterly*, 17(1), 1–23. https://doi.org/10.1521/scpq.17.1.1.19902

Manefield, J., Collins, R., Moore, J., Mahar, S., & Warne, C. (2007). *Students Voice: A historical perspective and new directions*. Department of Education Melbourne. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/265173461_Student_Voice_A_Historical_Perspective_and_New_Directions

Mannion, G., Sowerby, M., & I'Anson, J. (2020). Four arenas of school-based participation: towards a heuristic for children's rights-informed educational practice. *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education*, 43 (1) 30-47. https://doi.org/10.1080/01596306.2020.1795623

Mantzicopoulos, P., & Neuharth-Pritchett, S. (2003). Development and validation of a measure to assess head start children's appraisals of teacher support. *Journal of School Psychology*, 41(6), 431-451. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jsp.2003.08.002

Mati, A., Ciumwari Gatumu, J., & Rugendo Chandi, J. (2016). Students' Involvement in Decision Making and Their Academic Performance in Embu West Sub-County of Kenya. *Universal Journal of Educational Research*, 4(10), 2300-2304. https://doi.org/10.13189/ujer.2016.041008

McCormack, O., O'Flaherty, J. & Liddy, M (2019). Students' views on their participation in publicly managed second level schools In Ireland: The importance of student-teacher relationships. *Educational Studies*, 47(4), 422-437. https://doi.org/10.1080/03055698.2019.1706041

Milić, S., & Marojević, J. (2014). Implementacija koncepta dječjih prava u crnogorskom obrazovnom sustavu [Implementation of the concept of children's rights in the Montenegrin education system]. *Pedagogijska istraživanja*, 11(1), 123-137.

Mithans, M., Ivanuš Grmek, M., & Čagran, B. (2017). Participation in Decision-making in Class: Opportunities and Student Attitudes in Austria and Slovenia. *Center for Educational Policy Studies Journal, 7(4), 165-184.* https://doi.org/10.26529/cepsj.369

Nacionalni plan za prava djece u Republici Hrvatskoj za razdoblje od 2022. do 2026. [National plan for children's rights in the Republic of Croatia for the period from 2022 to 2026.], travanj2022., https://mrosp.gov.hr/UserDocsImages/dokumenti/Socijalna%20politika/Dokumenti/Nacionalni%20plan%20za%20prava%20djece%20u%20Republici%20Hrvatskoj%20za%20razdoblje%20od%202022.%20do%202026.%20godine.pdf

Niia, A., Almqvist, L., Brunnberg, E., & Granlund, M. (2015). Student participation and parental involvement in relation to academic achievement. *Scandinavian Journal of Educational Research,* 59(3), 297-315. https://doi.org/10.1080/00313831.2014.904421

Nwankwo, I. N., Ezenwanne, D.N., Obiako, M., & Okuata, V. (2015). *Students' Participation in Decision Making and its Implications for Educational Leadership* [Paper presentation]. Seventh Annual Education and Development Conference, Bangkok, Thailand.

O'Connor, M. (2012). Pupil voice-exploring the education journeys experienced by pupils labelled with behaviour, emotional and social difficulties (BESD) [Doctoral Dissertation]. Liverpool John Moores University.

Osmak Franjić, D., & Borić, I. (2019). Participacija djece u školi [Participation of children in school activities]. Ombudsman for Persons with Disabilities, Republic of Croatia and Faculty of Education and Rehabilitation Sciences, University of Zagreb. https://dijete.hr/hr/download/participacija-djece-u-skoli/#

Pavlović, Z. (1998). The Influence of Children's Quality Participation on Tension and Violence Reduction: the process of Children's Parliaments in Slovenia. *Bullying in Schools: European teachers' seminar, Council for Cultural Co-operation In-service Training Programme for Educational Staff.* Council of Europe Publishing.

Percy-Smith, P. (2010). Councils, consultations and community: rethinking the spaces for children and young people's participation. *Children's Geographies*, 8(2), 107-122. https://doi.org/10.080/14733281003691368

Pereira, F., Mouraz, A., & Figueiredo, C. (2014). Student Participation in School Life: The "Student Voice" and Mitigated Democracy. *Croatian Journal of Education,* 16(4), 935-975. https://doi.org/10.15516/cje.v16i4.742

Perry-Hazan, L. (2021). Conceptualising conflicts between student participation and other rights and interests. *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education*, 42(2), 184-198. https://doi.org/10.1080/01596306.2019.1599324

Radetić-Paić, M. (2020). Who is more satisfied with the school environment: vocational high school students or gymnasium students? In Gómez Chova, L., López Martínez, A.

,Candel Torres, I. (Ed.) *ICERI2020 Proceedings* (pp. 8530-8535). https://doi.org/10.21125/iceri.2020.1898

Rönnlund, M. (2014). Justice in and Through Education? Student's Participation in Decision-Making. *Journal of Social Science Education, 13(2),* 104-113. https://doi.org/10.2390/jsse-v14-i2-1282

Silva, E. (2001). Sqeaky Wheels and Flat Tires: a case study of students as reform participants. *Forum*, 43(2), 95-99. https://doi.org/10.2304/forum.2001.43.2.15

Simmons, C., Graham, A., & Thomas, N. (2015). Imagining an ideal school for wellbeing: Locating student voice. *Journal of Educational Change*, 16(2), 129-144. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10833-014-9239-8

Sinclair, R. (2004). Participation in Practice: Making it Meaningful, Effective and Sustainable. *Children* & *Society*, 18(2), 106-118. https://doi.org/10.1002/chi.817

Skinner, E. A., & Pitzer, J. R. (2012). Developmental dynamics of student engagement, coping, and everyday resilience. In S. L. Christenson, A. L. Reschly, E. & Wylie (Eds.), *Handbook of research on student engagement* (pp. 21-44). Springer.

Spajić-Vrkaš, V., & Horvat, M. (2016). Participativna demokracija, učenje za aktivno građanstvo i školska kultura [Participatory democracy, learning for active citizenship and school culture]. In Kovačić, M, Horvat, M. (Eds.), *Od podanika do građana: Razvoj građanske kompetencije mladih* (pp.111-151). Institut za društvena istraživanja, GONG.

Širanović, A. (2016). Poštovanje prava djeteta kao pokazatelj kvalitete odnosa učenika i učiteljaF Respect for children's rights as an indicator of the quality of the relationship between students and teachers]. [Doctoral dissertation]. University of Zagreb.

Tisdall, E.K.M. (2013). The transformation of participation? Exploring the potential of "transformative participation" for theory and practice around children and young people's participation'. *Global Studies of Childhood*, 3(2), 183-193. https://doi.org/10.2304/gsch.2013.3.2.183

Tomić, J. (2016). Participacija učenika u srednjim školama [Participation in high schools]. [Master thesis]. University of Zagreb.

Uziely, E. (2015). Implementing the Principle of Child Participation: Pupils Participation in Placement Committees in Israel In Gal, T., Faedi Duramy, B. (Eds.), *International Perspectives and Empirical Findings on Child Participation- From Social Exclusion to Child-Inclusive Policies*(59-87). Oxford University Press.

Voelkl, K. E. (1995). School Warmth, Student Participation, and Achievement. *The Journal of Experimental Education, 63 (2),* 127-138.

Vrcelj, S., Kušić, S., & Cikač, T. (2017). Odnos srednjoškolaca prema školskom uspjehu [High school students perception of school achievement]. *Acta Iadertina*, 14(2), 7-38. https://doi.org/10.15291/ai.1468

Wang, M. T., & Eccles, J. S. (2012). Social support matters: Longitudinal effects of social support on three dimensions of school engagement from middle to high school. *Child development*, 83(3), 877-895. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8624.2012.01745.x

West, A. (2004). Children and Participation: Meaning, Motives and Purpose In Crimmens, D., West, A. (Ed). *Having their say: young people and participation: European experiences*. Russell House, Lyme Regis.

Whitty, G., & Wisby, E. (2007). Whose voice? An exploration of the current policy interest in pupil involvement in school decision-making. *International Studies in Sociology of Education*, 17(3), 303-319. https://doi.org/10.1080/09620210701543957

Winton, S. (2013). How schools define success: The influence of local contexts on the meaning of success in three schools in Ontario, Canada. *Comparative and International Education/ Éducation Comparée et Internationale*, 42(1), 5. https://doi.org/10.5206/cie-eci.v42i1.9222

Wood, B. E. (2014). Participatory capital: Bourdieu and citizenship education in diverse school communities. *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, 35(4), 578-597. https://doi. org/10.1080/01425692.2013.777209

Yamashita, H., & Davies, L. (2010). Students as Professionals- The London Secondary School Councils Action Research Project In Percy-Smith, B., Thomas, N. (Eds.), *A Handbook of Children and Young People's Participation-Perspectives from theory and practice.* (pp. 252-261). Routhledge.

Yonezawa, S., Jones, M., & Joselowsky, F. (2009). Youth engagement in high schools: Developing a multidimensional, critical approach to improving engagement for all students. *Journal of Educational Change*, 10(2-3), 191-209. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10833-009-9106-1

Youniss, J., S. Bales, V. Christmas-Best, M. Diversi, McLaughlin, M., & Silbereisen, R. (2002) Youth civic engagement in the twenty-first century. *Journal of Research on Adolescence,* 12 (1), 121–148. https://doi.org/10.1111/1532-7795.00027

Zakon o odgoju i obrazovanju u osnovnoj i srednjoj školi [Law on Education in Primary and Secondary School] Official Gazette of the Republic of Croatia 87/08, 86/09, 92/10, 105/10, 90/11, 5/12, 16/12, 86/12, 126/12, 94/13, 152/14, 7/17, 68/18), 2020. https://zakon. hr/z/317/Zakon-o-odgoju-i-obrazovanju-u-osnovnoj-i-srednjoj-%C5%A1koli

Andrea Ćosić
University of Zagreb
Faculty of Education and Rehabilitation Sciences
Department of Behavioural Disorders
Borongajska cesta 83f, 10000 Zagreb, Croatia
andrea.cosic@erf.unizg.hr

Ivana Borić
University of Zagreb
Faculty of Education and Rehabilitation Sciences
Department of Behavioural Disorders
Borongajska cesta 83f, 10000 Zagreb, Croatia
ivana.boric@erf.unizg.hr

Obilježja participacije učenika srednjih škola u odnosu na vrstu obrazovnoga programa i školski uspjeh

Sažetak

Participacija učenika u školi prepoznata je kao važna vrijednost i dio kulture svake škole: u smislu poboljšanja škole kao zajednice, ali i kao prilika za vježbanje vještina građanske i političke pismenosti. Cilj je ovoga rada utvrditi postoje li razlike u pojedinim obilježjima participacije s obzirom na vrstu obrazovnih programa srednje škole i školski uspjeh, kao i interakciju tih varijabli i obilježja participacije. Ispitivana obilježja participacije su informiranost o pravu na participaciju, spremnost na participaciju, zadovoljstvo participacijom u školi te percepcija podrške nastavnika učeničkoj participaciji. Istraživanje je provedeno na uzorku od 1535 učenika iz 20 srednjih škola na području Republike Hrvatske. Rezultati pokazuju kako su učenici slabijega školskog uspjeha manje informirani i spremni participirati, nezadovoljniji prilikama za participacijom te doživljavaju manje podrške participaciji koju pružaju nastavnici u usporedbi s učenicima koji postižu vrlo dobar ili odličan uspjeh. Pokazalo se i da učenici strukovnih i umjetničkih škola percipiraju veću razinu podrške nastavnika njihovoj participaciji u odnosu na učenike gimnazijskoga programa. Nalazi istraživanja upućuju na to da je u srednjim školama nedovoljno iskorišten potencijal za participaciju učenika. U daljnjim nastojanjima osiguravanja prava na participaciju, važno je preispitati postojeće načine na koje učenici mogu sudjelovati, pri čemu participacija mora postati inkluzivnija, posebice za učenike slabijega školskog uspjeha, bez obzira koju vrstu obrazovnoga programa pohađaju. Srednje škole, neovisno o vrsti i trajanju programa, trebale bi nuditi više mogućnosti za participaciju svih učenika, otvoriti više mogućnosti za raznovrsne oblike participacije te promovirati kvalitetan dijalog između nastavnika i učenika.

Ključne riječi: *participacija; srednja škola; školski uspjeh.*

Uvod
Određenje i obilježja participacije učenika

Participacija učenika u školi temeljena je na participativnim pravima djece definiranima u Konvenciji o pravima djeteta (1989) i to prvenstveno u članku 12 koji govori kako „dijete ima pravo na slobodno izražavanje svog mišljenja u svim pitanjima koja se na njega odnose". Osim članka 12, participativna prava djece odnose se i na druga građanska prava kao što su pravo na slobodu izražavanja (čl. 13), pravo na slobodu misli, savjesti i vjere (čl. 14), pravo na slobodu udruživanja (čl. 15) i pristup informacijama (čl. 17) te pravo na zaštitu privatnosti (čl. 16). Participacija učenika u Hrvatskoj određena je i u Zakonu o odgoju i obrazovanju u osnovnoj i srednjoj školi (NN, 87/08, 86/09, 92/10, 105/10-ispr., 90/11, 16/12, 86/12, 94/13, 152/14, 7/17 i 68/18) te u Nacionalnom planu za prava djece u Republici Hrvatskoj (2022. - 2026.). Članak 61. Zakona o odgoju i obrazovanju navodi prava i obveze učenika, pri čemu su u kontekstu participacije važna sljedeća prava: *pravo na obaviještenost o svim pitanjima koja se na njega odnose, pravo na uvažavanje njegova mišljenja, pravo na pritužbu koju može predati učiteljima, odnosno nastavnicima, ravnatelju i Školskom odboru, pravo na sudjelovanje u radu Vijeća učenika te u izradi i provedbi kućnoga reda* te *pravo na predlaganje poboljšanja odgojno-obrazovnog procesa i odgojno-obrazovnog rada*. U Nacionalnom planu za prava djece (2022.-2026), participacija učenika u području obrazovanja istaknuta je kao jedno od ključnih područja te navodi kako je učenike potrebno uključivati u sve one procese u kojima mogu te po zakonskoj osnovi imaju pravo izraziti svoje mišljenje. Najpoznatiji formalni oblik predstavničke participacije učenika u školama su vijeća učenika čiji je rad specifičnije određen u članku 71 gore spomenutoga Zakona. No, osim formalnoga oblika participacije učenika, postoje i druga određenja ovoga koncepta koja uključuju i različite druge oblike participiranja. Tako primjerice u kontekstu prakse i svakodnevnice participacije u školi, Whitty i Wisby (2007) govore o „glasu učenika" te participaciju definiraju kao priliku da učenici sudjeluju u onim odlukama na razini škole koje se na njih odnose. To podrazumijeva da učenici imaju aktivnu ulogu u svojem obrazovanju te da škola, odnosno odrasli u školi postanu spremniji prihvaćati mišljenja učenika. Uvažavanje glasa učenika pritom može imati najmanje dvije funkcije: razvoj odgovornih građanina te prikupljanje informacija u svrhu poboljšanja škole iz pozicije učenika koji imaju važnost i punopravni status s drugim odraslima u školi. Participacija učenika u školi može se definirati kao: *dobivanje i dijeljenje informacija, biti pitan/a i konzultiran/a o stvarima koje se tiču života u razredu i školi, aktivno sudjelovanje u odlukama koje su važne za učenike, predlaganje i ostvarivanje ideja i projekata, a sve to uz podršku i poštovanje odraslih i vršnjaka te u skladu s vlastitim interesima i mogućnostima* (Borić, 2019, str. 47). Prema opisanoj definiciji, u ovom radu govori se o sljedećim obilježjima participacije u školi: *dobivanje i dijeljenje informacija* (operacionalizirano kao informiranost o pravu na participaciju i mogućnostima učenika da aktivno sudjeluju), *aktivno sudjelovanje u odlukama koje su važne za učenike* (operacionalizirano kao zadovoljstvo participacijom na razini škole), *sudjelovanje u*

skladu s vlastitim interesima i mogućnostima (operacionalizirano kao vlastita spremnost za uključivanje u participaciju) te *participacija učenika uz podršku i poštovanje odraslih* (operacionalizirano kao podrška nastavnika). Dosadašnja istraživanja, kako domaća tako i inozemna (neovisno o regiji i državi), govore u prilog važnosti i obilježjima participacije učenika, ali i o čimbenicima koji ograničavaju participaciju (Acar Erdol, 2018; Anderson i Graham, 2016; Gibson, 2006; Griebler i Nowak, 2012 Mannion i sur., 2020; Matii sur., 2016; Milić i Marojević, 2014; Mithans i sur., 2017; Nwankwoi sur., 2015; O'Connor, 2012; Osmak Franjić i Borić, 2019; Pereirai sur., 2014; Rönnlund, 2014; Tomić, 2016). Pereira i suradnici (2014) naglašavaju kako ideja o važnoj ulozi učenika u donošenju odluka u različitim područjima obrazovanja (kurikulno, organizacijsko i kulturno) nije nova, no često je zanemarena u obrazovnim politikama i praksama. Navedeni autori smatraju kako je uvažavanje glasa učenika važno iz etičko-političkih, epistemioloških i društveno-obrazovnih razloga. Etičko-politički razlozi odnose na participativna prava zajamčena Konvencijom o pravima djeteta te drugim zakonima i pravilnicima te naglašavaju demokratizaciju škola, izgradnju odgovornoga građanstva kroz suodgovornost za život u školi. Uz to, važno je i uvažavanje glasa svih učenika u školi, odnosno prihvaćanje različitosti i inkluzivnosti. Epistemiološki razlozi odnose se na razumijevanje fenomena školskoga iskustva iz različitih perspektiva pri čemu je uvažavanje „glasova" učenika način priznavanja legitimiteta učenika u procesu izgradnje znanja. Društveno-obrazovni razlozi nalažu uvažavanje percepcije i mišljenja djece i mladih o njihovom školskom iskustvu te uzimanje u obzir tih mišljenja pri donošenju odluka u sustavu obrazovanja. Time su društveno-obrazovni razlozi od posebne važnosti i zbog promicanja osjećaja pripadnosti školi te osobnoga i društvenoga razvoja učenika. Sagledavajući prethodno opisane razloge jasna je važnost participacije za dobrobit učenika i odraslih, kao i za postizanje promjena u obrazovnom sustavu i društvu u cjelini.

Obilježja participacije učenika u srednjim školama

Ostvarivanje participacije učenika važno je u svakom segmentu obrazovanja, već od predškolskih programa, no ono dobiva još veću važnost upravo u srednjoj školi, kao element pripreme učenika za građansku participaciju. U srednjoj školi mladi postaju zreliji, teže autonomnosti te im je važan osjećaj doprinosa zajednici. Srednje škole trebale bi, prateći razvojne osobitosti adolescencije, omogućiti učenicima aktivniju participaciju u životu škole posebno u smislu uključivanja u odlučivanje. Omogućavanje aktivnije participacije učenika posebno je važno zbog povezanosti participacije s raznim pozitivnim ishodima. Primjerice, Griebler i Novak (2012) temeljem analize empirijskih istraživanja o temi participacije, zaključuju kako participacija pozitivno utječe na životne vještine, samopoštovanje, društveni status učenika, demokratske vještine i građanstvo, odnose između učenika i odraslih i školski etos, dok su ograničeni dokazi kada je riječ o pozitivnim učincima na akademska postignuća. Nadalje, istraživanja pokazuju i kako učenici svoju dobrobit, između ostaloga, opisuju i kroz svoja participativna

prava: da ih se pita za mišljenje, da ih se sluša, da imaju svoja prava i da ih se poštuje, što se posebno važnim pokazalo kod učenika srednjih škola (Anderson i Graham, 2016). Izražavanje mišljenja i slušanje glasa učenika utječe na osjećaj dobrobiti kroz poticanje jednakosti, poštovanja, sigurnosti i vrijednosti. Učenici su također istaknuli kako se u situacijama kada se njihovi stavovi ne čuju, ne vrednuju ili ne uvažavaju kod njih stvara osjećaj da ih se u školi ne poštuje. U tom smislu Andreson i Graham (2016) zaključuju kako participacija učenika u školi nadilazi formalna učenička predstavnička tijela te da je povezana i s osobnim potrebama te identitetom učenika. Bez obzira na pozitivne utjecaje participacije u školi, Cruddas (2001) navodi kako su djeca i mladi povijesno zanemarena ili utišana grupa dionika u obrazovnom sustavu, iako zapravo čine većinu. U tom smislu, zanimljivo je etnografsko istraživanje koje je provela Rönnlund (2014) u srednjim školama o temi participacije učenika. Rezultati pokazuju da, iako su učenici bili često pozivani da sudjeluju u odlučivanju na razini razrednih odijela i vijeća učenika, njihova participacija nije imala stvarnoga utjecaja te se uglavnom svodila na konzultacije. Učenici pritom nisu imali mogućnost dijaloga i pregovaranja s odraslima o svojim mišljenjima i prijedlozima. U skladu s navedenim Rönnlund (2014) ističe tri ključna nedostatka u pristupanju participaciji učenika u školama: (1) uzak fokus tema/pitanja o kojima se traži sudjelovanje učenika (slično govore i Huddleston, 2007; Osmak Franjić i Borić, 2019; Yamashita i Davies, 2010), (2) participacija učenika svodila se uglavnom na izolirane i povremene situacije, a ne na uobičajenu praksu i procese i (3) u donošenju odluka sudjelovali su samo pojedini učenici ili određene skupine učenika. Istraživanja također ukazuju kako značajno manje učenika nego nastavnika smatra da ih nastavnici ohrabruju za raspravu, da su zainteresirani za njihovo mišljenje te da su otvoreni za razgovor o temama izvan nastavnoga gradiva (Milić i Marojević, 2014). Istraživanje o participaciji učenika u srednjim školama u Hrvatskoj također je pokazalo kako učenici srednjih škola uglavnom nemaju puno iskustva participiranja na razini škole, posebno kad je riječ o mogućnosti stvarnoga utjecaja na odluke i promjene u školi (Borići sur., 2019). Osim toga, učenici smatraju kako podrška odraslih u školi, koja često izostaje, istovremeno i ključni čimbenik za veću participaciju učenika. Kada odrasli u školi ne uvažavaju mišljenje učenika, to dovodi do odustajanja učenika od participacije te određene apatije i mirenja s postojećim stanjem. Mladima u srednjim školama u Hrvatskoj posebno smeta to što imaju osjećaj da ih odrasli ne doživljavaju kompetentnima, dok oni sami primjećuju kako njihove sposobnosti za participaciju rastu s dobi (Borić i sur., 2019). U istraživanju percepcije i iskustva hrvatskih srednjoškolaca u ostvarivanju participativnih prava Tomić (2016) navodi kako većina učenika više participira u pitanjima kao što su školski izleti i fizičko uređenje škole, a manje u pitanjima koja se tiču razrednih pravila, kućnoga reda i pedagoških mjera. Učenici smatraju kako nastavnici u školi poštuju prava učenika, potiču ih na razmišljanje o vlastitom uspjehu te primjećuju i pohvaljuju njihovo aktivno sudjelovanje, međutim dvije trećine učenika ipak nije zadovoljno vlastitom participacijom u školi.

Istraživanja obilježja participacije u odnosu na vrstu obrazovanja i školski uspjeh

Vezano uz razlike u obilježjima participacije i različite vrstama obrazovnih programa srednjih škola, zbog specifičnosti vrsta obrazovnih programa u Hrvatskoj, bit će prikazana nacionalna istraživanja. Istraživanje o participaciji učenika u srednjim školama u Hrvatskoj, ukazalo je da odrasli (nastavnici i stručni suradnici) govore kako su učenici gimnazijskih programa aktivniji te da je s njima lakše raditi (Borić i sur., 2019). Od učenika u strukovnim programima ne očekuje se veća razina aktivnosti i participacije što ukazuje na potencijalno diskriminiranje učenika u odnosu na vrstu obrazovnoga programa. Nadalje, Radetić-Paić (2020) istraživala je obilježja zadovoljstva školskim okruženjem učenika srednjih strukovnih škola i učenika gimnazije. Rezultati su pokazali kako su učenici srednjih strukovnih škola zadovoljniji i „slobodniji" u svojem školskom okružju, dok su učenici gimnazija više orijentirani na učenje i svoje obrazovne kompetencije. Također, istraživanje pokazuje kako učenici strukovnih škola, za razliku od učenika gimnazija, procjenjuju da nastavnici više potiču njihovu kreativnost, da poštuju njih i njihova mišljenja, kao i da ih škola potiče na razmišljanje i smišljanje novih ideja. Najrecentnije istraživanje o političkoj pismenosti učenika završnih razreda srednjih škola (Baketa i sur., 2021) pokazuje kako je politička participacija učenika u različitim društvenim i političkim aktivnostima relativno niska. Većina učenika nikada nije sudjelovala ni u kojem obliku prosvjeda, nije bojkotirala proizvode te nije sudjelovala u radu školskoga volonterskog kluba. Autori kao pozitivno u odnosu na manjak participacije u društvenim i političkim pitanjima ističu kako je 60% učenika više puta sudjelovalo u humanitarnim akcijama i barem jednom volontiralo u javnim akcijama u zajednici. Ističu se i razlike u stavovima između učenica i učenika te učenika gimnazija u odnosu na učenike strukovnih programa, pri čemu učenice i gimnazijalci iskazuju tolerantnije stavove i stavove koji su više u skladu s demokratskom političkom kulturom. U odnosu na političko znanje, gimnazijalci imaju u prosjeku najveći rezultat na testu političkoga znanja, a slijede ih učenici četverogodišnjih strukovnih programa te, na kraju, učenici trogodišnjih strukovnih programa. Autori navode kako je ista tendencija primijećena i u istraživanju u 2014./2015. što pokazuje kako je vrsta srednjoškolskoga programa i dalje važan čimbenik za političko znanje i informiranost te političku socijalizaciju mladih. U odnosu na spremnost na aktivnu participaciju u školi, istraživanja provedena u srednjim školama u međunarodnom kontekstu ukazuju na to da su učenici relativno nisko motivirani za participaciju (Acar Erdol, 2018; Nwankwo i sur., 2015). Rezultati posebno upućuju na to kako je učenicima bilo rijetko dopušteno sudjelovati u donošenju odluka, no i učenici i nastavnici složili su se kako je veća participacija učenika važna za kvalitetnije vođenje škola (Nwankwo i sur., 2015). Rezultati istraživanja također pokazuju kako sudjelovanje učenika u donošenju ključnih odluka u procesu njihova obrazovanja utječe na njihovu motivaciju, osjećaj „vlasništva"/ uključenosti u život škole te odgovornosti za proces

učenja (Mati i sur., 2016). Time se postiže i veće poštivanje pravila, veća motivacija za postizanje individualnih i zajedničkih ciljeva, kao i bolji akademski uspjeh. Istraživanja su također ukazala kako većina učenika misli kako njihovo sudjelovanje u formalnim učeničkim predstavničkim tijelima (vijećima učenika) ima mali utjecaj na odluke u školi te da značajan dio učenika ne želi ponovno biti predstavnik u vijeću učenika. Učenici smatraju da se njihova uloga u školi ne cijeni dovoljno, ali da ona pozitivno utječe na njihov osobni razvoj (Pereira i sur., 2014). Nadalje, Mannion i suradnici (2020) istraživali su povezanost participativnih prava s dobrim školskim uspjehom i dobrim osjećajem boravljenja u školi. Pokazalo se kako su za ostvarivanje participativnih prava ključni sljedeći elementi: međugeneracijski dijalog i uvažavanje, relevantnost tema te mogućnost utjecaja na odlučivanje. Također, istraživanje je pokazalo kako je učenicima važno sudjelovanje u svakodnevnim stvarima te se u tom smislu autori zalažu za proširivanje mogućnosti za participaciju učenika, izvan konteksta formalnih učeničkih vijeća. Silva (2001) je provela istraživanje s učenicima iz marginaliziranih skupina koji nisu imali dobra iskustva sa školom i uglavnom loš školski uspjeh. Zanimljivo je da ove skupine učenika na participaciju motivira želja da se usprotive tradicionalnim procesima odlučivanja u školama, odnosno njihova je participacija bila u većoj mjeri aktivistička, a mnogo manje su željeli participirati u formalnim i uobičajenim aspektima. Autorica pritom upozorava kako formalni (i deklarativni) načini ostvarivanja učeničke participacije ovim skupinama učenika nisu ni privlačni, ni dostižni. Uobičajeni napori za uvažavanjem participativnih prava učenika mogu samo dodatno pojačati hijerarhiju moći i privilegiranost nekih skupina. Stoga se Flynn i Hayes (2021) zalažu za osiguravanje autentičnosti glasa učenika i pluralizaciju oblika učeničke participacije jer unutar populacije učenika u nekoj školi postoje i specifične, ponekad zanemarene skupine, kao što su učenici pripadnici etničkih i vjerskih manjina, učenici s teškoćama u razvoju i učenici s problemima u ponašanju. U tom smislu Perry-Hazan (2021) upozorava kako odrasli mogu biti skloniji obraćati više pažnje na onu djecu čiji je „glas" artikuliran i pristojan, koja se bolje izražavaju i više odgovaraju okvirima izražavanja mišljenja i formama sudjelovanja primjerenima odraslima. Pritom participacija postaje neinkluzivna i skoro elitna (u formalnom smislu više participiraju učenici s boljim školskim uspjehom). Autorica Rönnlund (2014) problematizira uključivanje i participaciju svih učenika, posebno onih iz tzv. ranjivih/ marginaliziranih skupina te smatra kako se participacija učenika u školama treba proširiti i produbiti u smislu postavljanja realističnijih očekivanja od učeničke participacije, stavljajući u fokus pitanja poput: na koja pitanja učenici mogu i trebaju utjecati te koja je vrsta sudjelovanja razumna i pravedna za sve uključene? O'Connor (2012) u svojem istraživanju također ukazuje na to kako se učenici s emocionalnim i ponašajnim problemima često smatraju „izazovnima" za nastavnike te je njihov obrazovni put često kaotičan, dok je u formalnom okružju škole ova skupina učenika često isključena iz odlučivanja. Učenici koji ostvaruju slabiji školski uspjeh, kao prepreku

vlastitom sudjelovanju posebno ističu nedostatak podrške odraslih i vršnjaka te nisku informiranost o mogućnostima sudjelovanja (Jeđud Borić i sur., 2018). Istraživanja ukazuju i na relativnu uniformnost dječjih predstavničkih tijela u odnosu na djecu koja su u njih uključena, odnosno na manje sudjelovanje djece iz različitih manjinskih grupa koje su često i marginalizirane (Collins i sur., 2016; Borić i Osmak Franjić, 2019; Flynn, 2019; Perry-Hazan, 2021). Učenici koji pripadaju određenim ranjivim skupinama (ili manjinskim zajednicama), učenici koji su manje akademski ili društveno uspješni, često nisu uključeni u učenička predstavnička tijela. Na taj način, formiraju se dvije (uvjetno rečeno) skupine: privilegirana skupina u kojoj često sudjeluju i marginalizirani učenici koji su isključeni iz participativnih aktivnosti. Shodno tome postoji i opasnost da upravo pojačane aktivnosti već afirmirane djece dodatno umanjuju participaciju djece koja su marginalizirana. Tako Borić i Osmak Franjić (2019) upozoravaju kako participacija učenika može imati različite oblike, no u praksi je uglavnom svedena na jedan oblik - participacija „*putem dizanja ruke*" koja pogoduje onima koji su intelektualno jači te imaju bolji školski uspjeh.

Kao što je vidljivo iz prethodnih navoda, postoji niz istraživanja o temi participacije učenika (iako manje na području Hrvatske nego u drugim zemljama). Na generalnoj razini, rezultati istraživanja ukazuju na to da je participacija u srednjim školama niska i ograničena, iako se ističe da je od posebne važnosti za razvoj mladih. Isto tako, primjetno je da učenici koji ostvaruju bolji školski uspjeh, više sudjeluju u participacijskim aktivnostima, dok oni sa slabijim školskim uspjehom nailaze na određene prepreke u ostvarivanju prava na participaciju. Primjetno je da su rjeđa istraživanja koja u fokusu imaju razlike u pojedinim obilježjima participacije učenika srednjih škola u odnosu na školski uspjeh i na vrstu obrazovnoga programa. Navedeno iznenađuje jer se u istraživanjima često ističu upravo školski uspjeh i vrsta obrazovnoga programa kao čimbenici koji djeluju ograničavajuće na mogućnosti ostvarivanja participacije u školi. Stoga je istraživački cilj ovoga rada usmjeren na participaciju učenika srednjih škola te razlike u odnosu na vrstu obrazovnoga programa i školskog uspjeha kako bi se bolje razumjeli odnosi ovih čimbenika i nekih obilježja ostvarivanja prava na participaciju u školi kao što su informiranost, zadovoljstvo participacijom, percipirana podrška odraslih i spremnost na participaciju.

Metodologija
Cilj istraživanja

Cilj je ovoga istraživanja ispitati razlike u participaciji učenika srednjih škola u odnosu na vrstu obrazovnoga programa koji pohađaju i školski uspjeh koji ostvaruju. U skladu s ciljem, postavljeni su sljedeći istraživački problemi i hipoteze:

Hipoteza 1: Pretpostavlja se kako neće biti statistički značajne razlike između učenika s obzirom na vrstu obrazovnoga programa koji pohađaju, pri čemu se informiranost o pravu na participaciju neće razlikovati ni s obzirom na ocjenu koju učenici ostvaruju.

Ispitati razlike u spremnosti na aktivnu participaciju s obzirom na vrstu srednjoškolskoga obrazovnog programa i ostvareni školski uspjeh te ispitati značajnost interakcije.

Hipoteza 2: Učenici vrlo dobroga i odličnoga uspjeha bit će spremniji na aktivnu participaciju od učenika slabijega školskog uspjeha bez obzira na vrstu obrazovnoga programa koji pohađaju.

Utvrditi razlike u zadovoljstvu participacijom u školi s obzirom na vrstu srednjoškolskoga obrazovnog programa i ostvareni školski uspjeh te ispitati značajnost interakcije.

Hipoteza 3: Pretpostavlja se kako neće biti statistički značajne razlike između učenika koji pohađaju različite vrste srednjoškolskih programa, pri čemu se to zadovoljstvo participacijom neće razlikovati s obzirom na ocjenu koju učenici ostvaruju.

Utvrditi razlike u percepciji podrške nastavnika participaciji s obzirom na vrstu srednjoškolskoga obrazovnog programa i ostvareni školski uspjeh te ispitati značajnost interakcije.

Hipoteza 4: Očekuje se kako će učenici odličnoga i vrlo dobroga uspjeha percipirati veću podršku nastavnika, dok će učenici slabijega školskog uspjeha percipirati manju podršku nastavnika participaciji bez obzira na vrstu obrazovnoga programa koji pohađaju.

Sudionici

Istraživanje je provedeno u okviru projekta „Participacija djece u sustavu odgoja i obrazovanja", u suradnji Ureda pravobraniteljice za djecu Republike Hrvatske te tima istraživačica s Odsjeka za poremećaje u ponašanju Edukacijsko-rehabilitacijskog fakulteta i Odsjeka za pedagogiju Filozofskog fakulteta Sveučilišta u Zagrebu od veljače do lipnja 2018. godine. Radi se o sveobuhvatnom istraživanju pri čemu je primijenjen mješoviti istraživački pristup, a sudjelovali su učenici osnovnih i srednjih škola te odrasli dionici školskoga sustava (učitelji, predmetni nastavnici i stručni suradnici). U ovom radu prikazuju se podatci dobiveni kvantitativnim istraživanjem u srednjim školama. Istraživanje je provedeno u 20 srednjih škola diljem Hrvatske, na uzorku od 1535 učenika. Uzorak je prigodan, no vodilo se računa o regionalnoj zastupljenosti svih županija u Republici Hrvatskoj i različitosti škola po veličini, urbanom i/ili ruralnom lokalitetu te vrsti srednjoškolskoga obrazovnog programa. U uzorku su bile uključene državne srednje škole čiji je osnivač Republika Hrvatska ili jedinica lokalne i područne samouprave. Pri tome, bile su uključene različite vrste srednjoškolskih obrazovnih programa: gimnazije, strukovne škole i umjetničke škole. Gimnazije su četverogodišnji obrazovni programi u kojima učenici stječu kompetencije iz općega znanja čime stvaraju kvalitetnu osnovu za nastavak obrazovanja na visokoškolskim ustanovama; strukovne i umjetničke škole su srednjoškolski obrazovni programi koji mogu trajati od jedne do pet godina i osposobljavaju učenike za određeno zanimanje ili kvalifikaciju, pri čemu se učenik po završetku školovanja može uključiti na tržište rada ili nastaviti obrazovanje na visokoškolskim ustanovama. U uzorku

od 1535 učenika srednjih škola, 57,5 % čine djevojke i 41,7 % čine mladići, s tim da se 5 sudionika izjasnilo kao „ostalo" (0,3 %). Uzorak čine učenici drugih (48,8 %) i trećih razreda (50,6 %.). Dob sudionika kreće se u rasponu od 15 do 22 godine, pri čemu je prosječna dob M = 16,75, a raspršenje SD = 0,70. U odnosu na školski uspjeh i vrstu obrazovnoga programa, napravljena je kategorizacija uzorka. Kategorizacija učenika po školskom uspjehu napravljena je u odnosu na slabiji, vrlo dobar i odličan školski uspjeh. Razlog ovakve kategorizacije je metodološki, a u tom smislu podjela je napravljena kako bi se dobile podjednake kategorije školskoga uspjeha (u uzorku je najmanje bilo nedovoljnih, dovoljnih i dobrih pa vrlo dobrih te odličnih učenika). Drugi razlog je pretpostavka da su većinom u svim srednjim školama ocjene visoke pa je namjera bila provjeriti postoje li razlike između vrlo dobrih i odličnih učenika. U slabiji školski uspjeh grupirani su učenici koji su prethodni razred završili s ocjenom nedovoljan, dovoljan i dobar. U kategoriju vrlo dobar uspjeh učenici s ocjenom vrlo dobar, a u kategoriju odličan uspjeh oni s ocjenom odličan. Kategorizacija učenika po vrsti obrazovnoga programa napravljena je tako da su učenici svi strukovnih (trogodišnjih, četverogodišnjih, petogodišnjih programa) i umjetničkih škola spojeni u jednu kategoriju naziva strukovni i umjetnički program (n = 916, 59,8 %), a učenici gimnazijskoga programa činli su drugu kategoriju obrazovnoga programa (n = 619, 40,2 %). Uzorak u odnosu na vrstu obrazovnoga programa i ostvareni školski uspjeh u prethodnom razredu, kao i ukupan broj sudionika u određenim kategorijama prikazan je u Tablici 1.

Tablica 1

Procedura

Primjena upitnika provedena je u školama, u razredima do 30 učenika, metodom papir-olovka. Istraživanje je provedeno u skladu s Etičkim kodeksom istraživanja s djecom (Ajduković i Kolesarić 2003; Ajduković i Kolesarić 2020) te je školama unaprijed poslana informacija o istraživanju i suglasnosti za učenike i roditelje. Učenici su za svoje sudjelovanje u istraživanju davali osobnu suglasnost prije početka primjene upitnika, a roditelji su o istraživanju informirani putem pisma. Prije početka primjene učenici su bili upoznati sa svrhom i ciljevima istraživanja te svojim pravima vezanim uz sudjelovanje u istraživanju (dobrovoljnost, anonimnost, pravo na odustajanje bez posljedica). Predviđeno vrijeme za ispunjavanje upitnika bilo je 35 minuta, a učenicima je ponuđena pomoć u smislu dodatnoga pojašnjenja pojedinih pitanja. Primjenu upitnika provele su članice istraživačkoga tima i savjetnice iz Ureda pravobraniteljice za djecu.

Mjerni instrumenti

U okviru prethodno navedenoga projekta izrađen je instrument „Upitnik o participaciji djece u školi". Konstruiran je za potrebe istraživanja, na osnovi rezultata kvalitativnoga dijela istraživanja. Faktorska struktura i pouzdanost pojedinih mjera provjerene su pokusnim istraživanjem. Upitnik se sastoji od različitih skala i pitanja vezanih uz

područja: informiranost o pravu na participaciju, formalni oblici participacije, spremnost na aktivnu participaciju, znanja o vijeću učenika, važnost vijeća učenika, neformalni oblici participacije, podrška učeničkoj participaciji, zadovoljstvo sudjelovanjem u razredu i školi, pripadnost školi, poticaji na veći stupanj aktivne participacije te dodatna pitanja kojima su prikupljeni sociodemografski podatci o sudionicima. Cjeloviti upitnik dostupan je u publikaciji „Participacija djece u školi" (Osmak Franjić i Borić, 2019) i slobodan za korištenje uz suglasnost autora. Za potrebe ovoga rada, kako bi se dobili podatci potrebni za ostvarivanje cilja i odgovorilo na postavljene istraživačke probleme i hipoteze, od cjelovitoga instrumenta uzeto je u obzir sljedeće:

Sociodemografski podatci koji sadrže opća pitanja o rodu, dobi, vrsti obrazovnoga programa i školskom uspjehu prethodno završenoga razreda. Podatci o rodu i dobi učenici su iznosili u obliku otvorenoga odgovora. Podatak o školskom uspjehu prethodno završenoga razreda iznosio se zaokruživanjem cijeloga broja (1 (nedovoljan), 2 (dovoljan), 3 (dobar), 4 (vrlo dobar) i 5 (odličan). U odnosu na vrstu obrazovnoga programa, ponuđeni odgovori obuhvaćali su gimnaziju, četverogodišnju strukovnu školu, trogodišnju strukovnu školu i umjetničku školu.

Informiranost o pravu na participaciju, skala mjeri percepciju učenika u odnosu na to koliko ih često nastavnici i drugi odrasli u školi informiraju o njihovim participativnim pravima. Radi se o jednodimenzionalnom konstruktu, a skala se sastoji od 7 tvrdnji. Primjeri tvrdnji su: *u mojoj školi učimo o pravima djeteta; u mojoj školi daju nam do znanja da djeca i mladi imaju pravo izraziti svoje mišljenje; u mojoj školi informiraju nas o tome kome da se obratimo kad imamo ideju za neki projekt ili akciju.* Učenici na tvrdnje odgovaraju na skali od 5 stupnjeva (1 – nikad; 5 – uvijek). Viši rezultat pokazuje viši stupanj samoprocjene informiranosti o pravu na aktivnu participaciju u školi. Ukupni rezultat na skali dobiva se kao ukupni prosječni rezultat na svim tvrdnjama. Pouzdanost tipa unutarnje konzistencije je visoka (α = .84).

Spremnost na aktivnu participaciju, skala je koja se koristi za procjenu percepcije učenika o njihovoj spremnosti za aktivno sudjelovanje u donošenju važnih odluka u školi i predlaganje projekata i aktivnosti. Radi se o jednodimenzionalnom konstruktu, a skala se sastoji se od 5 tvrdnji. Primjeri tvrdnje su: *volio bih sudjelovati u školskim i razrednim projektima i akcijama; mislim da imam dovoljno znanja i vještina da mogu sudjelovati u svim aktivnostima u razredu i školi u kojima želim; želio bih biti predstavnik mog razreda u vijeću učenika.* Stupanj slaganja s tvrdnjom učenici izražavaju na skali od 5 stupnjeva (1 - uopće se ne slažem; 5 - u potpunosti se slažem).Viši rezultat pokazatelj je višega stupnja spremnosti na aktivnu participaciju u školi. Ukupni rezultat na skali dobiva se kao ukupni prosječni rezultat na svim tvrdnjama. Pouzdanost tipa unutarnje konzistencije je visoka (α = .77).

Zadovoljstvo participacijom u školi ispitano je jednom globalnom mjerom gdje su učenici na skali od 7 stupnjeva procjenjivali zadovoljstvo participacijom u školi (1 - uopće nisam zadovoljan; 7 - zadovoljan sam u potpunosti).

5. *Podrška učeničkoj participaciji,* skala je koja mjeri percepciju učenika o tome koliko smatraju da odrasli i drugi učenici podržavaju aktivnu participaciju. Sastoji se od dvije dimenzije, podrške nastavnika i podrške učenika. Za potrebe ovoga rada korišten je isključivo dio skale od 10 pitanja kojima se ispituje percepcija učenika o nastavničkoj podršci za aktivnu participaciju u školi. Primjeri tvrdnji su: *nastavnici nas potiču da na nastavi izražavamo vlastito mišljenje; nastavnici nas potiču da sudjelujemo u donošenju odluka koje nas se tiču; odrasli u mojoj školi (nastavnici, stručni suradnici, ravnatelj) trude se uvažiti prijedloge učenika*. Učenici izražavaju svoje procjene stupnja slaganja na skali od 5 stupnjeva (1 - uopće se ne slažem; 5 - u potpunosti se slažem). Viši rezultat pokazatelj je višega stupnja percipirane podrške. Ukupni rezultat na skali dobiva se kao ukupni prosječni rezultat na svim tvrdnjama. Pouzdanost tipa unutarnje konzistencije je visoka (α = .92).

Obrada podataka

U svrhu ostvarivanja ciljeva ovoga istraživanja sve statističke analize dobivene su korištenjem programa SPSS Statistics for Windows, Version 21.0. Tijekom analize podataka korištene su sljedeće analize i metode: deskriptivna statistika, Kolmogorov-Smirnovljev test, složena analiza varijance i post hoc test. Primjenom Kolmogorov-Smirnovljev testa provjerena je normalnost distribucije rezultata za ispitivana obilježja participacije u odnosu na obje vrste obrazovnoga programa i kategorije školskoga uspjeha. Navedeno znači da su u odnosu na svako obilježje participacije (informiranost, spremnost na participaciju, podrška nastavnika i zadovoljstvo participacijom) pojedinačno primijenjena tri Kolmogorov-Smirnovljev testa za provjeru normalnosti distribucije gimnazijskoga programa i tri Kolmogorov-Smirnovljev testa za provjeru normalnosti strukovne vrste programa u odnosu na tri kategorije školskoga uspjeha (slabiji, vrlo dobar i odličan). Distribucije za sva obilježja participacije i sve vrste programa i kategorije školskoga uspjeha je normalna (p > 0,05). Također, prije provedbe analize varijance proveden je i test homogenosti varijance, odnosno Levenov test, koji se nije pokazao značajnim u odnosu na ispitane varijable (p > 0,05). Vrijednosti Levenova testa bit će navedene u rezultatima. Time su u daljnjoj analizi stvoreni preduvjeti za primjenu analize varijance. Složenom dvosmjernom analizom provjerena je značajnost razlika između nezavisnih varijabli (vrste obrazovnoga programa i školskoga uspjeha) u odnosu na zavisne varijable (obilježja participacije) te interakcija tih dviju nezavisnih varijabli u odnosu na zavisne varijable (prethodno navedena obilježja participacije). Naknadnim post hoc testom (Scheffe) provjerena je značajnost razlika između tri kategorije školskoga uspjeha (slabiji, vrlo dobar i odličan školski uspjeh).

Rezultati
Informiranost o pravu na participaciju

Prvi istraživački problem bio je utvrditi razlike u informiranosti o pravu na participaciju učenika koji pohađaju različite obrazovne programe s obzirom na školski uspjeh koji

ostvaruju te ispitati značajnost interakcije vrste obrazovnoga programa i školskoga uspjeh u odnosu na informiranost o pravu na participaciju. Hipoteza je bila kako neće biti statistički značajne razlike kod srednjoškolaca u odnosu na ove varijable. Iz Tablice 2 vidljivo je kako su učenici i u odnosu na vrstu obrazovnoga programa i školski uspjeh, blago ispodprosječno informirani o pravu na participaciju. Budući da se Leveneov test (F(5,1497) = 2,129 = 0,059) nije pokazao statistički značajnim, omogućena je daljnja analiza varijance.

Tablica 2

Rezultati složene analize varijance iz Tablice 2 pokazuju kako postoji statistički značajna razlika u informiranosti kod učenika različitoga školskog uspjeha dok nema statistički značajne razlike u odnosu na vrstu škole niti značajne interakcije školskoga uspjeha i vrste škole Značajan učinak školskoga uspjeha je mali. Nakon provedenoga post hoc testa (Scheffe), vidljivo je kako učenici, bez obzira koji obrazovni program pohađaju, ako ostvaruju slabiji školski uspjeh (M = 2,56, SD = 0,81) imaju značajno nižu razinu informiranosti o pravu na participaciju u odnosu na učenike vrlo dobrog (M = 2,77, SD = 0,80; MD = -0,2121, p = 0,000) i odličnoga školskog uspjeha (M = 2,85, SD = 0,81; MD = -0,2922, p = 0,000).

Spremnost na aktivnu participaciju

U odnosu na drugi istraživački problem, zanimala nas je razlika u spremnosti na aktivnu participaciju. Pretpostavili smo razlike u odnosu na školski uspjeh, bez obzira na vrstu obrazovnoga programa, pri čemu se očekivalo da će učenici slabijega školskog uspjeha biti manje spremniji na participaciju nego oni koji ostvaruju vrlo dobar i odličan školski uspjeh. U odnosu na školu koju polaze, učenici su procijenili su kako su prosječno spremni aktivno se uključiti u život škole. Tako su učenici gimnazija postigli prosječan rezultat od M = 3,36 (SD = 0,82), a učenici strukovnih i umjetničkih srednjih škola od M = 3,19 (SD = 0,88). Prosječni rezultati spremnosti na participaciju postignuti su i u odnosu na školski uspjeh, pri čemu su učenici slaboga školskog uspjeh na skali spremnosti na aktivnu participaciju postigli ukupan prosječni rezultat M = 3,02 (SD = 0,83), učenici vrlo dobrog uspjeha M = 3,27 (SD = 0,86), a odlični učenici M = 3,53 (SD = 0,82) (Tablica 3). Kao i kod prethodnoga istraživačkog problema, Leveneov test (F(5,1509) = 3,022 = 0,010) nije se pokazao statistički značajnim te je omogućena daljnja analiza varijance.

Tablica 3

Rezultati složene analize varijance pokazuju kako u razini spremnosti na participaciju postoji statistički značajna razlika u odnosu na školski uspjeh, ali nema statistički značajne razlike u odnosu na vrstu obrazovnoga programa ni s obzirom na interakciju obrazovnoga programa i školskoga uspjeha Značajan efekt školskoga uspjeha je mali, a naknadnim post hoc testom (Scheffe) pokazalo se da u odnosu na školski uspjeh značajno najvišu razinu spremnosti za aktivnu participaciju u školi imaju učenici

odličnoga uspjeha (M = 3,53, SD = 0,82; MD$_{slabus}$ =-0,5117, p = 0,000; MD$_{vdus}$ = 0,2596, p = 0,000), zatim učenici vrlo dobroga uspjeha (M = 3,27, SD = 0,86; MD$_{slabu s}$ = -0,2521, p = 0,000; MD$_{odlus}$ = -0,25961, p = 0,000), dok najniže iskazanu spremnost imaju učenici slabijega školskog uspjeha (M = 3,02 SD = 0,83; MD$_{vdus}$ = -0,2521, p = 0,000; MD$_{odlus}$ = -0,5117, p = 0,000).

Zadovoljstvo participacijom u školi

Vezano uz zadovoljstvo participacijom u školi, hipoteza je bila da neće biti statistički značajne razlike u odnosu na vrstu obrazovnoga programa i školski uspjeh koji ostvaruju. Prema podatcima iz Tablice 4 vidljivo je da su učenici svih obrazovnih programa prosječno zadovoljni razinom participacije u školi (obje grupe, M = 3,93, SD$_{gim}$ = 1,57, SD$_{str}$ = 1,64). Prosječno zadovoljstvo participacijom iskazuju i učenici u odnosu na ocjene koje ostvaruju, pri čemu je prosječna vrijednost za učenike slabijega školskog uspjeha M = 3,72 (SD = 1,63), vrlo dobroag uspjeha M = 3,98 (SD = 1,60), a za učenike odličnoga uspjeha M = 4,10 (SD = 1,56). Daljnja je analiza varijance omogućena jer se Leveneov test (F(5,1517) = 0,894 = 0,484) nije pokazao statistički značajnim.

Tablica 4

Složena analiza varijance pokazala je kako postoji značajna razlika u razini zadovoljstva participacijom u školi kod učenika koji ostvaruju različiti školski uspjeh, dok razlika s obzirom na vrstu obrazovnoga programa nije statistički značajna, kao ni interakcija školskoga uspjeha i vrste obrazovnoga programa (Tablica 4). Značajan glavni efekt školskoga uspjeha je mali. Naknadnim post hoc testom (Scheffe) utvrđeno je da oni učenici koji ostvaruju najslabiji školski uspjeh (M = 3,72, SD = 1,63) imaju značajno niže iskazano zadovoljstvo razinom participacije u školi u odnosu na učenike vrlo dobroga (M = 3,98, SD = 1,60; MD = 0,2260, p = 0,001) i odličnoga uspjeha (M = 4,10, SD = 1,56; MD = 0,4287, p = 0,000).

Podrška nastavnika participaciji učenika

U posljednjem istraživačkom problemu zanimalo nas je kako učenici procjenjuju razinu podrške koju nastavnici daju njihovoj aktivnoj participaciji. Pri tome, polazilo se od hipoteze da se učenici neće statistički značajno razlikovati ni u odnosu na program koji pohađaju, no da će biti statistički značajne razlike u odnosu na uspjeh koji ostvaruju. Prosječne vrijednosti na skali vidljive su u Tablici 5. Učenici i u odnosu na vrstu obrazovnoga programa i školski uspjeh podršku nastavnika procjenjuju srednjom razinom zadovoljstva. U odnosu na ove varijable, Leveneov test (F(5,1396) = 1,935 = 0,086) nije se pokazao statistički značajnim te je omogućena daljnja analiza varijance.

Tablica 5

Složena analiza varijance (Tablica 5) pokazala je kako postoji statistički značajna razlika u procjeni podrške nastavnika učeničkoj participaciji u odnosu na vrstu obrazovnoga programa i školski uspjeh, no interakcija između vrste škole i školskoga uspjeha nije značajna. Učenici strukovnih i umjetničkih škola (M = 3,23, SD = 0,92)

podršku nastavnika procjenjuju višom u odnosu na učenike koji pohađaju gimnazijski program (M = 3,02, SD = 0,87), no važno je naglasiti da se radi o malim razlikama (efektima). U odnosu na školski uspjeh, naknadnim post hoc testom (Scheffe) utvrđeno je da učenici s najslabijim školskim uspjehom (M = 2,98, SD = 0,93) podršku nastavnika za aktivnu participaciju u školi procjenjuju značajno nižom u odnosu na učenike vrlo dobroga (M = 3,17, SD = 0,89; MD = -0,1868, p = 0,003) i odličnoga uspjeha (M = 3,30, SD = 0,88; MD = -0,3103, p = 0,000), dok nema značajne razlike između učenika vrlo dobroga i odličnoga uspjeha.

Rasprava

U odnosu na prvo ispitivano obilježje participacije, informiranost o pravu na participaciju, dobiveni rezultati pokazuju da je hipoteza 1 potvrđena. Rezultati su ukazali da nema statistički značajne razlike u informiranosti o pravu na participaciju između učenika gimnazijskoga i strukovnoga programa kada se uzme obzir školski uspjeh. Navedeni su nalazi u skladu s jednim ranijim istraživanjem u Hrvatskoj, čiji nalazi isto tako ukazuju da su svim učenicima srednjih škola potrebne dodatne informacije o pravu na participaciju, kao i oblicima i mogućnostima sudjelovanja u školi (Spajić-Vrkaš i Horvat, 2016). Niža razina informiranosti učenika o pravima, ukazuje i na moguće propuste u ostvarivanju niza dječjih prava. Uz pravo na participaciju (članak 12, Konvencija o pravima djeteta) potencijalno se dovodi u pitanje i ostvarivanje prava iz članaka 42 Konvencije o pravima djeteta koji naglašava pravo djece na informiranost o svojim pravima i odgovornost odraslih da ih informiraju. Važno je istaknuti da je primjetan jedino nesrazmjer u informiranosti o pravu na participaciju između učenika slabijega i boljega školskog uspjeha (vrlo dobar i odličan). Statistički značajne razlike dobivene u odnosu na školski uspjeh, u skladu su s prethodnim istraživanjima koja su pokazala kako učenici koji ostvaruju slabiji školski uspjeh procjenjuju da su manje upoznati s dječjim pravima općenito (Širanović, 2016; Youniss i sur., 2002) te su manje uključeni u formalne oblike participacije u školi kao što su vijeća učenika (Borić i Osmak Franjić, 2019; Collins et al., 2016; Flynn, 2019; Perry-Hazan, 2021). Ako svi učenici nemaju jednaku priliku i pristup informacijama o pravima, škole mogu postati mjesta koja dodatno marginaliziraju određene skupine djece, pri čemu djeca nemaju jednaku mogućnost aktivno participirati i ostvariti svoj participativni kapital (Wood, 2014). Niska razina informiranosti za učenike slabijega uspjeha problematična je i zbog toga što onemogućuje učenicima da zagovaraju svoja prava, odnosno ako nisu svjesni svojih prava, limitirani su i u njihovom ostvarivanju (Liebel, 2012). Stoga, škole osim zakonske imaju i socijalnu i moralnu odgovornost poticati učenje, promoviranje i ostvarivanje dječjih prava jednako za sve učenike. Rönnlund (2014) ističe da ako se rukovodimo aspektom socijalne pravde, potrebno je kreirati model participacije učenika koji će uključivati kontinuirano (svakodnevno) informiranje učenika i njihovo sudjelovanje u odlučivanju na razini razreda i škole u pitanjima koja i oni sami doživljavaju kao relevantna. Takve participativne prakse vjerojatno bi pozitivno utjecale na veći interes učenika za participacijom i veći broj učenika koji bi participirali.

Drugi istraživački problem bio je usmjeren na ispitivanje razlika u spremnosti na aktivnu participaciju s obzirom na vrstu obrazovnoga programa i ostvareni školski uspjeh. Hipoteza je postavljena u odnosu na školski uspjeh, pri čemu se očekivalo da će učenici slabijega školskog uspjeha biti manje spremniji na participaciju, nego oni koji ostvaruju vrlo dobar i odličan školski uspjeh, bez obzira na vrstu obrazovnoga programa. Ova je hipoteza potvrđena. U analizi, statistički značajna razlika pokazala se jedino u odnosu na školski uspjeh, dok nema statistički značajne razlike u odnosu na vrstu obrazovnoga programa ni s obzirom na interakciju vrste programa i školskoga uspjeha. Pri tome, zanimljivo je istaknuti da je analiza i kod ovoga istraživačkog problema pokazala da postoji statistički značajna razlika između učenika koji ostvaruju slabiji i bolji školski uspjeh. Dobiveni rezultati u skladu s rezultatima postojećih istraživanja koja su pokazala da u postojećem školskom sustavu oni uspješniji i afirmiraniji učenici iskazuju i veću spremnost na participaciju, pri čemu se nudi niz objašnjenja. Primjerice, Rönnlund (2014) objašnjava kako učenici češće sudjelovanje pojedinoga učenika ili pojedine grupe učenika u razrednim raspravama, vežu uz one učenike koje su uspješniji u školi i imaju razvijene komunikacijske vještine. Stoga se niža zainteresiranost učenika slabijega uspjeha za sudjelovanjem može povezati i s nedovoljno razvijenijim vještinama za sudjelovanje (Mithans i sur., 2017). Vezano uz mogućnosti sudjelovanja Percy-Smith (2010), naglašava kako neće svi učenici biti spremni na participaciju na isti način te da je potrebno razvijati što više različitih oblika i mogućnosti participacije. Primjerice, učenik koji postiže slabiji školski uspjeh, može imati značajne talente i sposobnosti na području odnosa s vršnjacima, a ako se njegova znanja i vještine vrednuju samo formalno kroz ocjene, učenik dobiva poruku da nije dovoljno kompetentan, što posredno smanjuje motivaciju za izražavanjem mišljenja i sudjelovanjem (Percy-Smith, 2010). Do pada motivacije za sudjelovanjem kod učenika slabijega uspjeha, može doći i ako njihov glas ostane sporadičan u odnosu na učenike koji su akademski uspješniji u školi (Cruddas, 2001; Flynn, 2019; Manefield i sur., 2007). Istraživanje koje je proveo Burger (2017) ukazalo je da ako djeca u školi percipiraju da se različite skupine djece podjednako poštuju, spremniji su sudjelovati i izraziti svoje mišljenje. Dobiveni rezultati vezani uz postupno smanjenje motivacije između odličnih, vrlo dobrih i slabijih učenika mogu se povezati s rezultatima longitudinalnoga istraživanja koje su proveli Finn i Zimmer (2012). Autori navode kako je participacija povezana s prijašnjim iskustvima uključenosti pri čemu su više motivirani oni učenici koji su u nižim razredima imali bolja postignuća i koji su kontinuirano od učitelja primali pohvale za rad i aktivno sudjelovanje. Fielding (2001) naglašava kako glas učenika nije jedinstven, pri čemu su neki učenici (ili grupe) učenika spremniji više govoriti te ih sama okolina na to više potiče. No, to vodi do toga da se pitamo imaju li takvi predstavnički glasovi legitimitet govoriti u ime svih učenika. Stoga je potrebno promišljati o načinima uključivanja sve djece kroz razvoj inkluzivnih načina participacije koji će uključiti i one čiji glasovi nisu „artikulirani i pristojni". Treći istraživački problem odnosio se na ispitivanje zadovoljstva učenika participacijom

u školi te je postavljena treća hipoteza potvrđena. Rezultati su pokazali kako nema statistički značajne razlike između učenika koji pohađaju različite vrste programa u odnosu na ocjenu koju učenici ostvaruju. Međutim, rezultati su ukazali da oni učenici koji ostvaruju slabiji školski uspjeh imaju značajno niže iskazano zadovoljstvo razinom participacije u školi u usporedbi s učenicima vrlo dobroga i odličnoga uspjeha. Slične rezultate vezane uz zadovoljstvo participacijom u školi, nalazi i Burger (2017) koji ukazuje da se procjene zadovoljstva participacijom u školi kod viših razreda osnovne škole učenika nisu značajno razlikovale među razredima, školama i gradskim četvrtima, već su procjene zadovoljstva bile značajno povezane sa psihosocijalnom obilježjima učenika. Kao značajni psihosocijalni resursi učenika za veće zadovoljstvo participacijom u školi pokazali su se: veća percepcija subjektivne dobrobiti i osjećaja sigurnosti, postojanje pouzdane odrasle osobe u školi te percepcija ne-diskriminacijske klime u odnosu na obilježja učenika kao što su invaliditet, problemi u ponašanju, slabiji akademski uspjeh i sl. (Burger, 2017). Vezano uz razliku koja se u rezultatima pokazala u odnosu na školski uspjeh, Karakuş (2017) također dolazi do rezultata da učenici koji ostvaruju bolji akademski uspjeh izražavaju veće zadovoljstvo participacijom, višu percepciju demokratskoga ozračja škole i osjećaja zajedništva nego učenici nižega akademskog uspjeha. Slično tome, istraživanje provedeno u osnovnim školama u Hrvatskoj, pokazalo je kako uključeni u dopunski program[2] nakon škole participiraju manje, nisu poticani na participaciju i imaju manje mogućnosti participacije zbog slabijega školskog uspjeha (Jeđud Borić i sur., 2018). Osim toga, niz drugih istraživanja ukazuje na pozitivnu povezanost participacije u školi i boljega akademskog uspjeha (Catalano i sur., 2004; González i sur., 2021; Malecki i Elliot, 2002).

Posljednji, četvrti istraživački problem odnosi se na to u kojoj mjeri učenici procjenjuju razinu podrške koju nastavnici daju njihovoj aktivnoj participaciji. Rezultati ukazuju da je četvrta hipoteza potvrđena, ali statistički značajna razlika u procjeni podrške nastavnika participaciji učenika pokazala se u odnosu na vrstu obrazovnoga programa i školski uspjeh. U odnosu na vrstu obrazovnoga programa, pokazalo se da učenici koji pohađaju gimnazijski program percipiraju da im nastavnici pružaju manje podrške za razliku od učenika strukovnih obrazovnih programa koji podršku nastavnika procjenjuju višom. Pojašnjenje ovih dobivenih rezultata moguće je promotriti kroz razlike u programima i kompetencijama koje usvajaju učenici iz gimnazijskih, strukovnih i umjetničkih programa. Pri tome, gimnazijski su programi usmjereni na stjecanje širokoga općeg znanja, dok su strukovne i umjetničke škole usmjerene na opća znanja, no posebice razvijaju specifična znanja i vještine vezana uz određena zanimanja i kvalifikacije (Baketa i sur., 2020). Zbog praktične nastave i usmjerenosti na razvoj vještina, učenici mogu imati više prilika za razvoj dobrih odnosa s nastavnicima. Lee i Smith (2001) smatraju da učenici u školama u kojima nemaju

---

[2] Riječ je o učenicima uključenima u program poludnevnih boravaka u osnovnim školama, pri čemu je jedan od kriterija uključivanja i lošiji školski uspjeh.

priliku bolje upoznati svoje nastavnike te formirati mentorske i pozitivne odnose, manje uključeni i manje motivirani za obrazovne procese. Slično navode i Hafen i suradnici (2011) koji ističu važnost percipirane razine autonomnosti kod učenika u poticanju participacije. Učenici koji su na početku školske godine izvijestili o višoj razini doživljene i poticane autonomnosti od strane nastavnika, ujedno su i aktivnije bili uključeni u izvođenje nastave tijekom i na kraju školske godine (češće postavljanje pitanja, pružanje informacija, sudjelovanje u aktivnostima i sl.). Stoga se u dobivenim rezultatima otvara i pitanje za daljnja istraživanja u smjeru koliko pojedina vrsta srednjoškolskoga programa potiče autonomnost učenika i kako to utječe na percepciju podrške nastavnika participaciji? Također, Vrcelj i suradnici (2017) pronalaze kako gimnazijalci u usporedbi sa strukovnim trogodišnjim i četverogodišnjim školama, češće školski uspjeh određuju kroz mogućnost upisa na fakultet, odnosno dominantno ekonomsku dimenziju školskoga uspjeha (Winton, 2013). Stoga, ocjene za gimnazijalce imaju važnu ulogu u planiranju njihove budućnosti i pritisak za ostvarivanje dobroga uspjeha što im potencijalno ostavlja manjak vremena za participaciju u školi. U kvalitativnom istraživanju sa srednjoškolcima, pokazalo se da upravo opterećenost sadržajima i krute forme obrazovnoga programa otežavaju participaciju i ne daju djeci dovoljno prilike, energije ni vremena za smisleno sudjelovanje (Borić i sur., 2019). Slobodnije i na vještine usmjerene forme učenja, koje su naizgled prisutnije u strukovnim i umjetničkim školama, posredno mogu potaknuti pozitivnije školsko okružje i odnose nastavnik-učenik, čimbenike koji su se pokazali važni za poticanje participacije u školama (Fatou i Kubizewski, 2018; John-Akinola i Nic-Gabhainn, 2014; Radetić-Paić, 2020; Simmons i sur., 2015). Niža procjena podrške nastavnika od strane učenika slabijega školskog učenika ukazuje na nekoliko ključnih prepreka za ostvarivanje dječje participacije koje pronalazimo u recentnoj literaturi. Prva prepreka odnosi se na pitanje inkluzivnosti participacije (Sinclair, 2004), pri čemu se često govori o tome kako priliku za participacijom imaju samo aktivna i socijalno vješta djeca koja postižu odličan školski uspjeh te se za njih neopravdano smatra da su reprezentativna skupina sve djece (Flynn, 2019; Pavlović, 1998; Perry-Hazan, 2021; Tisdall, 2013; West, 2004). Druga prepreka proizlazi iz pretpostavke koje odrasli imaju o djeci, odnosno odrasli često podcjenjuju dječje kompetencije i mogućnost sudjelovanja u odlučivanju (Lansdown, 2001). Istraživanje provedeno u švedskim školama s učiteljima, nastavnicima i roditeljima ukazalo je da postoje razlike u tome kako učenici i nastavnici opisuju odnos participacije i akademskoga uspjeha, pri čemu učenici participaciju više vide kroz odnosnu dimenziju s odraslima i vršnjacima u školi, dok nastavnici participaciju povezuju isključivo s boljim akademskim uspjehom i aktivnošću učenika u školi (Niia i sur., 2015). Drugim riječima, prema dobivenim rezultatima, jedno od mogućih objašnjenja niže percepcije podrške nastavnika učenicima slabijega školskog uspjeha jest pretpostavka da ih nastavnici doživljavaju manje kompetentnima za sudjelovanje. S druge strane, postoji i objašnjenje da se i sami učenici sa slabijim školskim uspjehom doživljavaju manje kompetentnima ili smatraju

da nemaju dovoljno razvijene vještine za sudjelovanje (Rönnlund, 2014). Stoga je u budućim istraživanjima potrebno bolje istražiti međuodnose participacije i percepcije podrške nastavnika, percepciju vlastitih kompetencija za sudjelovanje od strane djece, te stavove koje nastavnici imaju o pojedinim skupinama djece i njihovim kompetencijama za sudjelovanje. Kao što je već u prethodnim istraživačkim problemima spomenuto, upravo su pozitivan doživljaj nediskriminacijskoga ozračja u školi prema različitim obilježjima djece i prisutnost povjerljive osobe pozitivno povezani s većim sudjelovanjem i višom percepcijom ostvarivanja participativnih prava u školi (Burger, 2017; Cremin i sur., 2011; Uziely, 2015). Rezultati ovoga istraživanja u skladu su i s istraživanjima koja su pokazala kako su učenici koji percipiraju više podrške od nastavnika skloniji više participirati, za razliku od onih učenika koji percipiraju manji stupanj nastavničke podrške (Klem i Conell, 2004; Wang i Eccless, 2012). Slično tome, u istraživanju koje su proveli Larrivee i suradnici (1997) s učiteljima i učenicima u školama pokazalo se da su kod onih učitelja koji su kroz svoj rad više osnaživali cjelokupni djetetov razvoj (akademski uspjeh i socijalno-emocionalni razvoj), učenici više izvještavali o iskustvu participacije i doživljaju da ih se uvažava kao važne pojedince u školi. Kroz istraživanja o participaciji u školama, kvalitetan i podržavajući odnos nastavnika i učenika često se ističe kao ključan kontekstualni čimbenik u poticanju dječjega sudjelovanja (Kodele, 2017; Larrivee i sur., 1997; Mantzicopoulos i Neuharth-Pritchett, 2003; McCormack i sur., 2019; Skinner i Pitzer, 2012; Voelkl, 1995; Wang i Eccless, 2012). Pružanje podrške učenicima za sudjelovanje izrazito je važno, jer učenici koji imaju doživljaj doprinosa na temelju vlastitoga mišljenja razvijaju pripadnost, predanost i odgovornost prema vlastitom školskom okružju (Lansdown, 2001). Stoga su u tom pogledu zanimljivi dobiveni rezultati koji ukazuju na razlike i u odnosu na vrstu obrazovnoga programa, ali i u odnosu na školski uspjeh pri čemu treba imati u vidu da su u odnosu na sve prethodno opisane istraživačke hipoteze i rezultate dobivene razlike (efekti) male.

Zaključak

Rezultati ovoga istraživanja ukazuju da u odnosu na ispitivana obilježja participacije učenika srednjih škola postoji glavni efekt školskoga uspjeha pri čemu je niži školski uspjeh povezan s nižom razinom informiranosti, spremnosti, zadovoljstvom i podrškom nastavnika. Ovakvi rezultati potiču važno pitanje koje se odnosi se na inkluzivnost (odnosno elitnost) participacije. Iako su dobivene razlike efekta školskoga uspjeha male, nalazi istraživanja ukazuju da su učenici s lošijim školskim uspjehom manje informirani i spremni participirati te doživljavaju da ih nastavnici manje podržavaju u njihovim nastojanjima da participiraju. Ove uvide svakako bi trebalo dodatno produbiti kroz daljnja istraživanja, posebno kroz razgovore s mladima, no temeljem dobivenih rezultata opravdano je postaviti pitanje je li participacija privilegija samo nekih učenika? Imaju li svi učenici jednaku priliku i poticaj da izraze svoja mišljenja, da budu konzultirani, da se uključe u vijeća učenika, da sudjeluju u odlučivanju? Ovo istraživanje govori u prilog da u školskoj praksi možda to nije tako. Vrlo često

u školama nalazimo onakve oblike participacije koji su formalni, predstavnički i uniformni te kao takvi ne odgovaraju svim učenicima. Predstavničke pozicije u školama uglavnom su namijenjene učenicima s boljim školskim uspjehom te bi u budućnosti trebalo mijenjati ovakvu neinkluzivnu praksu. Nadalje, u odnosu na vrstu obrazovnoga programa pokazalo se kako učenici strukovnih škola percipiraju veću podršku svojih nastavnika u svojim participativnim aktivnostima od učenika gimnazija. Također, važno je istaknuti da se učenici gimnazija i strukovnih škola ne razlikuju ni po jednom drugom ispitivanom obilježju vezanom uz participaciju. U daljnjem razmatranju jačanja učeničke participacije (a onda posljedično i političke pismenosti i građanske participacije) nalazi stoga ukazuju da je u srednjim školama potrebno koristiti potencijale obje vrste programa: znanja i sadržaja koji se prenose u gimnazijskim programima i podršku nastavnika koja se pokazala većom u strukovnim programima. Stoga bi srednje škole, neovisno o vrsti i trajanju programa, trebale nuditi više mogućnosti za participaciju učenika otvarajući veći prostor i vrijeme za dijalog te razvoj novih odnosa koji nisu nužno temeljeni na autoritarnim obrascima već na su-stvaranju nastavnika i učenika. Obilježja participacije ispitivana u ovom istraživanju nisu pokazala značajne interakcije u odnosu na vrstu obrazovnoga programa i školski uspjeh. Stoga se temeljem svih dobivenih rezultata može zaključiti da bi srednje škole općenito trebale biti usmjerenije (i više nego osnovne škole zbog dobi svojih učenika) na razvoj i promociju autonomije, odgovornosti i sudjelovanja učenika. Pritom upravo participacija učenika ima dobar emancipacijski potencijal te nudi mogućnost nijansiranoga pristupa i izbora načina i mjere u kojoj učenici žele sudjelovati. Poticanje učenika na (su)djelovanje mijenja odnose učenika i odraslih u školi te propituje postojeće odnose moći. Na taj način participacija učenika ima potencijal postati dio transformativnih obrazovnih praksi. U tom smislu transformativna participacija mogla bi se u srednjim školama očitovati kroz tri aspekta: *transformaciju osoba koje su uključene* (poboljšanje vještina, stjecanje iskustva, širenje socijalnih mreža, novi i promijenjeni odnosi među djecom i odraslima); *transformaciju kao učinak* (npr. utjecaj na donošenje odluka) i *širu društvenu transformaciju* kao ishod prva dva aspekta (Tisdall, 2013). Stoga se u ovom radu nastojalo dati doprinos i potaknuti nova pitanja o obilježjima participacije učenika u srednjim školama imajući u vidu upravo transformativni potencijal škola kao obrazovnih institucija koje među prvima mogu promovirati i omogućavati uključenost i participaciju svih.

Ograničenja istraživanja i smjernice za buduća istraživanja

Rad se bavi relativno neistraženom temom, posebno u kontekstu hrvatskoga područja te daje početni uvid u pojedina obilježja participacije učenika u srednjim školama. S obzirom na kompleksnost istraživanja participacije učenika u odnosu na obilježja participacije, utjecaj individualnih i okolinskih uvjeta kao što su kultura, dob, rod, okružje, politički i širi društveni uvjeti, dostupni resursi; različita razumijevanja participacije (kao procesa ili/i ishoda) te u odnosu na oblike participacije djece u

školi (Jeđud Borić i sur., 2018) prezentirano istraživanje ima nekoliko metodoloških ograničenja, kao i smjernica za daljnja istraživanja. Prvo metodološko ograničenje istraživanja je u tome što je uzorak na kojem su prikupljeni podatci prigodan, što znači da se podatci ne mogu generalizirati na cjelokupnu populaciju srednjoškolaca u Hrvatskoj. Pri sagledavanju rezultata važno je naglasiti da je uzorak vrlo heterogen u odnosu na regionalnu zastupljenost, vrstu obrazovnoga programa i veličinu škola. Drugo metodološko ograničenje vezano je uz sam instrument, odnosno njegovu formu samoiskaza što povećava tendenciju davanja poželjnih odgovora. Isto tako, problem samoiskaza potencijalno je povezan s mogućim niskim poznavanjem teme i time da su neki sudionici ispunjavajući upitnik potencijalno prvi put promišljali o participaciji učenika, što svakako može utjecati na rezultate. Problem samoiskaza vezan je i uz retrospektivnu prirodu, odnosno učenička percepcija može biti pod utjecajem trenutačnoga raspoloženja, nedostatka u ljudskom pamćenju i drugih kognitivnih čimbenika koji se odvijaju u trenutku dosjećanja. Treće metodološko ograničenje vezano je uz kategorizaciju uzorka u odnosu na školske ocjene. Uzorci u odnosu na pojedini školski uspjeh nisu bili međusobno usporedivi zbog neravnomjerne zastupljenosti pojedinačnih ocjena te su kategorizirani u tri međusobno usporedive kategorije ocjena što može imati utjecaj na sagledavanje rezultata. Daljnja istraživanja vezana uz temu participacije prije svega trebala bi dodatno istražiti doprinos pojedinih kontekstualnih čimbenika (primjerice, školsku klimu, veličinu razreda i škole, opremljenost školskih prostorija) vezanih uz pojedine obrazovne programe i obilježja participacije. Isto tako, bilo bi važno istražiti na koji način određeni programi podržavaju formalno, a na koji neformalno sudjelovanje učenika te postoje li neke razlike u odnosu na to. Nadalje, bilo bi važno provjeriti razlikuju li se učenici u spremnosti na participaciju u odnosu na različite oblike participacije u školi (npr. formalnu kroz vijeća učenika ili neformalnu kroz aktivnosti na razini razreda i škole) te ostvaren školski uspjeh. U daljnjim istraživanjima bilo bi također vrijedno usmjeriti se i na osobne karakteristike učenika koje utječu na njihovu participaciju, kao i karakteristike nastavnika koje potiču učenike na sudjelovanje. Potencijal u budućim istraživanjima ove teme, nalazi se i u korištenju participativnih istraživačkih metoda. Participativne istraživačke metode omogućuju aktivnije uključivanje djece tijekom istraživačkoga procesa, a odnose se na korištenje metoda istraživanja koje su primjerene djeci, poštuju njihova prava i dobrobit (primjerice, vizualne i kreativno-ekspresivne metode te korištenje digitalnih tehnologija). Primjeri iz stranih istraživanja (Cruddas, 2001; Gibson, 2006; Hunter i O'Brien, 2018; O'Connor, 2012; Rönnlund, 2014; Silva, 2001) govore u prilog uspjeha korištenja takvih metoda, ne samo u istraživačke svrhe, već i u smjeru poticanja participacije u školama.

Napomena

Prikazano istraživanje dio je istraživačkoga projekta koji je proveo Ured pravobraniteljice za djecu Republike Hrvatske.