Aleksandra Berkowicz
Jagiellonian University

ORCID: 0000-0003-4387-7788
e-mail: aleksandra.zurowska@uj.edu.pl

SOCIALIZATION OF MANAGEMENT AS THE FUNCTIONING OF SCHOOL SOCIAL BODIES FROM THE PERSPECTIVE OF NON-PUBLIC AND PUBLIC-SCHOOL TEACHERS

USPOŁECZNIENIE ZARZĄDZANIA JAKO FUNKCJONOWANIE SZKOLNYCH ORGANÓW SPOŁECZNYCH Z PERSPEKTYWY NAUCZYCIELI SZKÓŁ NIEPUBLICZNYCH I PUBLICZNYCH

Abstract: Socialization was an important change in education management introduced after 1989. It provided an opportunity for schools to be managed by citizens and for citizens. Socialization was implemented by changing and modifying the tasks of social bodies that are part of a school's organizational structure. The main aim of the work is to explore the issue of the role of school social bodies in the management of modern schools as a manifestation of the socialization of management. The article poses the following research question: what is the involvement of social bodies in school management? The research used a quantitative strategy. The tool used to collect research material was a survey. The subjects of the research were teachers of public and private schools. The article shows that social bodies, as elements of the organizational structure, depending on the type of institution: public or non-public, have a different impact on the functioning of the studied school organizations. Their activity covers various areas of the school's activities. School is an ideal platform, a laboratory, and a preliminary introduction to the world of democracy and its practice. One of the possibilities and at the same time a way through which attitudes and actions based on democratic values can be taught are social bodies operating in schools.
Keywords: socialization of management, educational management, democracy in schools

Streszczenie: Uspołecznienie było ważną zmianą w zarządzaniu edukacją wprowadzoną po 1989 r. Dawało szansę na zarządzanie szkołami przez obywateli i dla obywateli. Uspołecznienie zarządzania realizowano poprzez wprowadzenie, a także modyfikację zadań organów społecznych będących częścią struktury organizacyjnej szkoły. Głównym celem pracy jest zgłębienie problematyki roli szkolnych organów społecznych w zarządzaniu współczesnymi szkołami, jako przejaw uspołecznienia zarządzania. W artykule postawiono następujące pytania badawcze: jaki jest udział organów społecznych w zarządzaniu szkołą? W badaniach zastosowano strategię ilościową. Narzędziem, które posłużyło do zebrania materiału badawczego była ankieta. Przedmiotem badań byli nauczyciele szkół publicznych i niepublicznych. W niniejszej pracy wykazano, iż organy społeczne, jako elementy struktury organizacyjnej w zależności od typu placówki: publicznej czy niepublicznej mają zróżnicowany wpływ na funkcjonowanie badanych organizacji szkolnych. Ich aktywność obejmuje różnorodne obszary działalności szkoły. Szkoła stanowi idealną platformę, laboratorium, przedpole wprowadzenia w świat demokracji i jej praktykowania. Jedną z możliwości a zarazem drogą dzięki której można uczyć postaw i działań w oparciu o wartości demokratyczne są organy społeczne funkcjonujące w szkołach.
Słowa kluczowe: uspołecznienie zarządzania, zarządzanie edukacją, demokracja w szkołach

Entry

The socialization of schools, apart from autonomy and decentralization, was one of the most important changes in the management of Polish education after 1989. This change was the result of the willingness, opportunity, and need to democratize schools. "Democratization of school is nothing else than the exercise of government in school by teachers, students, and parents, for teachers, students, and parents, by teachers, students and parents (…). Democratization of school means mutuality of goals and responsibilities, obligations and interests; partnership, i.e. a meeting of entities equal before the law, transparency thanks to equal access to information, knowledge of rights; an atmosphere of cooperation and the possibility of cooperation (work, control, evaluation, decision-making, etc.) (Mencel, 2009, p. 36-37). In other words, a manifestation of the democratization of schools was their socialization. It was reflected, among others, in the presence and activities of school social bodies. This work, therefore, aims to examine the role played by social bodies in schools in the context of the idea of socializing school management. The research question is: what is the scope of influence of social bodies on school management?

Review of the literature

A socialized school is "an expression of a democratic community practiced in a physical space" (Mendel, 2019, p. 11). From a pedagogical point of view, socialization is the result of educational activities that aim to prepare an individual to act not only for their good, but also for the good of other people, caring for the common good treated as part of the personal good (Okoń, 2007, p. 377). In the political science context, it involves citizens exercising bottom-up control over educational institutions, participating in management, and influencing educational processes and legal regulations (Milerski, Śliwerski, 2000, p. 263). The common point of various definitions of socialization is, as H. Sowińska (1992, p. 23) writes, the focus on people, the subordination of organizations to the good and needs of people so that they can realize humanity and the values resulting from it. The implementation of socialization understood in this way requires the introduction of democratic structures that will guarantee people's influence on the processes of social life, allowing self-regulatory processes to operate, and rebuilding the awareness of people, in this case, teachers, parents, and students (Sowińska, 1992, p. 23). Socialization of management in schools means the participation of teachers, parents, and students in managing educational processes. Socialization of management allows the development of social and emotional skills such as self-awareness - recognizing one's feelings, thoughts, and values, assessing strengths and weaknesses while maintaining a sense of self-confidence, self-management – regulating emotions, thoughts, and behaviors, social awareness – adopting a point of view and empathy towards others, understanding and appreciating similarities and differences, recognizing the resources and support of environments: family, school, community, relationship skills – the ability to establish and maintain healthy and satisfying relationships through effective communication, fruitful cooperation, constructive conflict resolution, responsible decision-making – making decisions based on ethical standards, safety considerations, social norms, respect for others, and the well-being of the school and community (Garibaldi, Josias, 2015, pp. 1588-1589). The implementation of socialized management leads to organizational socialization – the process of moving from being an organizational outsider who feels unfamiliar in the organization to an organizational insider (Louis, 1980, quote for: Bauer, Erdogan, 2012, p. 97). D. Gamage and D.M. San Antonio (2006) emphasize that participation in decision-making and their implementation affect employee satisfaction, morale, motivation and self-esteem (Vroom, 1960; Driscoll, 1978; English, 1979; Locke, Schweiger, 1979; Jenkins Jr., Lawler III, 1981; Watkins, 1985; Chapman, Boyd, 1986; Lindelow, Bentley, 1989; Doyle, Wells, 1996; Hargreaves, Hopkins, 1991; Lawler III, Mohrman, Ledford Jr., 1992; Hunton, Hall, Price, 1998; Gamage, Pang, 2003), increasing efficiency through open communication between people with different points of view (Tarter, 1967; Connors, 1978; Dachler, Wilpert, 1978; Fidler, Bowles, 1989; Lindelow, Bentley, 1989; Lindelow, Coursen, Heynderickx, Smith, 1989c; Hargreaves, Rosener, 1990; Gamage, Hopkins, 1991), a sense of

responsibility for implementing decisions made and supporting their implementation (Duke, Showers, Imber, 1980; Hopkins, 1991; Kefford, 1985; Lindelow, Bentley, 1989), preventing the authorities from manipulating people (Watkins, 1985), teachers' sense of control over their professional lives (Weiss, Cambone, Wyeth, 1992), balancing power inequalities (Harchar, Hyle, 1996), the availability of additional resources in the organization (King and Swanson, 1990; Gamage, Sipple, Partridge, 1996; Lienhart and Willert, 2002).

It is these entities – teachers, parents, and students who create the school community. Representative bodies have been provided for these individual groups in the form of social bodies operating in schools. Both school entities and social bodies are part of a school's organizational structure. They have competencies specified in the Education Law Act, allowing them to influence school reality's shaping. These bodies at the micro level include the school council, the parents' council, the student government, and other social organizations operating at the school.

At school, an optional social body is the school council, which consists of: teachers elected by all teachers, parents elected by all parents, and students elected by all students. The school council participates in solving the school's internal affairs and adopts the school's statute, gives opinions on the draft financial plan of the school, may submit requests to the body exercising pedagogical supervision over the school to examine and evaluate the activities of the school, its principal or other teacher, and gives opinions on the work plan of the school or institution, projects of pedagogical experiments, and other matters important for the school, on its initiative assesses the situation and condition of the school and submits applications to the principal, the pedagogical council, the school's governing body, the provincial education council regarding the organization of classes, to support the school's statutory activities, the school council may collect funds from voluntary contributions and other sources (Act on Education Law, type 4, art. 80, 81). B. Śliwerski (2008, p. 20) considers the school council to be the only completely democratic body functioning in the school.

There is a parents' council in schools. The parents' council in schools consists of one representative of the branch councils, elected in secret elections by the meeting of parents of a given branch. The parents' council may submit motions and opinions to the principal and other school bodies, the school management body, and the body exercising pedagogical supervision on all school matters. The competencies of the parents' council include adopting, in consultation with the pedagogical council, the school's educational and preventive program (referred to in Article 26), giving opinions on the program and schedule for improving the effectiveness of education or upbringing at the school, giving opinions on the draft financial plan submitted by the school principal (Act on Education Law, item 4, articles 83, 84). The student council is made up of all students of the school, and the student council body are the only representatives of all students. The student council may present to the school council, the pedagogical council, and the principal conclusions and opinions on all school matters, in particular: the right to become acquainted with the curriculum, its content, purpose, and requirements, the right to an open and motivated assessment of progress in learning and behavior, the right to organize school life, enabling the right balance between school effort and the ability to develop and satisfy one's interests, the right to edit and publish the school newspaper, the right to organize cultural, educational, sports and entertainment activities by one's own needs and organizational possibilities in consultation with the principal, the right to choose a teacher who will act as a local government guardian. The local government may also, in consultation with the school principal, undertake volunteering activities (Act on Education Law, item 4, article 85). Moreover, except political parties and organizations, associations and other organizations, in particular scouting organizations, may operate at school, the statutory purpose of which is educational activity or the expansion and enrichment of the forms of teaching, educational, caring and innovative activities of the school (Act on Education Law, item 4, article 86).

The school always operates in a specific environment, which influences the school and often reflects the processes occurring there. The determinants that favor (or do not) the socialization of management are: socio-political, or more precisely, they include the will of various entities within and outside the school, including people who create the educational space and the appropriate political climate (Cudowska, 2018,

p. 133). According to B. Śliwerski, the political authorities inhibited the socialization of schools through, among others, educational and school pseudo-government, immunization of education from social control, and partisanization of the educational system (Śliwerski, 2011-2012, p. 67). As an example, he gives the appearance of school co-management by the school self-government, which carries out tasks usually related to participation in school ceremonies or entertainment functions, such as organizing discos, a provision in the Act on the education system stating that in schools where a school council has not been appointed, these tasks are performed by the pedagogical council, the chairmanship of the pedagogical council by the director, who is their employer, the appointment of social bodies – the student government, the parents' council, the school council, the scope of their tasks is determined from above (Śliwerski, 2011-2012, p. 70).

Research Methodology

The original research form in the form of a survey was an introduction to broader research and was addressed to teachers of private and public schools living in the Małopolskie, ląskie , and Podkarpackie voivodeships. 109 teachers working in public schools and 107 teachers working in non-public schools at the primary and secondary school level were surveyed. The majority of respondents were women aged 30-50 in private schools and over 50 in public schools. The respondents' work experience in private schools ranged from 10 to 20 years and from 10 to 30 years in public schools. Detailed data regarding the characteristics of the study group can be found in the tables below (tables 1-3). The questionnaire consisted of open and closed single-choice questions with a cafeteria of answers and was part of a broader study on selected aspects of management in education.

Table 1. Gender of teachers, level of education, and type of school

Level of education	Sex	Non-public schools		Public schools	
		L	%	L	%
Primary school	W	43	84,31	46	90,2
	M	7	13,73	3	5,88
	NA	1	1,96	2	3,92
	Total	51	100	51	100
Secondary school	W	48	85,71	34	58,62
	M	6	10,71	21	36,21
	NA	2	3,57	3	5,17
	Total	56	100	58	100
Schools together	W	91	85,05	80	73,39
	M	13	12,15	24	22,02
	NA	3	2,8	5	4,59
	Total	107	100	109	100

W – woman; M – man; NA – no answer   Source: own research

Table 2. Teachers' age, education level, and school type

Level of education	Teachers' age	Non-public schools		Public schools	
		L	%	L	%
Primary school	20-30	5	9,8	2	3,92
	30-40	21	41,18	14	27,45
	40-50	18	35,29	12	23,53
	above 50	5	9,8	15	29,41
	NO	2	3,92	8	15,69
	Total	51	51	100	51
Secondary school	20-30	7	12,5	0	0
	30-40	14	25	15	25,86
	40-50	21	37,5	13	22,41
	above 50	10	17,86	19	32,76
	NO	4	7,14	11	18,97
	Total	56	56	100	58
Schools together	20-30	12	11,21	2	1,83
	30-40	35	32,71	29	26,61
	40-50	39	36,45	25	22,94
	above 50	15	14,02	34	31,19
	NO	6	5,61	19	17,43
	Total	107	107	100	109

Source: own research

Table 3. Teachers' experience, level of education, and type of school

Level of education	Teachers' experience	Non-public schools		Public schools	
		L	%	L	%
Primary school	0-10	14	27,45	9	17,65
	10-20	16	31,37	16	31,37
	20-30	14	27,45	13	25,49
	30-40	2	3,92	7	13,73
	above 40	0	0	0	0
	NA	5	9,8	6	11,76
	Total	51	51	100	51
Secondary school	0-10	12	21,43	4	6,9
	10-20	21	37,5	22	37,93
	20-30	12	21,43	21	36,21
	30-40	7	12,5	8	13,79
	above 40	0	0	0	0
	NA	4	7,14	3	5,17
	Total	56	56	100	58
Schools together	0-10	26	24,3	13	11,93
	10-20	37	34,58	38	34,86
	20-30	26	24,3	34	31,19
	30-40	9	8,41	15	13,76
	above 40	0	0	0	0
	NA	9	8,41	9	8,26
	Total	107	107	100	109

Source: own research

Results and discussion

The respondents mentioned the following social bodies functioning in their schools: the school council, student rights advocate, the parents' council, and the student government. More than 30% of teachers working in non-public schools assessed the influence of the parents' council on the school's activities as large, and on

average every third respondent from this type of school assessed it as a medium. In public schools, the influence of the parents' council on the operation of schools, according to more than half of the teachers, was medium and was described as large by on average every second respondent. The influence of the student government on school matters was rated as average in both non-public (46.73%) and public (35.78%) schools. On average, every third respondents in both types of schools described the influence of the student government as small. Less than half of teachers from public schools (37.61%) and approximately 20% from non-public schools attributed to the school board a large influence on the functioning of the institution, and on average every sixth respondent from a non-public school and every fifth respondent from a public school stated that the influence of the school board on the operation of the facility is average. It is worth emphasizing that more than half of the respondents from non-public schools and less than half of the respondents from public schools did not answer the question. More than 90% of respondents from non-public schools and almost 70% of respondents from public schools did not provide an answer regarding the influence of the student rights advocate on the school's activities. However, on average, every sixth respondent from a public school described its impact as small. The research results are illustrated in Table 1.

Table 4. The scope of influence of social bodies on the functioning of non-public and public schools

Social bodies	School status	Big		Medium		Little		No influence		No answer	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
School board	NP	22	20,56	17	15,89	5	4,67	0	0	63	58,88
	P	41	37,61	19	17,43	2	1,83	0	0	47	43,12
Student rights advocate	NP	2	1,87	4	3,74	2	1,87	1	0,93	98	91,59
	P	6	5,5	12	11,01	16	14,68	0	0	75	68,81
Parents' council	NP	34	31,78	29	27,1	16	14,95	2	1,87	26	24,3
	P	40	36,7	57	52,29	10	9,17	0	0	2	1,83
Student council	NP	21	19,63	50	46,73	34	31,78	0	0	2	1,87
	P	24	22,02	39	35,78	34	31,19	1	0,92	11	10,09

NP – non-public school, P – public school   Source: own research

About 50% of respondents from non-public schools and about 40% of respondents from public schools indicated social bodies that should have a greater influence on the activities of schools. It is worth emphasizing that more than half of the respondents from public schools (58.72%) and less than half of the respondents from non-public schools (48.6%) have no opinion on increasing the influence of social bodies at school. 15.89% of respondents from non-public schools stated that the influence of social bodies on the school's activities was adequate. A slightly smaller percentage of teachers from this type of school believed that the student government should have a greater influence on the school's activities. On average, every eleventh teacher from a non-public school stated that the school council had a greater influence on the functioning of the school, and every thirteenth said that the student rights advocate had a greater influence on the functioning of the school. The smallest percentage of respondents from non-public schools (2.8%) supported increasing the influence of the parents' council on the school. According to 12.84% of public-school teachers, the influence of social bodies should remain unchanged because it is appropriate. On average, every twelfth person from a public school believed that the student council should have greater influence on the school's activities, and every thirteenth person believed that the parents' council should have more influence on the school's activities. Only 2.75% of respondents from public schools believed that the student rights advocate should have a greater influence on the school's activities, and just over 4% would be in favor of increasing the influence of the school board. The responses are summarized in Table 2.

Table 5. Social bodies that should have greater influence on the activities of non-public and public schools

Social bodies	Non-public schools		Public schools	
	N	%	N	%
School board	9	8,41	5	4,59
Student rights advocate	8	7,48	3	2,75
Parents' council	3	2,8	8	7,34
Student council	13	12,15	9	8,26
The current condition is adequate	17	15,89	14	12,84
I have no opinion	52	48,6	64	58,72

Source: own research

The answers regarding increasing the powers of individual social bodies were justified by 15.89% of respondents from non-public schools and 14.68% from public schools. The analysis of the data contained in the table shows that the majority of teachers from non-public schools justified the increase in the influence of the student council on the school's activities by the need for greater involvement of students in the functioning of the institution; the importance of this body as a representative of the student community; the importance of students at school and the need to use students' knowledge about the school. Individual statements by respondents from public schools concerned: the promotion of students' creativity and self-government, the involvement of the student council in the institution's activities, organizing students' lives, knowledge of students' needs, and the fact that the school is intended for students. In the case of the school board, the increased influence of this body on the activities of schools, according to teachers from non-public schools, would be related to the need for greater involvement of the school board, and according to public school teachers, the knowledge of the needs and problems of the school by this body. Respondents in both types of institutions would increase the influence of the parents' council at school due to the need for their greater involvement. Moreover, respondents from non-public schools mentioned knowledge of children's needs and the need for parents to co-create school life. However, respondents from public schools associated the increase in the powers of the parents' council with a natural (parental) interest in the quality of education and the well-being of students. Other statements included: in non-public schools – increasing the influence of the governing body, because it provides help and financial support for the school, and in public schools – both the teaching council and the student government, because these are the bodies most interested in life of the school, and all bodies to their impact on school life was sustainable. The statements also indicated the lack of interest in school life among social authorities, especially parents and students. The test results are presented in Table 3.

Teachers also perceive the influence of social bodies on specific areas of schools. According to approximately 35% of teachers from non-public schools, the parents' council had the greatest influence on the administrative and organizational area, a slightly smaller percentage of respondents from these schools believed that the council influenced the teaching and educational, environmental, and financial areas. The influence of parents' councils was different in public schools. Almost 70% of respondents from this type of school believed that the parents' council had the greatest influence on the school's financial area and more than half believed that it had the greatest influence on the school's cooperation with the local community. A slightly smaller percentage of respondents indicated the influence of the parents' council on the administrative, organizational, didactic and educational areas. The student council in non-public schools, in the opinion of over 60% of respondents, operated in the area of cooperation between the school and the local environment and in the opinion of over 50% of respondents in the teaching and educational area. Moreover, it had a smaller impact on the administrative and organizational area (approx. 10%) and did not affect the school's financial situation.

Table 6. Justifications of teachers of non-public and public schools explaining the increase in powers of individual social bodies

Social bodies	Non-public schools	Public schools
School board	1. The need for involvement in school activities.	1. Knowledge of the school's needs and/or problems.
Student rights advocate		1. The student is the most important entity of the school. 2. Co-creating school life.
Parent council	1. Knowing your children's needs. 2. There is a need to co-create school life. 3. The need for involvement in school activities.	1. The need for involvement in the organizational and educational activities of the school. 2. Interest in the functioning of the school due to the quality of education for their children. 3. For parents, the student is the most important entity at school.
Student council	1. The need for involvement in school activities. 2. It is a representative body of students and influences them. 3. The student is the most important entity in school. 4. A very good observer of the school.	1. Promoting students' creativity and self-government 2. Involvement in school activities. 3. A school created for students. 4. Organizing students' lives. 5. Knowledge of student needs.
Other answers	Governing body: 1. Help and support for the school in financial matters.	Concerning all social bodies: 1. The influence of individual bodies should be balanced. 2. Loss of interest in social cooperation (egocentric attitudes of parents and students).

Source: own research

In public schools, the influence of this body, according to over 50% of respondents, concerned the teaching and educational area and cooperation between the school and the local environment. Then it related to a lesser extent (12.84%) to the administrative and organizational area and a negligible extent to the financial area (1.83%). The school council influenced all areas of school operations. In non-public schools, in the opinion of ¼ of teachers, this body influenced administrative and organizational matters and to a slightly lesser extent (19.63%) in the teaching, educational, and financial areas. According to on average every sixth respondent from a non-public school, this body influenced the area of cooperation between the school and the local environment. In public schools, the greatest impact of the school board, in the opinion of over 30% of respondents, was in the area of teaching and education and cooperation between the school and the local environment. On average, every third respondent from a public school indicated the financial administrative, and organizational areas. According to 20.18% of teachers from public schools and 6.54% from non-public schools, the student rights advocate operated in the teaching and educational field. On average, every tenth person from a public school indicated the level of cooperation between the school and the local community. In both types of schools, this body did not influence other areas. The research results are presented in Table 4.

Table 7. The influence of social bodies on the areas of activity of non-public and public schools

Social bodies	School status	Administrative and organizational		Teaching and educational		Financial		Cooperation between the school and the local environment	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
School board	NP	27	25,23	21	19,63	21	19,63	16	14,95
	P	28	25,69	33	30,28	31	28,44	33	30,28
Student rights advocate	NP	0	0	7	6,54	0	0	1	0,93
	P	0	0	22	20,18	0	0	10	9,17
Parents' council	NP	38	35,51	33	30,84	29	27,1	32	29,91
	P	38	34,86	27	24,77	76	69,72	63	57,8
Student council	NP	11	10,28	58	54,21	0	0	68	63,55
	P	14	12,84	59	54,13	2	1,83	58	53,21

NP – non-public school, P – public school   Source: own research

Conclusions

The research results provide preliminary knowledge about the socialization of management in the form of the activities of school social bodies, constituting the initial stage of research in this direction. The cognitive value of the article comes down to presenting new knowledge on an important but rarely discussed topic among researchers and spreading awareness of the organizational and educational potential of schools, especially among school leaders and employees.

A limitation of this article is the use of only a quantitative strategy to conduct the research and the number of questions in the survey, which was only part of a broader study. It would be worth undertaking additional quantitative and qualitative research in the future.

The conclusions that emerged after the data analysis are as follows:

1. Social bodies influence the activities of schools, although to a varying degree. In public schools, the school council has the greatest influence among social bodies, and in private schools, it is the parents' council.

2. Lack of reflection by teachers on increasing the powers of individual school bodies (over 48% of respondents in non-public schools and over 58% in public schools have no opinion on which social bodies should have a greater influence on the activities of schools). The question that arises is what is the reason for teachers' "lack of an opinion" on this subject.

3. It is positive that social bodies, especially the school council, parents' council, and student council in both types of schools, influence almost every school area to varying degrees. The greatest influence – and these are the differences in this respect in the comparison groups – in non-public schools is exercised by the parents' council and the school council in the administrative and organizational area, and in public schools, the school council in the teaching and educational area and cooperation between the school and the local community, and the parents' council in the area of financial.

Social bodies are part of the organizational structure of schools, however, based on the research conducted, it can be concluded that in the opinion of the largest group of school employees, which are teachers, they do not constitute a leading social force in terms of their influence on schools' activities. Schools have structures and therefore potential opportunities to shape school life. Perhaps the organizational culture of the school should be changed in a direction that would encourage school entities to participate more and create an inclusive community. Social bodies have the competence to support and meet the needs of community members and solve their problems. Additionally, the school includes the functioning of social bodies; it is an ideal place to perform and prepare to perform important functions in modern society through the development of social competencies and values – empowerment, cooperation, communication, mutual respect, autonomy, dialogue, participation and responsibility. Social bodies, as representatives of individual school groups, constitute a necessary bridge to articulate the needs of members of the school community, a source and "platform" for information exchange and joint meetings of educational entities.

It is important to consider these organizational structures as a whole, rather than as organizational units, rather than as a single formal unit. In many organizations there are automated small practices, and diagrams are drawn up so that the images, descriptions, and details are not stored. The effect of this is to reduce the wealth of opportunities that a school offers in this case through the socialization of management.

References

Bauer, N.T., Erdogan, B. (2012). Organizational Socialization Outcomes: Now and Into the Future, in: C.R. Warnbeg, (Ed.), The Oxford Handbook of Organizational Socialization (pp. 97-112). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Chapman, J.D., Boyd, W.L. (1986). Decentralization, devolution, and the school principal: Australian lessons on statewide educational reform. Educational Administration Quarterly nr 22(4), 2858.

Connors, L. (1978). School-Based Decision Making. Australia: School Commission.

Cudowska, A. (2018). Kultura szkoły stymulująca kształtowanie uczącej się wspólnoty. [School culture stimulating the formation of a learning community]. Kultura i Edukacja, nr 3(121), 129-141.

Dachler, H.P., Wilpert, B. (1978). Conceptual dimensions and boundaries of participation in organizations: a critical evaluation. Administrative Science Quarterly, nr 23, 139.

Doyle, J.L., Wells, S. (1996). LMS: the managerial climate and its effects on the interpersonal climate of the school. International Journal of Educational Management, nr 10(6), 32-41.

Driscoll, J.W. (1978). Trust and participation in organizational decision making as predictors of satisfaction. Academy of Management Journal, nr 21(1), 44-56.

Duke, D.L., Showers, B.K., Imber, M. (1980). Teachers and shared decision making: the costs and benefits of involvement. Educational Administration Quarterly, nr 16(1), 93-106.

English, P.S. (1979). The concept of leadership and the role of the school principal. Unicorn, 5(3), 294-303.

Fidler, B., Bowles, G. (1989). *Effective Local Management of Schools: A Strategic Approach.* Essex: Longman Industry and Public Service Management.

Gamage, D.T. (1996b, November). *Building partnerships towards the creation of effective schools: an Australian case study*. Paper presented at the ERAAARE Joint Conference, Singapore.

Gamage, D.T. (1996c). *School-Based Management: Theory, Research and Practice*. Colombo: Karunaratne and Sons Ltd.

Gamage, D.T., Pang, N.S. (2003). *Leadership and Management in Education: Developing Essential Skills and Competencies*. Hong Kong: The Chinese University Press.

Gamage, D., San Antonio, D. (2006). Effective Participatory School Administration, Leadership and Management: Does It Affect the Trust Levels of Stakeholders?. Retrieved from https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1066691.pdf.

Gamage, D.T., Sipple, P., Partridge, P. (1996). Research on school-based management in Victoria. Journal of Educational Administration, 34(1), 24-40.

Garibaldi, M., Josias, L. (2015). Designing schools to support socialization processes of students. Procedia Manufacturing, 3, 1587-1594.

Harchar, R.L., Hyle, A. (1996). Collaborative power: a grounded theory of administrative instructional leadership in the elementary school. Journal of Educational Administration, 34(3), 1529.

Hargreaves, D.H., Hopkins, D. (1991). *The Empowered School: The management and practice of development planning.* London: Cassell Educational Limited.

Hoy, W.K., Tarter, C.J. (1993). A normative theory of participative decision making in schools. Journal of Educational Administration, 31(3), 419.

Hunton, J.E., Hall, T.W., Price, K.H. (1998). The value of voice in participative decision making. Journal of Applied Psychology, 83(5), 788-797.

Jenkins Jr., G.D., Lawler III, E.E. (1981). Impact of employee participation in pay plan development. Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 28(1), 111-128.

Kefford, R. (1985). Clayton's participatory decision-making a dilemma for the school administrator. Unicorn, 11(2), 146-152.

King, R.A., Swanson, A.D. (1990). Resources for restructured schools: partnerships, foundations and volunteerism. Planning and Change, 21(2), 94-107.

Lawler III, E.E., Mohrman, S.A., Ledford Jr., G.E. (1992). Employee Involvement and Total Quality Management: Practices and Results in Fortune 1000 Companies. San Francisco: Jossey Bass Publishers.

Lienhart, A.M.C., Willert, H.J. (2002). Involving stakeholders in resolving school violence. NASSP Bulletin, 86(631), 32-43.

Lindelow, J., Bentley, S. (1989). Team management, in S.C. Smith, P.K. Piele (Eds.), School Leadership: Handbook for Excellence (pp. 135-151). Oregon: ERIC Clearinghouse on Educational Management.

Lindelow, J., Coursen, D., Mazzarella, J.A., Heynderickx, J.J., Smith, S.C. (1989). Participative decision-making. in S.C. Smith, P.K. Piele (Eds.), School Leadership: Handbook for Excellence (2nd ed., pp. 152-167). Oregon: ERIC Clearinghouse on Educational Management.

Locke, E.A., Schweiger, D.M. (1979). Participation in decision-making: one more look. Research in Organizational Behavior, 1, 265-359.

Louis, M.R. (1980). Surprise and sense making: What newcomers experience in entering unfamiliar organizational settings. Administrative Science Quarterly, 25, 226-251.

Mencel, M. (2009). Rada szkoły [School board]. Kraków: Impuls.

Mendel, M. (2019). Szkoła uspołeczniona: między odspołecznianiem i uspołecznieniem na nowo. Perspektywa pedagogiki miejsca wspólnego [The socialized school: between desocialization and socialization. The perspective of the pedagogy of a common place]. Pedagogika Społeczna, 1(71), 9-27.

Milerski, B., Śliwerski, B. (2000). *Pedagogika. Leksykon* [Pedagogy. Lexicon]. Warszawa: PWN.

Okoń, W. (2007). *Nowy słownik pedagogiczny* [New pedagogical dictionary]. Warszawa: Żak.

Rosener, J.B. (1990). Ways women lead. Harvard Business Review, 68(6), 119-125

Śliwerski, B. (2008). Klinika szkolnej demokracji [School democracy clinic]. Kraków: Impuls.

Śliwerski, B. (2011-2012). Dokąd zmierza polska edukacja? [Where is Polish education heading?]. Neodidagmata, 33/34, 65-76.

Sowińska, H. (1992). Procesy uspołecznienia szkoły – szanse i zagrożenia. [School socialization processes – opportunities and threats]. Neodidagmata, 21, 23-31.

Ustawa z dn. 14 grudnia 2016 r. Prawo oświatowe. Dz.U. 2017, poz. 59. [Act of. December 14, 2016 Education law]. Retrieved from: https://isap.sejm.gov.pl/isap.nsf/download.xsp/WDU20170000059/U/D20170059Lj.pdf.

Vroom, V.H. (1960). *Some personality determinants of the effects of participation*. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: PrenticeHall, Inc.

Watkins, P. (1985). Collective strategies: collaborative approaches towards the administration of education. Unicorn, 11(2), 105-113.

Weiss, C.H., Cambone, J., Wyeth, A. (1992). Trouble in paradise: teacher conflicts in shared decision making. Educational Administration Quarterly, 28(3), 350-367.