SCHOOL'S CULTURAL DIVERSITY: WHAT IS THE DIFFERENCE BETWEEN "SCHOOL OF HAPPINESS" AND "SCHOOL - PRISON"?

Daiva Bubeliene
Kauno kolegija, Kaunas University of Applied Sciences, Lithuania

Gediminas Merkys
Lithuanian Association of Higher Education Institutions Trade Unions, Lithuania

Abstract. *Five years ago, a questionnaire for senior pupils "Safe School - A Safe Child" was launched in Lithuania. It is a standard inventory containing 160 primary items that are distributed into 38 sub-scales and ultimately into 8 psychometric scales with unusual goodness of fit. At the moment, 2072 pupils' answers appear on the basis of statistical rationing, and 40 different schools in the country are evaluated. A cluster analysis was carried out with scale estimates that reflect the child's psychological well-being and school well-being. In this way, schools were identified at the base of the rationale, which metaphorically converge into a "school of happiness" or a "school prison" model. Then, with the remaining inventory variables, their subscales, the discriminant analysis was carried out. The school type in the model was defined as a grouping variable. Such approach has made it possible to find out which variables, reflecting school's security and livelihood, define the mentioned types of schools. It turned out that the identified types of schools are characterized by such factors as the openness and accessibility of the director; participation of parents and students in school life; sticking to universally accepted, disputed rules; social and pedagogical involvement, sensitivity; avoiding to hide problems and misbehavior. The research data allow on the hypothesis's rights to formulate specific recommendations of the school life improvement for school leaders and educators.*

Keywords: "school of happiness", "school prison", "family educational milieu", „school culture".

Theoretical and practical context of the research

In the history of social sciences, we could find the precedents when the concepts-metaphors had a great heuristic-analytical potential. Let us remember the greatly popular A. Maslow's metaphor „Hierarchy of needs", the metaphor of "playing man" (Homo Ludens), the "ice" metaphor of K. Lewin, which was used to explain planned changes in the organization. From more recent examples it is worth mentioning Morgan's activities as "organization images", when the organization is compared to "mechanism", "organism", "brain", "spiritual prison" and so on. (Morgan, 1986; Huizinga, 1949; Pätzold, 2013). Morgan's metaphor of

spiritual prison started to be used for characterizing the school culture. There are more authors who emphasize that a school can be an authoritarian institution that existentially reminds a prison.

Thus, the concepts of "School of Happiness" and "School-prison" are metaphorical concepts responding to the Weber's "ideal type" epistemological concept. Like the concept of the "ideal bureaucrat", the lexical unit "school of happiness" is the ideal type. In reality, there is no such school, it is a construct of consciousness, a theoretical model to which a particular school (or group of them) can progressively converge. Analogically to the antipode of the "school of happiness", it is theoretically possible to construct an alternative ideal type of "school - prison". The actual school (or even the entire school network) in reality moves in a continuum between the "school of happiness" and "School - prison". From the history of education and education in the 20th century, we know that there were the waves of parental extreme disappointment (partly justified) with the official education system. For example, in the seventh decade of the 20th century in the West, gave birth to massive radical society "protests" against the existing educational system and the movement for the search of new, different school was initiated. In this context it is worth to mention the so-called "Deschooling" movement in the US, as well as the so-called "anti-pedagogics" (Antipädagogik), originated in Germany (Illich, 1971; Braunmühl, 1975; Jandrić, 2015). The search of the alternative school, that might be prominent for its distinctive culture, is still relevant (Malone, 2015; Cobb, 2014; Gülsen & Gülenay, 2014; Fisher, Pumpian, & Frey, 2012).

Postmodern democratic society brings the complex ideal of a dignified and happy person, the subjective quality of life and well-being, and a happy organization. It is promoted the economy of happiness, positive psychology, there is emphasized the importance of such concepts as perfect working place, sense of happiness and satisfaction with the daily work (MacConville & Rae, 2012; Graham, 2011; Hefferon & Boniwell, 2011; Ventegodt & Merrick, 2009; Smith & Patton, 2009; Pugno, Comim, & Bruni, 2008).

The working place of the student and the teacher is the school. In this broader context, the goal of a "School of happiness" seems to be quite meaningful and persuasive. Of course, there is no such complete and universally accepted theory of "School of happiness" today. If we talk about research in the relevant field (especially empirical), then the discourse of the "school of happiness" collides with other related discourses. These include: learning motivation and satisfaction with school, school security, healthy school, enabling learning environment, school social climate, school culture and school leadership, children's rights. It is important to mention semantically negative concepts: deviance, aggression and bullying in school (Hopson, Schiller, & Lawson, 2014; Conaway, 2014;

Bradshaw et al., 2014; Baker et al., 2003; Sergiovanni, 1991; Astor et al., 2010; Coldron & Boulton, 1996).

The paradox is that by exploring the above-mentioned quite different concepts, researchers usually apply the used empirical indicators, which often overlap or nearly overlap. On the whole "school of happiness" is a school that shows the quality of social relations among all participants of educational process (pupils, teachers, parents, and staff); social pedagogical relationships are based on such values as trust, solidarity and humanism. The school acts as an object of social attraction, it is good to be in school, to participate in its meaningful activities. The School of Happiness existentially does not coincide with hierarchical and authoritarian relations, the cult of competition, lack of solidarity, publicity and openness, unwillingness to discuss real problems, concealment of unpleasant events, and prevalence of bullying, violence and aggression (Merkys & Bubelienė, 2017). The "school prison" and its antipode "School of Happiness" is influenced by all subjects in the school community: school leaders, pedagogical and administrative staff, the family and, of course, the pupils themselves.

The empirical diagnostic research of the "School of Happiness" phenomenon has not only an academic meaning, but also has considerable practical relevance and applicability. Data-based school performance evaluation, data-based school culture change, etc. are becoming more and more popular. The research of the "School of Happiness" phenomenon is a source of reliable and essential information for educational projects (Guthrie & Schuermann, 2011). On the other hand, there may be a need to recognize a school that converges towards a "school prison". Such studies and their results can serve as a reason for the school founder or education administrators to initiate managerial and educational interventions to prevent the development of a crisis in school. Development and implementation of appropriate diagnostic tools, standardized questionnaires, and qualitative "ethnographic" methodologies is an important task for contemporary science and practice. Educational science and empirical social research would seem rather unfortunate if they only offered diagnostic tools for the "School of happiness". It is important to develop research that has a complex, conceptually rich structure of features to identify factors, managerial and educational tools that will help the school to form a "School of happiness".

Thus, this article illustrates a large-scale continuous empirical study that attempted to address the two above mentioned challenges: to develop diagnostic tools, as well as to identify factors and ways to create and nurture a "School of happiness".

Research Design

The survey uses the statistical archive data of the questionnaire "Safe School - Safe Child" (Merkys, Bagdonas, & Bubelienė, 2013). The current database is formed after the anonymous interviewing of 2072 senior pupils representing 39 different types of comprehensive schools. The presented study continues the research which was started in 2016. The sample of the primary survey was represented by 1078 senior students of 26 Lithuanian schools. The results of the first study have already been published (Merkys & Bubelienė, 2017). After doubling the sample size, it was expedient to repeat the study for several reasons. To begin with to check if it makes sense to see whether the psychometric statistics in the questionnaire have improved. Secondly, to find out if the regularities found in the larger sample repeated the results of 2016. Finally, it is trivial that the doubling of the sample increases the statistical reliability of the results.

*Table 1 **Scales and Primary indicators, reflecting the Phenomenon of „School of Happiness": percentages of acceptance and psychometric indicators***

(-) School Ability to Cope with Bullying, Vague Bullying Spread Cronbachs Alpha=0,89; Spearmen-Brown=0,98*	*Yes %*	*r it/tot*
Pupils bully each other even during the lessons	29,1 (49,7)	0,75
Pupils do not miss the opportunity to mock at each other's failures in the classroom	35,3 (44,5)	0,74
There are children who arbitrarily distribute my / my friends' photos online, for example in the Facebook	23,9 (53,3)	0,60
Bullying among the pupils is moved to the Internet, Facebook, and other media.	26,1 (50,6)	0,65
Bullying is widely spread in school	26,4 (53,1)	0,74
Bullying among students is a daily, permanent phenomenon	24,6 (53,8)	0,71
Mean of Acceptance	**27,57**	
Discomfort and Loss of Security Feeling in School **Cronbachs Alpha=0,84; Spearmen-Brown=0,98 ***	*YES %*	*r it/tot*
I almost have no friends at school	13,2	0,42
I do not feel safe at school	13,1	0,55
I do not feel good at school, I'd like to escape from it	27,3	0,65
I would never go to school again, if I could	26,2	0,61
I do not see any sence to be at school	16,2	0,68
School is stress	28,7	0,60
There is nothing interesting at school	22,3	0,64
Mean of Acceptance	**21,0**	
School as the object of social interest **Cronbachs Alpha=0,63; Spearmen-Brown=0,95 ***	*YES%*	*r it/tot*

I miss school, because I want to spend some time with my friends	43,4	0,38
I enjoy school	49,4	0,52
I feel that teachers appreciate me	53,1	0,41
School frieds, classmates appreaciate me	57,1	0,34
Mean of Acceptance	50,75	

The presented questionnaire has 160 primary indicators, which are summarized in 8 scales and 38 subscales. This article analyzes only 16 psychometric scales formed by factor validation (see Tables 1-2). The reason for a more detailed analysis of only a set of scales was the fact that the mentioned scales meaningfully correlated with each other. This research paper presents the study based on 73 primary indicators measured on a typical 5-grade Likert scale. The clustering variable - "School of Happiness" and its antipode "School prison" - are based on 17 primary indicators put into three psychometric scales. 56 primary variables reflecting the school's socioeducational environment and culture are reduced to 13 scales (see Table 2).

As it is usual in the questionnaire researching social attitudes, some of the semantics of primary features are positive, some of them are negative. Re-coded evaluations/estimates are marked with a sign of minus in brackets (-). The tables show the names of the scales, the primary indicators that make up the scales (or their typical examples) and the percentages of acceptance.

*Table 2 **Independent Variables: Scales Defining School Educational Environment, School Culture, and Family Educational Milieu***

Scale Title	N_{it}	Alfa	SB	Item examples
The atmosphere of openness, sensitivity, trust and sincerity at school	7	0,83	0,98*	If any pupil feels bad at school, the classmates notice it, ask, and offer help. I trust majority of teachers, I can talk to them about unusual topics
(-)Honest Response to Weaknesses, Events, Complaints (Avoiding Problem Hiding)	2	0,63	0,95*	If an unfortunate event happens, the school tries to hide everything. The school reaction to the complaints, reports of illness are slowly responded, all pretend that nothing has happened.
School regulations are clear, school is able to support order	4	0,72	0,97*	Larger misconduct at school does not go unresponsive, the director and class teacher always participate. The school has clear rules - everyone knows what is possible and what is not possible
The school principle is easy to reach, open to parents and pupils	3	0,81	0,98*	With the parents of the pupils, the school principle is willing to communicate.

				Director sincerely communicates with students, is not conceited.
Disappointment and dissatisfaction with the teachers	2	0,70	0,98*	I am disappointed with the teachers. The majority of teachers irritates me
(-) The lack of pupils' organizations that would support the order within the school	4	0,67	0,96*	It is in the interest of students to maintain order and discipline within the school during the breaks. If there is scuffle in a classroom, in a corridor, there will be disciples who will calm the bullies down.
The lack of pupils' organizations that would support the order within the school yard	5	0,67	0,94*	When things go wrong in the school yard, most students pretend not to see or know anything. Pupils themselves do not allow conflicts, aggression in the school yard
Lack of Social Pedagogical Control inside the school (indifference)	6	0,77	0,97*	If something goes wrong at school, teachers, supervisors usually do not see anything, do not interfere. (-) School premises are constantly monitored (supervisors, teachers, video cameras, etc.)
Lack of Social Pedagogical Control outnside the school (indifference)	5	0,68	0,96*	(-) If something goes wrong in school surroundings or in the yard (for eg. conflict, fights, etc.), teachers, the supervisors come immediately, intervene. What is happening in the school yard, teachers, supervisors are not very interested.
Parents demonstrate the indifference to child problems, tend to moralize	3	0,74	0,96*	Even when I feel very bad, parents do not notice it. If I talk about the problems or ask something, the parents are screaming, condemning, reading the morals.
Child's confidence in parents	3	0,83	0,98*	I can talk to my parents on any subject, on any topic If I get into trouble, I can turn to my parents for help and I know I will get it
Parent interest in school, involvement	4	0,78	0,98*	If possible, parents attend each parent's meeting. Parents are interested in school life.
Social control of the child in the family	7	0,82	0,98*	Parents know the plans of my day, where I will go, what I will do. Parents know my best friends and acquaintances.

*Designation: N_{it} -item number in the scale; **alfa** – Cronbach –α coeficient; **SB** – Spearmen-Brown, coeficient; * -. predicted coefficient value when item number is 12.*

Usually, there is an extremely high correlation between the mean in the scales and percentages of acceptance, which are much more meaningful than the mean, so we prefer the percentages to mean (Borg & Gabler, 2002). The psychometric quality of the formed scales is good, the item to total correlations and the meanings of the reliability coefficients are high enough. Some scales are very short, what means that the meanings of Cronbach alpha coefficients are not always eloquent. For this reason, they were calculated using the meanings of Spearmen-Brown coefficients. They were calculated while using Spearman-Brown prophesy formula when the number of test items is 12. There were received extremely high coefficient (0.94-0.98). The empirical distributions of all scales are close to the theoretical normal distribution. Scale raw scores are transferred to the standard normal distribution z-scale.

K-mean cluster analysis of was performed with three scales reflecting the phenomenon of "school of happiness", and a new grouping variable was formed. The latter differentiates pupils into two large groups - those who evaluated their school (according to its converging to the "school of happiness" model) positively or not positively.

The problem of how to reliably identify a "school of happiness" and its antipode on the basis of social survey data is quite a problem. After all, public opinion is always a statistical process that creates an object of stochastic expression. Hence, in one and the same school, whether it is a 'school of happiness' or its antipode, there will always be both types of pupils who evaluate their school differently. Of course, the relative distribution of pupils representing opposite views and opinions about their school will be different in schools. Although the source of scientific information in this study is the pupils' opinion, the factual holder of the measured qualities (the "school of happiness" versus its antipode) is precisely the specific school, not the statistical group of pupils representing different schools. So, a correct and very reliable identifying of a school type is rather tricky. Such recognition can only be approximate.

Taking this into consideration, the school identification and classification procedure was triangulated. It was decided not to rely exceptional on the K-Mean cluster analysis, which classifies the students. From the means of the school scores according to the three scales of "happiness school" (see Table 1), a new matrix of secondary data was formed, which became the raw material for hierarchical cluster analysis. The novelty is that the school itself is already the unit of analysis. While choosing the Euclidean square as the measurement of the distance, and for the cluster formation using the Ward method, there has been performed a hierarchical cluster analysis of all the schools involved. 39 schools were initially classified into three clusters and later into two clusters (see Table 4). This classification also has a stochastic constraint. If the school was recognized as a "school of happiness" or its antipode in the cluster analysis process, then, in the

statistical data matrix, all pupils in that school are assigned to the appropriate type, regardless of the actual individual response profile.

Thus, the attempt to recognize the "school of happiness" and its antipode was based on statistical triangulation. In one case, two K-means were used to find two groups of pupils who contrasted with the school. In other case, while using hierarchical cluster analysis a number of different types of schools significantly differing from their group estimates were discovered. This created another grouping variable. The two grouping variables formed by the statistical classification are of two steps, where one step reflects the relative convergence of the school towards the type of "school of happiness", while the other step reflects the relative convergence of the school towards that type of school antipode – "school – prison". Further on, the one and the other grouping of variables applying the discriminatory analysis model were defined as the dependent variables, while the measurements of the 13 sub-units reflecting the school culture and the family educational milieu were defined as independent variables. Such a rigid classification of schools, inevitably marked by a stochastic element, does not contradict both: the theory and the realistic life-understanding. Each school is a very heterogeneous social unit. Each school has professionally stronger and weaker teachers. The same could be said of pupils' cultural capital and social intelligence. Thus, the idea of soft classification and the convergence of a particular school towards one or another theoretical type of school is persuasive and reasonable.

Results. Attempt to identify the "School of Happiness" and its Antipode – "School – Prison"

After performing K-means cluster analysis, it turned out that from the point of view of interpretation, the simplest is a model of two clusters (see Table 3). The key to cluster interpretation is the profile of z-scale measurements inside the cluster, more precisely, the distance between cluster centers.

Table 3 *Categorization of students into contrasting opinions about their school; model of two clusters, prevalence of statistical types (%), N = 2072; K-means method; cluster centers that are presented on a standardized z-scale*

Clusters and their prevalence (%)	**Cluster 1** **47,8 %**	**Cluster 2** **52,2 %**	Distance between cluster centers
Classification scales	*Relatively positive diagnostic profile (school of happiness)*	*Relatively negative diagnostic profile (the antipode of school of happiness)*	*Difference of measurements in the z-scale*
School as the object of social attraction	*0,56*	*-0,50*	*1,06*

Discomfort and loss of security sense in the school.	*-0,77*	*0,62*	*1,39*
School Ability to Cope with Bullying, Vague Bullying Spread	*0,69*	*-0,62*	*1,31*

By the way, it is large enough, averaging almost 1.25 standard deviations. The first cluster, with a relative prevalence of 47.8%, includes students who tend positively to evaluate their school according to three scales (or 17 primary indicators). The second cluster (with a prevalence of 52.2%) groups pupils who tend to evaluate their school not so positively. After evaluating confidence interval for the relative frequency $\alpha = 0.00$, both groups practically do not differ in their degree of distribution. Thus, according to how the school is assessed (school of happiness or conditional antipode), the population of pupils splits more or less halfway.

*Table 4 **Classification of 39 schools into contrast groups by converging them to the two types: "school of happiness" and its relative antipode; three and two cluster models; distance measure - Euclidean distance square, cluster formation by Ward method***

3 cluster model	Cluster 1	Cluster 2	Cluster 3
Number of schools	7	12	20
Interpretation of clusters	"School of happiness"	Moving towards "School of happiness"	Antipode
2 cluster model	Cluster 1		Cluster 2
Number of schools	19		20
Interpretation of clusters	"School of happiness"		Preliminary antipode of "School of happiness"

The results of hierarchical cluster analysis are reflected at the Table 4. Seven schools out of 39 investigated schools compile a highly valid cluster with very strong "school of happiness" features. Next, in the three cluster model, even 12 schools out of 39 ones fall into the middle, intermediate state. However, the analysis of scale measurements within a cluster still allows those schools to be classified as a "school of happiness". Finally, there are 20 schools out of 39, which are clearly attributable to the antipode type of the "school of happiness". By the way, the latter cluster is very stable, its structure is unchangeable in neither 2 cluster nor 3 cluster models.

The stability of this school cluster (statistical type) is an argument for its structural validity. Dendrogram configuration and fusion measures have shown

that clusters 1 and 2 can be combined into a single cluster. In such a way a 2-cluster model is constructed which consists of the 19 above-mentioned schools, that are close to the type of 'school of happiness' and 20 schools that can be defined as a preliminary antipode for "School happiness".

Theoretically it is possible that the two contrasting groups of pupils that were identified while using the K means method, should be statistically related to the school classification results obtained by hierarchical cluster analysis. Because of the aforementioned stochastic element, which is characterized by every statistical classification, there is no reason to expect correlations to one unit. On the other hand, a zero correlation (or worse, a negative correlation) should be treated as a fiasco of a triangulation study. After all, it is not clear which of the two classifications to trust if their results are totally irrelevant or mutually neglecting each other. The degree of the coincidence between the two classifications was verified by the chi-square and cross-tabulation method. The resulting Cramer V coefficient is somewhat small ($V = 0.33$; $p = 0.000$). It would be possible to state that it would be optimal if it reached 0.50-0.70. However, as long as we do not have more accurate diagnostic tools, we can assume that both of our classifications do not deny each other and at least partially correctly reflect the theoretical "ideal" and "fair" classification.

Attempt to identify the factors that shape the identities of the "school of happiness" and its antipode

A hypothetical statement was made in advance for the future result: a significant result difference of both discriminatory analyzes would be considered that the factors and variables that would allow a reliable separation of the contrasting school types in question were not detected. If the results of discriminatory analysis are at least relatively overlapping, it will be considered that we have managed to identify variables and factors that still make it possible to separate the "school of happiness" from its antipode. Table 5 summarizes the results of discriminant analysis.

The scales included in the analytical model, and reflecting the school's educational environment and culture, the family's educational milieu in the whole, very well distinguishes (discriminates) the grouping variables. Differences between the mean of the comparison groups in all cases satisfy a very high level of reliability $p = 0.000$. Verification was carried out by Wilks' Lambda test, specially designed for discriminatory analysis. In the case of large samples even very small differences could be statistically very reliable. Therefore, taking the Cohen Effective Measurement Concept as a basis for this research stage, the modular significance of the difference of the mean of the comparative groups on the z-scale were controlled as well (Cohen, 1988).

In the case of the separation of two contrasting pupils' groups of, the minimum difference between group means was 0.60, the maximum was 1.11, and the average was 0.78 of z-scale point. In the case of separation of contrast groups in schools, the minimum difference between group averages was 0.31, maximum - 0.64, and average - 0.49 of z-scale point. Such values are significantly above the minimum Cohen effective Measurement (0.20). Hence, the differences between the contrast groups of the researched pupils, as well as the differences between the contrast groups of the schools on all 13 scales, are large, significant and deserve theoretical interpretations.

Discriminant analysis is an attractive multidimensional statistical method that shows not only the differences between groups in many analytical models, but also shows which feature distinguishes (discriminates) the most contrasting groups most strongly. It is demonstrated by the SM coefficient of the structural matrix. (see columns 6 and 10 in Table 5).

The mentioned coefficient is interpreted in the same way as the factor weight. Columns 1 and 6 of the commented table are compiled by a ranking order. It is symptomatic that all 13 features that reflect the school's educational environment, school culture, and the family educational milieu, are important for the identity of the "School of happiness". However, it is interesting which features (and factors) are most important here.

Equally important is if the influence rate of these factors in both discriminatory analysis models at least minimally coincide. For example, the readings in columns 4 and 8 of Table 5 were defined as rank queues and the Spearman rank correlation coefficient was calculated with a value of 0.52 in this case. The overlap between rank queues is of medium size. In any case, there is no need to talk about the failure of the study. That would be the case if the correlation coefficient mentioned were zero or worse - negative. There are even a few variables out of 13, which in both models occupy a relatively high position in terms of discriminatory function.

A well-discriminating variable may be regarded the one in which the SM is at least 0.50. So "School of Happiness" from its antipode in both models is well discriminated by the independent variables such as "Disappointment and dissatisfaction with teachers", "Clear rules and ability to maintain order", "An atmosphere of openness, sensitivity, trust and sincerity in school".

Some of the variables may be regarded as "gone astray" in the compiled rankings. In the case of pupils' contrast groups, they find themselves in the middle of the ranking and, in the case of discriminatory analysis of school contrast groups, they rank high in the ranking. A typical example is "The lack of social pedagogical control: the indifference of supervisors and teachers".

*Table 5 **Results of discriminatory analysis of two different grouping variables. Labeling: + School of Happiness (-) the antipode of School of Happiness; group means in z-scale; modular significance of mean differences; p reliability; SM Coefficient structural matrix coefficient***

Dependable variable: "School of Hapiness" versus "antipode"		2 contrastive groups of pupils; df1=1, df2=1695				2 contrastive groups of schools; df1=1, df2=825			
Independent variables: Scales reflecting school culture and family milieu	Gr.	Mean	Diff.	p	SM coef.	Mean	Diff.	p	SM coef.
1	*2*	*3*	*4*	*5*	*6*	*7*	*8*	*9*	*10*
Disappointment and dissatisfaction with teachers	+	-0,61	1,11	0,000	0,77	-0,26	0,56	0,000	0,66
	-	0,50				0,32			
The atmosphere of openness, sensitivity, trust and sincerity in the school	+	0,50	0,94	0,000	- 0,61	0,22	0,55	0,000	-0,62
	-	-0,44				-0,33			
The atmosphere of openness, sensitivity, trust and sincerity in the school	+	-0,52	0,90	0,000	0,59	-0,28	0,59	0,000	0,68
	-	0,38				0,31			
Principled response to the evils, events, complaints (Avoidance of problem hiding)	+	0,48	0,85	0,000	- 0,55	0,24	0,52	0,000	-0,60
	-	-0,37				-0,28			
Clear rules and ability to maintain order	+	0,45	0,79	0,000	- 0,50	0,27	0,61	0,000	-0,71
	-	-0,34				-0,34			
Lack of social pedagogical control: indifference of supervisors and teachers	+	-0,43	0,76	0,000	0,48	-0,28	0,64	0,000	0,74
	-	0,33				0,36			
Parental indifference to child problems and moralization	+	-0,43	0,76	0,000	0,48	-0,17	0,35	0,000	0,38
	-	0,33				0,17			

Parental interest in school, involvement	+	0,39	0,71	0,000	- 0,44	0,17	0,40	0,000	-0,44
	-	-0,32				-0,23			
Lack of student self-organization to maintain order in the yard	+	-0,36	0,69	0,000	0,42	-0,24	0,62	0,000	0,71
	-	0,33				0,38			
Child's confidence in parents	+	0,38	0,67	0,000	- 0,41	0,15	0,31	0,000	-0,34
	-	-0,29				-0,16			
Accessibility of the director, openness to parents and pupils	+	0,38	0,68	0,000	- 0,41	0,20	0,45	0,000	-0,50
	-	-0,30				-0,25			
Social control of the child in the family	+	0,36	0,64	0,000	- 0,39	0,15	0,33	0,000	-0,37
	-	-0,28				-0,18			
Lack of pupils' self-organization to maintain order in the school	+	-0,32	0,60	0,000	0,35	-0,17	0,43	0,000	0,48
	-	0,28				0,26			
Characteristics of the model		Personal value=0,76; cannonic correlation coefficient=0,66; Wilks' Lambda=,568; Chi-square=954,735; df=13; p=0,000. Correct classification **-80,5%**				Personal value =0,20; cannonic correlation coefficient =0,41; Wilks' Lambda=,835; Chi-square=311,509; df=13; p=0,000. Correct classification **-67,4%**			

It is symptomatic that the factors of family milieu in general are relatively weaker than the factors of school culture that allow to distinguish "school of happiness" from its antipode. This tendency is evident in both models of discriminatory analysis. However, the family factor is quite important because the differences in group averages are high.

Discussion and conclusions

The idea of conducting a repeated empirical study by doubling the sample of the study was successful. There are purified factors that construct or weaken the identity of "School of happiness". It is quite problematic, while relying on the methodology of numerous pupils' social survey, to recognize the type of "school of happiness" and the factors that determine the identity of this school. Apparently, it should be based on multimodal, triangular access, additionally qualitative-ethnographic methods, participatory observation, and so on. However, from the point of view of both educational practice and theory and methodology,

it is important to know the specific indicators, the features of the 'character' and the culture of the educational organization, which would allow a reliable diagnosis of the 'school of happiness'. It is equally important to know precisely the main pedagogical factors, managerial levers, which can help to form the identity of such school, to gradually lead the state of a particular individual school towards the corresponding favorable type. From the point of view of educational practice, modern school management, it is no less important to recognize a school that is moving away from the type of happy school and converging towards a school-prison type.

The authors of this article are self-critical in their results, acknowledge their relative limitations. Let us remember that the relatively low correlations of the degree of overlap between different classifications and the factors that shape the identity of the "school of happiness" are already discussed. However, even at this stage of research, despite the relative limitations of the data obtained, it is already possible to formulate relatively reliable, empirically tested knowledge and specific recommendations for educational practice and science.

A particular school could be said to convert towards a type of "school of happiness" if it:
1)   provides a feeling of safety, tries to create a non-aggressive environment, provides many interesting and meaningful activities for students, they want to go to school;
2)   is able to control and manage the spread of bullying;
3)   enables the students feeling valued, respected by both: friends and teachers, inspires their wish to be with friends.

Of course, the principle of inversion is also valid here; the school goes to the antipode of the "school of happiness" if it:
1)   lacks security, interesting and meaningful activities, provides a lot of stress and a desire to break out of school;
2)   does not cope with bullying;
3)   does not encourage the pupils to respect the school friends and teachers.

A particular school can commence in a purposeful way towards the type of "School of happiness" if:
1)   a specific type of culture is created in the school and certain educational principles are applied;
2)   there is a certain attitude of the pupil's family, towards the child and the school, the family does not stay away from school and co-operates with it.

The following moments of school culture should be mentioned and educational principles applied:
1)   The atmosphere of sensitivity, trust and sincerity must be created in the school; if something is wrong, the surrounding people (pupils,

educators) should notice, react, help; pupils should not be afraid to open up, ask questions, talk on different topics.

2) In the case of an unpleasant event at school, "cluttering", concealment must be avoided; publicity and a principled assessment of the event should be evaluated.

3) There must be clear rules in the school that are cordially followed; there should be an adequate reaction towards the violation of rules.

4) The headmaster must be open and easily accessible to pupils and parents, to communicate sincerely and subjectively, do not demonstrate social distance.

5) The school must have a critical mass of teachers who deserve the respect and trust of their pupils, and do not disappoint students. Schoolchildren's disillusionment with teachers, annoyance about their position or activity is one of the strongest factors driving a particular school away from the ideal "school of happiness".

If the school lacks the five above mentioned aspects, then such a school will move away from the "School of happiness" and commences towards its antipode.

The following aspects of the pupil's family and parenting are to be mentioned, which contribute to the formation of the "school of happiness" in a particular school:

1. child's trust in parents (the child can talk to his parents in any situation). While in trouble, the child knows he will be helped.

2. Parents are interested in school, are involved in its affairs, attend school events and parent meetings.

3. The social control of the child in the family is appropriate (parents know the timetable of the child, the plans of the day and the week, are interested in who makes up the circle of the child's friends, are interested in grades, warn of possible risks, and explain the possible consequences).

4. Parents are sincerely interested in the problems of the child, they themselves notice, feel in time if something happens to him. Facing the child's failure or problems, the parents avoid quarrels and moralization.

If families, that lack the above mentioned four things, are dominating, it is likely that such a school will be away of the "School of happiness". In order to construct the identity of the "School of happiness" the efforts of both: school and the family must be synchronized while developing the "School of happiness". These efforts must be consistent and focused.

References

Astor, R.A., Guerra, N., & Van Acker, R. (2010). How can we improve school safety research? *Educational Researcher. 39*(1), 69 – 78. DOI: 10.3102/0013189X09357619

Baker, J.A., Dilly, L.J., Aupperlee, J.L., & Patil, S.A. (2003). The developmental context of school satisfaction: schools as psychologically healthy environments. *School Psychology Quarterly. 18*(2), 206- 221.

Borg, I., & Gabler, S. (2002). Zustimmungsanteile und Mittelwerte von Liker-skalierten Items. *ZUMA Nachrichten*, *26*, 50, 7–25.

Bradshaw, C.P., Waasdorp, T.E., Debnam, K.J., & Johnson, S.L. (2014). Measuring school climate in High schools: a focus on safety, engagement, and the environment. *Journal of School Health. 84*, 593-604

Braunmühl, E. von (1975). *Antipädagogik.* Neuauflage: tologo verlag, Leipzig 2006.

Cobb, N. (2014). Climate, culture and collaboration: The key to creating safe and supportive schools. *Techniques: Connecting Education & Careers*, *89*(7), 14-19.

Cohen, J. (1988). *Statistical power analysis for the behavioral sciences*. 2nd ed. New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Coldron, J., & Boulton, P. (1996). What do parents mean when they talk about „Discipline" in relation to their children's schools? *British Journal of sociology of education*, *17,* 1, 53-64.

Conaway, J. (2014). *Public and school safety: Risk assessment, perceptions and management strategies*. New York: Nova Science Publishers, Inc.

Fisher, D., Pumpian, I., & Frey, N. (2012). *How to create a culture of achievement in your school and classroom*. Alexandria, Va: ASCD.

Graham, C. (2011). *The pursuit of happiness: An economy of well-being*. Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institution Press.

Gülsen, C., & Gülenay, G.B. (2014). The principal and healthy school climate. *Social Behavior & Personality: An International Journal, 42*, 93-100. DOI:10.2224/sbp.2014.42.0.S93

Guthrie, W.J., & Schuermann, P. (2011). *Leading schools to success: constructing and sustaining high-performing learning cultures*. USA: SAGE.

Hefferon, K., & Boniwell, I. (2011). *Positive psychology: Theory, research and applications*. Maidenhead, Berkshire, England: McGraw-Hill Education.

Hopson, L.M., Schiller, K.S., & Lawson, H.A. (2014). Exploring linkages between school climate, behavioral norms, social supports, and academic success. *Social Work Research. 38*(4), 197-209. DOI:10.1093/swr/svu017

Huizinga, J. (1949). *Homo ludens: A study of the play element in culture*. Routledge & Kegan Paul: London, Boston and Henley.

Illich, I. (1972). *Deschooling society*. Retrieved from http://www.arvindguptatoys.com/ arvindgupta/DESCHOOLING.pdf

Jandrić, P. (2015). Deschooling Virtuality 2.0. *Concept*, *6*(2), 1-10.

MacConville, R., & Rae, T. (2012). *Building happiness, resilience and motivation in adolescents: A positive psychology curriculum for well-being*. London: Jessica Kingsley Publishers.

Malone, D. (2015). Culture: A potential challenge for parental involvement in schools. *Delta Kappa Gamma Bulletin, 82*(1), 14-18.

Merkys, G., & Bubelienė, D. (2016). "Laimės mokyklos" formavimosi prielaidos: šeimos ir mokyklos vaidmuo. *Pedagogika, 122*(2), 33 – 48.

Merkys, G., Bagdonas, A., & Bubelienė, D. (2013). Vaiko ir mokyklos saugumo vertinimo klausimynas: indikatoriai ir faktorinė validacija. *Socialinis ugdymas. 3*(35), 52-61.

Morgan, G. (1986). *Images of Organization*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.

Pätzold, H. (2013). Images of the School – Images of the Organisation. *Research on Steiner Education. 4,* 1, 111-122.

Pugno, M., Comim, F., & Bruni, L. (2008). *Capabilities and happiness*. Oxford: OUP Oxford.

Sergiovanni, Th.J. (1991). *The Principalship: A Reflective Practice Perspective*, 2nd ed. Boston: Allyn and Bacpon.

Smith, E., & Patton, W. (2009). School students and part-time work: Workplace problems and challenges. *Youth Studies Australia, 28*(3), 21-31.

Ventegodt, S., & Merrick, J. (2009). *Health and happiness from meaningful work: Research in quality of working life*. Hauppauge, NY: Nova Science Publishers, Inc.