

**University of Pécs
'Education and Society'
Doctoral School of Education**

Krisztián Széll

**CLIMATE AND EFFECTIVENESS IN PRIMARY SCHOOLS
WITH A LOW SOCIO-ECONOMIC STATUS**

In focus: resilient and vulnerable schools

Theses of Doctoral (PhD) Dissertation

Supervisor

**Prof. Dr. Katalin R. Forray
professor emeritus**

**Pécs
2017**

Designating the research topic

Empirical research results have proven that children from a low socio-economic background are at a disadvantage already when they enter the school and that disadvantage is maintained or even increased all throughout the school years (Havas 2008). An additional point is that students who are at a disadvantage from several aspects show greater probability of not finishing their studies (Liskó 2008). This determinism can be largely attributed to the selectional mechanism of the educational system (Tóth et al 2010).

It can be concluded that the selection and segregation have not been reduced in the Hungarian educational system as whole in the past decades, and this tendency negatively impacts student, school and educational effectiveness (Forray–Hegedűs 2003; Forray 2009a; Kertesi–Kézdi 2009, 2012, 2014, 2016; Havas–Zolnay 2011; Papp Z. 2011, 2013; Hajdu et al 2014). According to the majority of studies, the reasons for unsuccessfulness are poverty at family and settlement level, disadvantageous – and many times latent – discrimination, territorial segregation, free choice of school, language disadvantage, motivation deficit, insufficient relationship between the family and the school, as well as the quality of school educational activities, quality and pedagogical practices of teachers (Forray 1992, 2009a, 2009b; Liskó 2002; Réger 2002; Forray–Hegedűs 2003; Orsós 2004; Kertesi–Kézdi 2005, 2012, 2014; Cserti Csapó 2006; Havas 2008; Nahalka–Zempléni 2014; Fehérvári 2015, 2016; Berényi 2016).

Due to a selective school system, instead of moderating them, the majority of domestic schools conveys, reproduces, many times even reinforces social inequalities and the impact of disadvantages stemming from adverse social situation. Research dealing with the effectiveness of Hungarian education system unambiguously indicate the strong relationship between family background and the students' performance in school (Balázsi–Horváth 2011; Balázsi et al 2010, 2013; OECD 2013, 2014; Csapó et al 2009, 2014; Fehérvári–Széll 2014). It has to be emphasised that the effect of family background primarily applied through the general social composition (Balázsi et al 2010, 2013), i.e. the student composition of the school and its socio-economic status provides a stronger explanation of student performance than the family background of individual students.

The socio-economic status of schools provided in the dissertation in all cases signifies the school level average of the socio-economic status of students attending the school; it can be determined along the line of factors such as financial situation, social benefits, as well as the parents' labour market situation and their level of education. My dissertation focuses on primary schools of low socio-economic status; the six- and eight-grade high schools operating on the level of primary school but bearing completely different characteristics are left out of the analysis. I define *primary schools of low socio-economic status* as schools in which the proportion of students with disadvantageous, adverse socio-economic background attending the school is higher than the average.

I regard the school's fundamental purpose to be ensurance of quality education guaranteeing the acquisition of basic competences, one of the key tasks may be to moderate the difference between students arising from their different background characteristics (origin, social situation, innate abilities, etc.) which may lead to differences in further education and labour market opportunities as well as to differences in objective and subjective life conditions. In my opinion, the school should be able to develop basic skills and competences needed for establishment of general well-being (for example, mathematical-logical operations, reading comprehension) in all students, irrespective of their family and socio-economic background. This is why it is increasingly important to create and develop factors which can positively influence school effectiveness in schools educating large numbers of children of disadvantageous socio-economic background. Relevant information for the understanding of these factors may come from the comparison of low socio-economic schools with outstanding effectiveness (resilient schools) and low socio-economic schools with very weak effectiveness (vulnerable schools).

Aim of the research

A modern education policy which validates aspects of fairness and attempts to ensure better quality and more effective education work in schools requires science-based research, the results of which deepen our knowledge of a given education policy issue and by revealing new relationships and aspects set new research directions, all of which supports the development of the educational system based on expertise. It is therefore crucial, when talking about ensuring high quality education, to have as much knowledge and empirical results at our disposal about the factors correlating and affecting the quality of educational work in schools with large numbers of children of disadvantageous socio-economic background. With my research results I aim to contribute to this professional discourse.

In my opinion, the school is an entity surpassing the totality of its actors, in other words, explanations built on the activities and performance of the individuals do not make a school's activities, performance, aims comprehensible. Numerous research shows that the school context, i.e. the combination of school level indicators (average, ratio, etc.), school collective and teaching staff fundamentally determine the students' individual effectiveness (cf. e.g. Rutter et al 1979; Rutter 1983; Mortimore et al 1988; Oakes 1989; Sammons et al 1994; Talbert–McLaughlin 1999; Pusztai 2009; Lannert–Nagy 2006; Masten et al 2008; Bread et al 2009; MacNeil et al 2009; Gu–Johansson 2013; Moller et al 2013; Bascia 2014; Bacskai 2015; Sági 2016; Szemerszki 2015). This type of education ecology approach interprets teaching-learning processes in different contexts. The analysis of school context, the analysis of school level and school collective processes may bring us closer to understanding the mechanisms in low-status schools.

My starting point therefore is to approach the holistic operation of a school, consequently, I primarily look at the school as an organisation, and I attempt to identify and analyse schools and groups of schools. At the same time, I do not disregard the fact that

schools show an individualistic feature besides the holistic one. There is therefore a mutual interaction between the student's and the school's world: we can understand the student's school performance and decisions only by taking into account both the individual and school level effects on the student at the same time (contextual analysis). In my dissertation I study school context firstly through differential analysis, secondly through binomial logistic regression and finally through contextual analysis.

From the point of view of my analysis, it is important to note that schools of low socio-economic status do not form a unified group regarding their educational work and effectiveness. There are schools that are more successful and there are those that accommodate themselves to the teaching-learning situations and tasks which pose greater challenges and are generated by socially less advantageous student composition. In other words, the differences between the schools may influence student performance irrespective of the student's family background and their socio-economic status. In order to capture the differences between schools, I introduce two school types, which embody the different school contexts. I define those schools as *resilient schools* which achieve high added value (upper quarter) at the National Assessment of Basic Competencies despite a disadvantageous social, economic and cultural student composition (lower quarter). As opposed to the above, I call those schools *vulnerable schools*, which are not able to achieve notable results with a disadvantageous social, economic and cultural student composition, i.e. their socio-economic status and the results they achieve at the National Assessment of Basic Competencies are equally low (lower quarter).

The aim of my dissertation is to reveal the different contextual characteristics of the different groups of schools defined along the lines of school effectiveness and socio-economic status. In other words, the focus of the dissertation is the analysis of differences (and characteristics) appearing in basic characteristics of the schools, as well as the investigation of compensating for the disadvantage and creating opportunities in low-status schools. The goal of my research is an analysis that combines quantitative (questionnaire survey, competence assessment) and qualitative (interviews with the teachers and the school master, classroom observation) elements, focusing on the school level, moving along the lines of school effectiveness, resilience and climate analysis, taking into account the results achieved at the National Assessment of Basic Competencies, the socio-economic status of the students and the student composition, climate and internal environment of the school.

The novelty of my research is, on the one hand, the study methodology I developed (calculation of added value of the school education, creation of groups of schools), and, on the other hand, an analysis focusing on two groups of schools (resilient versus vulnerable) which are each others' reference points, along this point the analysis would reveal the different contextual features of both outstanding and poorly performing schools in low socio-economic status.

Research questions, hypotheses, methods and data sources

In my dissertation I am basically looking for an answer to the question which school factors induce differences between successful (resilient) and unsuccessful (vulnerable) primary schools in a similar disadvantageous position from a socio-economic aspect. According to my main topic and aim, my main research question can be broken into further research questions:

1. What differences can be seen in school level characteristics and background data of the two studied groups of schools?
2. What differences can be seen in the individual impact of a multiple disadvantageous situation, if we take into account the different school context of resilient and vulnerable school groups?
3. What differences can be found in the climate and teaching attitude patterns among studied school groups recognised by their educators?

In order to provide a response to my questions, I used the primary school site level (2012–2015) and student level database of the National Assessment of Basic Competencies as my basic data resource, which provides grounds for the study of school performance and socio-economic status, as well as data further related school characteristics. I complemented information gained from the above with contents derived from Statistical data of institutions of public education (KIR-STAT: 2014/2015) (such as student number, teachers number, age distribution). Mapping of the school climate, the related teachers' opinions, attitudes, goals and competencies is based on the results concerning primary school teachers of the online teacher panel survey's *first* (2013) and *second wave* (2014), which studies the factors influencing teachers' work. During the teacher panel research in October 2013, a large-scale representative online questionnaire survey was conducted among educators and school masters arching over the whole spectrum of public education, from kindergarten to secondary school; and a year after, new data recording took place primarily among educators and school masters who have participated in the first wave, too. The surveys were based on probability samples stratified on the basis of district (50 districts), region, county and resident population.¹

Apart from quantitative data sources, I have also two qualitative field work experience and interview material, which focused on schools with the majority of students being in disadvantageous, adverse situation. Within the framework of one of the fieldwork I visited eight state-maintained primary schools in Pest county in Spring 2014², and within the framework of the other research I included six primary schools from two counties in Eastern Hungary³. From both fieldworks I included the context of altogether four schools – one

¹ The online survey was realised within the framework of TÁMOP priority project entitled “21st century public education (development, coordination), 2nd phase” (TÁMOP-3.1.1-11/1–2012-0001). For detailed description of the surveys and databases see Sági (2015b).

² The research was enabled by project TÁMOP 4.2.4.A/2-11-1-2012-0001 *National Excellence Programme – Convergence programme for the establishment and operation of a system supporting students and researchers*.

³ The research was conducted by the Hungarian Institute for Educational Research and Development in Autumn 2015 (cf. Szemerszki 2016).

resilient and one vulnerable – in my research, I analysed the answers provided by the educators and the school masters, since these schools made it into the resilient and vulnerable school groups formed by me based on the National Assessment of Basic Competencies.

Related to my *first research question*, with the help of differential analysis, I analysed school background data (location, size, operator, characteristics of students and teachers), as well as school masters' reflexions on their school (human resources infrastructure, evaluation, group formation, parent-school relationship, student progress). Following this I used a multivariable binomial logistic regression method to study which of the factors showing statistically significant differences increase and which decrease the chances of getting into a different school group.

Related to my *second research question* I am looking for an answer to the kind of relationship between the school context and environmental characteristic of resilient and vulnerable school groups developed by me to the individual characteristics of the students; can they and do they influence student performance, learning motivation, as well as the attitude of the student's family to school and learning. The method of contextual analysis offers help in deciding on this issue. Contextual analysis explains the individual's behaviour or attitude with their environment, in other words, it focuses firstly on the environment and its features, where the individual is part of that environment, and secondly on the relationship system between the individual and its environment. A contextual effect is nothing more than the result of two factors interacting (Moksony 1985). Contextual effect is therefore especially important in situations when a person's actions, behaviour, performance are influenced not only by individual characteristics, but also by factors on environmental (institutional) level, which are many times aggregate. In the case of schools, this is the situation.

Among contextual analysis methods the most frequent is the cross tabulation analysis, the graphic representation of which is a good illustration of the appearance of individual and contextual factors. I use this method in my research. During the analysis of school determination of student performance, desired qualification, family-school relationship (parent meeting attendance, home support and conversation) resilient and vulnerable school groups based on effectiveness and socio-economic status provide different school contexts, which can be further narrowed down in order for us to be able to actually study schools of equal status. I monitor the individual impact with the help of multiple disadvantageous situation indicated by the student's financial, cultural and social situation.

Related to my *third research question* with the help of differential analysis (chi-square test, independent sample t-test) I am investigating how the educators in resilient and vulnerable school groups perceive the climate in the classroom (including the system of goals, norms and values, education practices, relationships and cooperation, general well-being), as well as the differences between their attitudes and approach to teaching, learning, segregation and compensating for disadvantages. I complemented the results of questionnaire survey with the results of the teacher and school master interviews, as well as with my experience gathered during school visits and classroom observations.

My basic hypothesis is that the effectiveness of low-status schools directly derives from the school learning-teaching environment, the quality of the school climate, as well as

from the school educators' attitude and approach to teaching, educating, segregation and compensating for disadvantages. Starting from the above, my analysis focuses on revealing those school factors, climate and teacher attitude patterns, which differentiate the resilient from vulnerable low socio-economic status schools. In my study I compare the two school groups' features according to the whole school and educator pattern features.

The structure of the dissertation

The first part of the dissertation introduces the theoretical and interpretation framework of the research, discussing the conceptual framework and definitions, while the second part of the dissertation discusses the parameters and results of the research.

In Chapter II we are provided with an answer how to define educational efficiency, effectiveness and fairness, why, from the point of view of this research, it is important to take into consideration the school context, and what we actually mean by pedagogical added value of a school and resilience. This chapter further explains the models along which inequality of opportunity is created and maintained, based on which factors we define educational and methodological culture, as well as what differences there are in the conceptual approaches to the notion of school climate.

Chapter III presents the quality of the school's teaching-educating work, the relationship between school effectiveness and fairness, as well as the most important research history and scientific results regarding school climate. This chapter pays a special attention to several segments of pedagogical and methodological culture (selection according to competence, pedagogical practices and attitudes, self-fulfilling prophecies), furthermore, it discusses in detail the factors relevant to school effectiveness and the important role of school climate.

Chapter IV lists the school factors of resilience development, discussing the main characteristics of education work in schools of low socio-economic status, and also discusses scientific knowledge about resilience examinations gaining increasingly large ground in education research.

Chapter V discusses the methodology of the research, consequently, this chapter outlines the complex framework of interpretation which helps the reader understand what, why and how I conduct research and on what level.

Chapter VI presents my research questions, hypotheses and methodologies and data sources used in my research. It also details the measuring methodology of school effectiveness and school climate, the method of creating the analysed school groups, as well as the methodology-related limitations and dilemmas of the research.

The last chapters of my dissertation showed and summarised my research results regarding the difference between resilient and vulnerable school groups, and also points to the direction of possible further research.

Summary of research results

We can conclude that the context of vulnerable schools differs greatly from the context of resilient schools. The internal world of schools, the school and its educators all contribute to the successfulness or unsuccessfulness of their students of different social background. The increasing proportion of multiple disadvantaged and Roma/Gypsy students does not necessarily correlate with weaker performance and lower school added value, since there are schools where this relationship does not exist at all, what is more, it works the other way round, as for example, in resilient schools. The answers to the challenges deriving from low socio-economic status can therefore be different, and the negative consequences of inadequate responses may be exponentially worse in the case of vulnerable schools. Institutional structural factors such as cooperation among the teaching staff and between parents and teachers, as well as events supporting the foundation of school communities, building bridges between the value systems of families and the school, all support the development of successful coping strategies.

Based on the results one may conclude that resilient schools show a more advantageous and unified picture than the one in vulnerable schools in almost all respects. I have to emphasise that in the majority of cases these school groups can be differentiated significantly along the lines of factors which fundamentally determine the quality of the school climate, such as teaching staff turnover; pedagogical practices aiming at developing student competencies, their personalities and social skills; teacher attitudes to segregation, compensating for disadvantages; satisfaction with teaching profession; educator cooperation; teacher-student and school-family relationships.

All together we may conclude that in creating a more successful and effective, i.e. a more advantageous and inclusive climate, it is those human factors and methodological elements which can and should be developed a huge impact and which help to retrieve applied pedagogical practices, methods and tools adequate to the pedagogical situation as well as the students' and teachers' spiritual and mental state at that moment. I have to add that school operate on different developmental levels and that vulnerable schools also require external support and intervention.

1st RESEARCH QUESTION: What differences can be found between the school level characteristics and background data of the two studied groups?

Hypothesis: With respect to factors determining school climate (teacher turnover, supply, student motivation, discipline), resilient schools show a more favourable picture than vulnerable schools.

Results:

By comparing the two school groups we can learn that the students in a resilient school are more motivated and disciplined, there are fewer occasions of problematic behaviour in their case, the school building is in a better state, and in general the school infrastructure is better. Another significant difference is that resilient school have less teaching staff turnover; lack of

supply is not as characteristic; there are more people employed who support teachers' work; parents' expectations and performance-orientedness are higher; and there are less families taking their child to another school.

The two analysed school groups are different in relevant indicators, which fundamentally influence student drop-out and their progress. In resilient schools, children starting their first grade came from kindergartens which they attended for three years, there are far fewer instances of unaccounted inattendance, there is more students staying in daycare and participating in some kind of sports activities, and the proportion of students continuing their studies in a high school is greater. What is more, the homogeneous class organisation according to capabilities, which according to researchers leads to greater differences in their performance, is less common.

When interpreting the results, it is important to note that there is difference between the two school groups regarding certain indicators of a socio-economic status (the ratio of multiple disadvantaged students and Roma/Gypsy students). In addition, there are large differences in this respect even within individual school groups. At the same time, the results of the logistic regressive model indicate that a larger settlement (except the capital), teacher shortage, lack of high expectations on the parents' part, existence of gypsy minority programme, lack of integrated activities aiming at revealing talent, adverse situation regarding the number of supporting staff, short kindergarten history of children entering first grade – all significantly increase the chances of getting into a vulnerable school group. Apart from the above, there are no other factors that appear significantly, not even socio-economic indicators such as the multiple disadvantageous situation or the Roma/Gypsy proportion.

2nd RESEARCH QUESTION: What differences can be seen in the individual impact of a multiple disadvantageous situation, if we take into account the different school context of resilient and vulnerable school groups?

Hypothesis: The context of the resilient schools moderates, while the context of the vulnerable schools does not substantially change, or rather enhances the possible negative effects of a multiple disadvantageous situation.

Results:

The results of my analysis in the majority of cases show that the context of resilient schools has a more beneficial impact on the students than the context of vulnerable schools, independently of individual background. It can be said in general that the differences between the two school groups are due to both individual and school-level effects regarding the multiple disadvantageous situation, in other words, the individual and contextual impact is cumulative.

With respect to the students' school effectiveness, one can see that in general, irrespective of their social situation, the context of the resilient schools is significantly more beneficial to the students' effectiveness, than the vulnerable school context. Participation in extracurricular activities organised by the school, as well as the parents' pro-active attitude (attendance at

parent-teacher meetings) is more frequent in the resilient schools than in the vulnerable schools, both among the multiple disadvantaged students and those in a less adverse situation. At the same time, the intention to study further is less present among the multiple disadvantaged students in resilient schools, i.e. a larger proportion of students from these schools would be satisfied by finishing primary school. This is primarily due to the more adverse family cultural background of students in multiple disadvantageous situations, since – compared to their peers attending vulnerable schools – in their case their parents' education is lower, and so is value of the family background index, which also includes socio-cultural indicators. In other words, multiple disadvantaged students in resilient schools are able to achieve better school results despite the fact that the cultural capital they brought from home is lower.

When we compare a resilient and a vulnerable school with a homogeneous status – i.e. with more than 50% of multiple disadvantaged students – there is a Pygmalion-effect concerning the academic results average: in their case, they overvalue both student groups separated based on the disadvantageous situation, which is more forcefully manifested in the case of multiple disadvantaged students. In programmes organised by the school (e.g. camping, summer holiday vacation) students from resilient schools take part more often independently of their individual social situation, than their peers from vulnerable schools.

3 a) RESEARCH QUESTION: What differences can be found in the system of goals, norms and values of the studied school groups recognised by their educators?

Hypothesis 1: The aims to compensate for disadvantages and create customised development, as well as educator competences necessary for achieving them are more frequently present in resilient schools than they are in vulnerable schools.

Hypothesis 2: A common system of norms and values is also more characteristic of resilient schools than of vulnerable schools.

Results:

In general, it can be said that the teachers in the resilient schools aim at a common aim, which in return indicates a coherent value system and pedagogical concept. At the same time, there is not statistically significant difference between the two school groups in this respect, but it is an important indicator that the educators from resilient schools have a much more positive opinion about themselves regarding this dimension.

The results of my research have led me to conclude that customised approach is more present in the practice and methods of resilient schools, they have a pedagogical and methodological culture of supporting disadvantaged students to accommodate, and this culture is better achieving better results and success than focusing solely on the development of general skills. Resilient schools, which are successful despite their disadvantageous position, consider it more important and also more productive to develop skills which focus on the individuals and communities and which enhance the communication and cooperation between individuals and communities instead of developing professional, planning and assessment competences, which is the priority of the vulnerable schools.

3 b) RESEARCH QUESTION: What differences can be found in the educating practice of the studied school groups evaluated by their educators?

Hypothesis: Compared to vulnerable schools, resilient schools place a greater emphasis on and show higher quality of developing personality and social skills, and they are also noted for focusing on differentiated development.

Results:

What can be stated in general is that within a resilient school, opinions are more unified, and all pedagogical activities (cognitive, social and creating opportunities) are realised on a much higher quality level according to resilient schools' teachers. This refers to a coherent, strategic and targeted concept. Further benefit of a resilient school is the development of cognitive skills such as: acquiring knowledge suitable for the students' age, maintaining openness and curiosity to the world, making students aware of their goals, as well as activities grounding their critical thinking, learning motivation and lifestyle.

Pedagogical activities aiming at the development of personality and social skills are conducted on a far lower quality level in vulnerable schools according to their teachers, and the deviation in the responses is also higher. Resilient schools are the most satisfied when they are able to realise the following: creating emotional safety, developing student self-image and self-worth, communicational skills, norm and value systems, social sensitivity.

Pedagogical work related to creating opportunity, individual treatment and cooperation with the families in a pedagogical dimension are also features regarded of better quality by teachers in resilient schools; and it is especially true for the communication with the families, parents, for the effective cooperation between educators, for taking over certain socialisation responsibilities, as well as taking into account certain individual sociocultural and family, home characteristics.

3 c) RESEARCH QUESTION: What differences can be found in the relationships and cooperation of the studied school groups recognised by their educators?

Hypothesis: Relationship networks in resilient schools are much stronger than in vulnerable schools.

Results:

My results have supported my initial hypothesis that resilient schools provide a better quality and also more extensive relationship and cooperation network, in other words, the difference is obvious in all types of connections, including teacher-student, teacher-teacher, teacher-parent, family-school and school-environment relationships.

Compared to the educators in vulnerable schools, educators in a resilient school are able to rely more on the school master's support and advice, experience exchange is more intensive, and so is talking through and about educational and teaching issues. Students in resilient schools are involved in decision making processes, and the relationship with the parent is also better than in vulnerable schools.

It needs to be highlighted that the lack of internal, close relationships and the weakness of professional and collegial bonds in vulnerable schools may also influence everyday activities, which negatively impacts not only the teachers, but also the students. Contrary to this, resilient schools are characterised by inclusive climate built on professional relationships, cooperation and sharing of knowledge. The way teachers and school leadership in a resilient school interpret their roles is closer to a researcher-innovator role than the ones experienced in a vulnerable school.

3 d) RESEARCH QUESTION: What differences can be found in the general well-being and sense of satisfaction of the studied school groups evaluated by their educators?

Hypothesis: Educators in a resilient school feel more comfortable in the school and more satisfied with their work than their colleagues working in vulnerable schools.

Results:

When examining the general climate I came across an important difference between the two school types, i.e. the educators in resilient schools are more happy to work in their school and they believe the students are equally happy to be able to attend this school. In other words, the teachers in a resilient school perceive their school's climate in a more beneficial than their colleagues working in vulnerable schools.

More advantageous attitude of teachers working in resilient schools is in general well summarised by the fact that they form a more positive picture of their work and career than their colleagues working in vulnerable schools. Educators from both school types believe their biggest responsibility is to themselves and their students. Teachers from resilient schools, however, consider taking responsibility both for themselves and their students more valuable than the teachers from vulnerable schools. There is also a difference between the school types regarding their responsibility toward their school: educators from resilient schools have greater responsibility in that direction, too.

3 e) RESEARCH QUESTION: What differences can be discovered related to teachers' attitudes towards segregation and compensating for disadvantage?

Hypothesis 1: In resilient schools, the ethnic segregation of Roma/Gypsy students, as well as grouping students according to their skills and abilities is rejected to a greater extent than in vulnerable schools.

Hypothesis 2: The resilient schools hold the value of the school's and its teachers' compensating-for-advantages role higher than they do vulnerable schools.

Results:

My results clearly show that educators in resilient schools accept the separation of Roma/Gypsy students in schools to a far less extent. They also disagree with the opinion that integration and joint education do not bring solutions, and the role of the school as an institution enhancing acceptance, understanding, tolerance is more visibly present. It is a vital

result that the resilient schools' educators are more resistant to the temptation to segregate. The climate of a vulnerable school is known for exactly the opposite.

Educators in resilient schools support selection according to skills and abilities less significantly (27%) than educators in the whole sample (34%) and educators in vulnerable schools (41%). Opinions about the school being powerless when it comes to socialisation are far more intensively present in vulnerable schools than in resilient schools. In other words, educators from vulnerable schools are convinced that the school is not able to make up for what was lost during education within the family, especially if the family is not working together with the school.

There is no significant difference, however, in how the two school groups view compensating for disadvantages; i.e. both teachers from resilient schools and teachers from vulnerable schools think the socialisation disadvantages of multiple disadvantaged children at the point of entering the school can be compensated for only to a certain degree. It may be concluded in general that the role of the school, the educators, the educating methods is somewhat more emphasised in resilient schools. Data also show that the number of burnt-out, disillusioned teachers in both school groups is approximately equal, though we have to add that labelling and the impact of previously negative expectations is present to a greater extent in vulnerable schools. Therefore the explanation for resilience lies not in individual teacher attitudes, but in the collective world of the school.

Further research directions

The results of the research raise new research questions and at the same time set new research directions:

- It would be justified to expand the analytical aspects, since the different characteristics of school themselves and the teachers, different teacher attitudes in the two school groups raise the question of the role of school leadership' role, quality, educational aims and concepts, which in turn calls for new research directions.
- When comparing resilient and vulnerable schools, it would be justified to delineate more homogenous school groups along the socio-economic status, and based on the above conduct an analysis which would take into account factors other than student composition and identification of effectiveness, which would make homogeneity more visible. I made an attempt at this in my current research when I compared the context of resilient and vulnerable schools with the ratio of students with multiple disadvantaged background above 50%. A further quantitative and qualitative study of these school groups would lead to more robust results. In other words, a more focused research would provide a study of the internal and external environment of these schools.

- According to my results, the positive climate in resilient schools is created due to the fact that they tend to exploit the potential hidden in tenders and further education for teachers, constantly reinvesting the results and experience from the above into their everyday educating practice. In other words, school effectiveness of schools educating a large number multiple disadvantaged children may be correlated with these schools' innovative activity and success. A more deeper analysis of the above may lead to important information on the functioning of schools which are successful despite their low status.
- There is an equally important opportunity in the school flow research. To put it differently, another important line of research would be to search for those life situations in school groups, which ensure an optimal emotional flow, and which reveal the possibilities leading to the perfect flow, as well as personal and school factors which would make staying in the flow experience possible. (cf. e.g. Oláh 2005).
- My results may be grounds for a research program which would put the educational actors (teachers, parents, educators, local communities) in a wider context, i.e. it would not put an emphasis on the school and the internal world of the school, but on its micro and macro environment. A research like this would provide an opportunity to reveal factors which have not yet been studied and which can lead to establishing where and why is a school successful or not.

References

- Bacsikai Katinka (2015): *Iskolák a társadalom peremén. Alacsony státusú diákokat tanító eredményes tanárok*. Szeged: Belvedere Meridionale.
- Balázi Ildikó – Ostorics László – Szalay Balázs – Szepesi Ildikó (2010): *PISA2009 összefoglaló jelentés. Szövegértés tíz év távlatában*. Budapest: Oktatási Hivatal.
- Balázi Ildikó – Horváth Zsuzsanna (2011): A közoktatás minősége és eredményessége. In: Balázs Éva – Kocsis Mihály – Vágó Irén (szerk.): *Jelentés a közoktatásról 2010*. Budapest: Oktatáskutató és Fejlesztő Intézet, 325–362.
- Balázi Ildikó – Ostorics László – Szalay Balázs – Szepesi Ildikó – Vadász Csaba (2013): *PISA 2012 Összefoglaló jelentés*. Budapest: Oktatási Hivatal.
- Bascia, Nina (2014): *The School Context Model: How School Environments Shape Students' Opportunities to Learn*. Toronto: In Measuring What Matters, People for Education.
- Berényi Eszter (2016): *Az autonómiától a szelekcióig: Az iskolaválasztás jelentése a rendszerváltás utáni időszak magyar közoktatásában*. Budapest: Gondolat Kiadó.
- Bread, Karen Stansberry – Hoy, Wayne, K. – Hoy, Anita W. (2009): Academic Optimism of Individual Teachers: Confirming a New Construct. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 26(5):1136–1144.
- Csapó Benő – Molnár Gyöngyvér – Kinyó László (2009): A magyar oktatási rendszer szelektivitása a nemzetközi összehasonlító vizsgálatok eredményeinek tükrében. *Iskolakultúra*, 19(3–4):3–13.
- Csapó Benő – Fejes József Balázs – Kinyó László – Tóth Edit (2014): Az iskolai teljesítmények alakulása Magyarországon nemzetközi összehasonlításban. In: Kolosi Tamás – Tóth István György (szerk.): *Társadalmi Ríport 2014*. Budapest: TÁRKI, 110–136.

- Cserti Csapó Tibor (2006): Szociológiai, szociális tényezők a cigány népesség vizsgálatában. In: Forray R. Katalin (szerk.): *Ismeretek a romológia alapképzési szakhoz*. Budapest: Bölcsész Konzorcium (Pécsi Tudományegyetem).
- Fehérvári Anikó (2015): A hátrányos helyzetű tanulók oktatásának változás, 2006–2014. In: Fehérvári Anikó – Tomasz Gábor (szerk.): *Kudarok és megoldások: Iskolai hátrányok, lemorzsolódás, problémakezelés*. Budapest: Oktatókutató és Fejlesztő Intézet, 31–52.
- Fehérvári Anikó (2016): Iskolai eredményesség és hátrányos helyzet. In: Szemerszki Marianna (szerk.): *Hátrányos helyzet és iskolai eredményesség*. Budapest: Oktatókutató és Fejlesztő Intézet, 15–27.
- Fehérvári Anikó – Széll Krisztián (2014): Méltányosság az oktatásban: tanulói eredmények, szülők, iskola. In: Széll Krisztián (szerk.): *Az OECD az oktatásról – adatok, elemzések, értelmezések*. Budapest: Oktatókutató és Fejlesztő Intézet, 41–51.
- Forray R. Katalin (1992): Általános iskolai sikertelenség aprófalvas térségekben. In: Forray R. Katalin – Kozma Tamás (szerk.): *Társadalmi tér és oktatási rendszer*. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó, 99–110.
- Forray R. Katalin (2009a): Hátrányos helyzet – a cigányság az iskolában. *Educatio*, 18(4):436–446.
- Forray R. Katalin (2009b): Falusi kisiskola és lokális társadalom. In: Kozma Tamás – Perjés István (szerk.): *Új Kutatások a neveléstudományokban 2008*. Budapest: MTA Pedagógiai Bizottsága, 245–254.
- Forray R. Katalin – Hegedűs T. András (2003): *Cigányok, iskola, oktatáspolitiká*. Budapest: Új Mandátum Kiadó.
- Gu, Quing – Johansson, Olof (2013): Sustaining school performance: School contexts matter. *International Journal of Leadership in Education*, 16(3), 301–326.
- Hajdu Tamás – Kertesi Gábor – Kézdi Gábor (2014): Roma fiatalok a középiskolában: Beszámoló a TÁRKI Életpálya-felmérésének 2006 és 2012 közötti hullámaiból. In: Kolosi Tamás – Tóth István György (szerk.): *Társadalmi riport 2014*. Budapest: TÁRKI, 265–302.
- Havas Gábor (2008): Esélyegyenlőség, deszegregáció. In: Fazekas Károly – Köllő János – Varga Júlia (szerk.): *Zöld könyv: A magyar közoktatás megújításáért 2008*. Budapest: Ecostat Kormányzati Gazdaság- és Társadalomstratégiai Kutató Intézet, 121–138.
- Havas Gábor – Zolnay János (2011): Sziszifusz számvetése: Az integrációs oktatáspolitiká. *Beszélő*, 16(6):24–49.
- Kertesi Gábor – Kézdi Gábor (2005): Általános iskolai szegregáció. Okok és következmények. In: Kertesi Gábor (szerk.): *A társadalom peremén: Romák a munkaerőpiacon és az iskolában*. Budapest: Osiris Kiadó, 377–387.
- Kertesi Gábor – Kézdi Gábor (2009): Általános iskolai szegregáció Magyarországon az ezredforduló után. *Közgazdasági Szemle*, 56(11):959–1000.
- Kertesi Gábor – Kézdi Gábor (2012): A roma és nem roma tanulók teszteredményei közti különbségekről és e különbségek okairól. *Közgazdasági Szemle*, 59(7–8):798–853.
- Kertesi Gábor – Kézdi Gábor (2014): *Iskolai szegregáció, szabad iskolaválasztás és helyi oktatáspolitiká 100 magyar városban*. (BWP 2014/6) Budapest: Magyar Tudományos Akadémia Közgazdaság- és Regionális Tudományi Kutatóközpont Közgazdaság-tudományi Intézete. <http://www.econ.core.hu/file/download/bwp/bwp1406.pdf> [2017.03.10.]
- Kertesi Gábor – Kézdi Gábor (2016): *A roma fiatalok esélyei és az iskolarendszer egyenlőtlensége*. (BWP 2016/3) Budapest: Magyar Tudományos Akadémia Közgazdaság- és Regionális Tudományi Kutatóközpont Közgazdaság-tudományi Intézete. <http://www.econ.core.hu/file/download/bwp/bwp1603.pdf> [2017.03.10.]
- Lannert Judit – Nagy Mária (2006, szerk.): *Eredményes iskola: Adatok és esetek*. Budapest: Országos Közoktatási Intézet.
- Liskó Ilona (2002): A hátrányos helyzetű tanulók oktatásának minősége. *Új Pedagógia Szemle*, 52(2):56–69.
- Liskó Ilona (2008): Szakképzés és lemorzsolódás. In: Fazekas Károly – Köllő János – Varga Júlia (szerk.): *Zöld könyv: A magyar közoktatás megújításáért 2008*. Budapest: Ecostat Kormányzati Gazdaság- és Társadalomstratégiai Kutató Intézet, 95–119.

- MacNeil, Angus J. – Prater, Doris L. – Busch, Steve (2009): The Effects of School Culture and Climate on Student Achievement. *International Journal of Leadership in Education*, 12(1):73–84.
- Masten, Ann S. – Herbers, Janette E. – Cutuli, J. J. – Lafavor, Theresa L. (2008): Promoting Competence and Resilience in the School Context. *Professional School Counseling*, 12(2):76–84.
- Moksony Ferenc (1985): *A kontextuális elemzés*. Budapest: Központi Statisztikai Hivatal Népeségstudományi Kutató Intézet. Demográfiai módszertani füzetek 3., 1985/2.
- Moller, Stephanie – Mickelson, Roslyn A. – Stearns, Elizabeth – Banerjee, Neena – Bottia, Martha C. (2013): Collective Pedagogical Teacher Culture and Mathematics Achievement: Differences by Race, Ethnicity, and Socioeconomic Status. *Sociology of Education*, 86(2):174–194.
- Mortimore, Peter – Sammons, Pam – Stoll, Louise – Lewis, David – Ecob, Russel J. (1988): *School matters: the junior years*. Wells, Somerset: Open Books.
- Nahalka István – Zempléni András (2014): Hogyan hat az iskola/osztály tanulóinak heterogén/homogén összetétele a tanulók eredményességére? In: Oktatási Hivatal (szerk.): *Hatások és különbségek: Másodelemzések a hazai és nemzetközi tanulói képességmérések eredményei alapján*. Budapest: Oktatási Hivatal, 91–166.
- Oakes, Jeannie (1989): What educational indicators? The case for assessing the school context. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 11(2), 181–199.
- OECD (2013): *PISA 2012 Results: Excellence through Equity (Volume II): Giving Every Student the Chance to Succeed*. Paris: OECD Publishing. DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/9789264201132-en>
- OECD (2014): *PISA 2012 Results: What Students Know and Can Do (Volume I, Revised edition, February 2014): Student Performance in Mathematics, Reading and Science*. Paris: OECD Publishing. DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/9789264208780-en>
- Oláh Attila (2005): *Érzelmek, megküzdés és optimális élmény*. Budapest: Trefort Kiadó.
- Orsós Anna (2004): *A beás nyelv szociolingvisztikai helyzete*. In: Cserti Csapó Tibor (szerk.): *Friss kutatások a romológia köréből: konferenciakötet, Pécs, 2002. november 15.* Gypsy Studies – Cigány Tanulmányok 10. Pécs: PTE BTK Romológia Tanszék, 15–24.
- Papp Z. Attila (2011): A roma tanulók aránya Magyarországon és a tanulói teljesítmények az általános iskolai oktatásban. In Bárdi Nándor – Tóth Ágnes (szerk.): *Asszimiláció, integráció, szegregáció: párhuzamos értelmezések és modellek a kisebbségkutatásban*. Budapest: Argumentum Kiadó, 224–267.
- Papp Z. Attila (2013): Pedagógiai hozzáadott érték a roma tanulói arány függvényében a magyar iskolarendszerben. In: Bárdi Nándor–Tóth Ágnes (szerk.): *Önazonosság és tagoltság: elemzések a kulturális megosztottságról*. Budapest: Argumentum Kiadó, 69–88.
- Pusztai Gabriella (2009): *A társadalmi tőke és az iskola. Kapcsolati erőforrások hatása az iskolai pályafutásra*. Budapest: Új Mandátum Könyvkiadó.
- Réger Zita (2002): *Utak a nyelvhez: Nyelvi szocializáció – nyelvi hátrány*. (Második kiadás) Budapest: Soros Alapítvány – MTA Nyelvtudományi Intézet. http://www.nytud.hu/utak_a_nyelvhez/utak_reger.pdf [2017.03.10.]
- Rutter, Michael (1983): School Effects on Pupil Progress: Research Findings and policy Implications. *Child Development*, 54(1):1–29.
- Rutter, Michael – Maughan, Barbara – Mortimore, Peter – Ouston, Janet – Smith, Alan (1979): *Fifteen Thousand hours: Secondary Schools and Their Effects on Children*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Sági Matild (2016): Iskolavezetés, iskolai kollektíva és eredményesség. In: Szemerszki Marianna (szerk.): *Hátrányos helyzet és iskolai eredményesség*. Budapest: Oktatókutató és Fejlesztő Intézet, 101–124.
- Sammons, Pam – Nuttall, Desmond – Cuttance, Peter – Sally, Thomas (1994): Continuity of School Effects: A Longitudinal Analysis of Primary and Secondary School Effects on GCSE Performance. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement: An International Journal of Research, Policy and Practice*, 6(4):285–307.

- Szemerszki Marianna (2015, szerk.): *Eredményesség az oktatásban: Dimenziók és megközelítések*. Budapest: Oktatókutató és Fejlesztő Intézet.
- Talbert, Joan E. – McLaughlin, Milbrey W. (1999): Assessing the school environment: Embedded contexts and bottom-up research strategies. In: Sarah L. Friedman – Theodore D. Wachs (Eds.): *Measuring environment across the life span: Emerging methods and concepts*. Washington, D.C.: American Psychological Association, 197–227.
- Tóth Edit – Csapó Benő – Székely László (2010): Az iskolák és osztályok közötti különbségek alakulása a magyar iskolarendszerben: Egy longitudinális vizsgálat eredményei. *Közgazdasági Szemle*, 57(9):798–814.

Publications Related to the Research Topic

- Széll Krisztián (2016): Iskolai légkör és eredményesség. In: Szemerszki Marianna (szerk.): *Hátrányos helyzet és iskolai eredményesség: Az általános iskolák hátránykompenzáló lehetőségei*. Budapest: Oktatókutató és Fejlesztő Intézet, 51–73.
- Széll, Krisztián (2016): School Climate and Educational Effectiveness. In: Fehérvári, Anikó (Ed.): *Curriculum, Effectiveness, Equity*. Budapest: Hungarian Institute for Educational Research and Development, 95–107.
- Széll Krisztián (2015, szerk.): *Mit mér a műszer? A tanulói teljesítménymérések alkalmazhatóságáról*. Budapest: Oktatókutató és Fejlesztő Intézet.
- Széll Krisztián – Szemerszki Marianna (2015): A tanulói teljesítménymérések megítélése és intézményi hasznosulása. In: Széll Krisztián (szerk.): *Mit mér a műszer? A tanulói teljesítménymérések alkalmazhatóságáról*. Budapest: Oktatókutató és Fejlesztő Intézet, 91–117.
- Széll, Krisztián (2015): Schools' effectiveness and teachers' attitudes. In: Fehérvári, Anikó (Ed.): *Snapshot of Hungarian Education 2014*. Budapest: Hungarian Institute for Educational Research and Development, 98–117.
- Széll Krisztián (2015): Iskolai eredményesség a hátrányos helyzet tükrében. *Educatio*, 24(1), 140–147.
- Széll Krisztián (2015): Iskolai eredményesség és tanári attitűdök. In: Szemerszki Marianna (szerk.): *Eredményesség az oktatásban. Dimenziók és megközelítések*. Budapest: Oktatókutató és Fejlesztő Intézet, 25–51.
- Széll Krisztián (2015): Iskolai légkördimenziók – az igazgatók és a pedagógusok percepciói. In: Sági Matild (szerk.): *A pedagógushivatás megerősítésének néhány aspektusa*. Budapest: Oktatókutató és Fejlesztő Intézet, 57–82.
- Széll Krisztián (2015): Szegregáció és hátránykompenzáció – pedagógusattitűdök. In: Fehérvári Anikó – Tomasz Gábor (szerk.): *Kudarok és megoldások. Iskolai hátrányok, lemorzsolódás, problémakezelés*. Budapest: Oktatókutató és Fejlesztő Intézet, 53–72.
- Sági Matild – Széll Krisztián (2015): *Hatásvizsgálatok alapszintű kézikönyve. Módszertani segédkönyv oktatásfejlesztők számára*. Budapest: Oktatókutató és Fejlesztő Intézet.
- Fehérvári Anikó – Széll Krisztián (2014): Méltányosság az oktatásban: tanulói eredmények, szülők, iskola. In: Széll Krisztián (szerk.): *Az OECD az oktatásról – adatok, elemzések, értelmezések*. Budapest: Oktatókutató és Fejlesztő Intézet, 41–51.
- Széll Krisztián (2014): Az oktatási eredményesség iskolai vetülete. *Educatio*, 23(2), 336–343.
- Széll, Krisztián (2014): The External Conditions of Teachers' Career in Hungary. *Hungarian Educational Research Journal*, 4(2). doi: 10.14413/HERJ2014.02.08
- Széll Krisztián – Sági Matild (2014): A tanári munka jellemzőinek hatása a tanulói eredményességre. In: Havancsák Alexandra – Oláh Ildikó (szerk.): *Perspektívák a neveléstudományban. Válogatás a Pécsi Tudományegyetem „Oktatás és Társadalom” Neveléstudományi Doktori Iskola kutatóinak írásaiból 2013–2014*. Pécs: PTE BTK „Oktatás és Társadalom” Neveléstudományi Doktori Iskola, 8–23.

- Széll, Krisztián (2013): Factors Determining Student Achievement. *Hungarian Educational Research Journal*, 3(3). doi 10.14413/HERJ2013.03.06
- Széll Krisztián (2013): A pedagógusmunka minőségét meghatározó tényezőkről. *Educatio*, 22(2), 245–251.
- Széll Krisztián (2012): Szelekció a hazai pedagógusképzésben. In: Benedek Dániel – Vadász Viola (szerk.): *Perspektívák a neveléstudományban: Válogatás a Pécsi Tudományegyetem „Oktatás és Társadalom” Neveléstudományi Doktori Iskola kutatóinak írásaiból 2011.* Pécs: Virágmandula Kft., 11–28.

Presentations Related to the Research Topic

- Széll Krisztián: *Az iskolai pedagógiai hozzáadott érték egy lehetséges számítása és kutatási célú alkalmazása.* XVI. Országos Neveléstudományi Konferencia, Szegedi Tudományegyetem, Szeged, 2016. november 17.
- Fehérvári Anikó – Széll Krisztián – Paksi Borbála: *Az iskolai eredményesség szervezeti meghatározottsága.* XVI. Országos Neveléstudományi Konferencia, Szegedi Tudományegyetem, Szeged, 2016. november 17.
- Széll Krisztián: *Amit a tanulóiteljesítmény-mérések mutat(hat)nak az oktatási folyamatokról, rendszerekről.* Magyar Szociológiai Társaság éves vándorgyűlése, Oktatásszociológia Szakosztály, Pécsi Tudományegyetem, Pécs, 2016. október 21.
- Széll Krisztián: *Iskolai légkör és eredményesség.* HuCER 2016 (Hungarian Conference on Educational Research) éves konferencia, Kaposvári Egyetem, 2016. május 27.
- Széll Krisztián: *Iskolai légkör és eredményesség.* XV. Országos Neveléstudományi Konferencia, Óbudai Egyetem, Budapest, 2015. november 19-21.
- Sági Matild – Széll Krisztián: *Exploring Teachers' Effect on School Effectiveness.* ECER 2015 "Education and Transition. Contributions from Educational Research" (Network 9 SES 03 A, Findings from International and National Large-Scale Assessments: Relating Parent and Teacher Variables to Student Achievement), Corvinus University, Budapest 2015, szeptember 8.
- Fehérvári Anikó – Széll Krisztián: *Hátrányos helyzetű tanulók oktatása.* Oktatási esélyegyenlőség – Magyarország 2015. Alapvető Jogok Biztosának Hivatala, Budapest, 2015. június 9.
- Széll Krisztián: *Iskolai légkördimenziók – pedagógusi és igazgatói percepciók.* Eredményes nevelés. A TÁMOP 3.1.1-11/1-2012-0001 XXI. századi közoktatás (fejlesztés, koordináció) II. szakasz kiemelt projekt 4. és 5. alprojektjeinek konferenciája, Budapest, 2015. április 29.
- Széll Krisztián: *Iskolai eredményesség és tanári attitűdök.* PÉK 2015, XIII. Pedagógiai Értékelési Konferencia, József Attila Tanulmányi és Információs Központ, Szeged, 2015. április 23.
- Széll Krisztián: *Iskolai eredményesség és tanári attitűdök.* Pedagógus életutak, karrierök. *Educatio* folyóirat műhelykonferenciája, Budapest, 2015. január 15.
- Fehérvári Anikó – Széll Krisztián: *Hátránykompenzáció – lehetőségek és korlátok.* Hazai és európai szakpolitikai irányok a kisgyermekkorú nevelésben. Oktatókutató és Fejlesztő Intézet Eurydice Iroda, Budapest, 2014. december 2.
- Széll Krisztián: *Az iskola hátránykompenzáló hatékonyságát befolyásoló tényezőkről.* Hátránykompenzáció a roma oktatásban. Pécsi Tudományegyetem, Tudásközpont, 2014. november 19.
- Széll Krisztián: *Az iskola hátránykompenzáló hatékonyságát befolyásoló tényezőkről.* XIV. Országos Neveléstudományi Konferencia, Debreceni Egyetem, 2014. november 6.
- Sági Matild – Széll Krisztián: *The Effect of Teachers on Students' Achievements.* ECER 2014 "The Past, the Present and Future of Educational Research in Europe" (Network 9 SES 14 A, Findings from Large-Scale Assessments: Relating Teaching and Teacher Characteristics to Student Achievement), University of Porto, Porto, 2014, szeptember 5.

- Széll Krisztián: *Hátránykompenzáció és esélyteremtés – a pedagógusok, illetve az intézményvezetők szemével*. HuCER 2014 (Hungarian Conference on Educational Research) éves konferencia, Szeged, MTA SzAB Székház, 2014. május 30.
- Sági Matild – Széll Krisztián: *A pedagógus szakmai továbbfejlődés gyakorlatának változása – a pedagógusok szemével*. HuCER 2014 (Hungarian Conference on Educational Research) éves konferencia, Szeged, MTA SzAB Székház, 2014. május 29.
- Széll Krisztián: *Az iskolák pedagógiai kultúrájának és hozzáadott értékének kapcsolata a hátrányos helyzet tükrében*. Iskola a társadalmi térben és időben V., Pécsi Tudományegyetem „Oktatás és Társadalom” Neveléstudományi Doktori Iskola tudományos konferencia, Pécs, 2014. május 21.
- Sági Matild – Széll Krisztián: *Tanári jellemzők hatása a tanulói teljesítményekre*. PÉK 2014, XII. Pedagógiai Értékelési Konferencia, Szegedi Akadémiai Bizottság Székháza, Szeged, 2014. május 2.
- Széll Krisztián: *Pedagógiai hozzáadott érték az eltérő társadalmi összetételű általános iskolákban*. „Tavaszi Szél 2014” – Nemzetközi Tudományos Konferencia, Debreceni Egyetem, Debrecen, 2014. március 22.
- Széll Krisztián: *The impact of Teaching Practise and Attitudes to Teaching on Student Effectiveness*. INTED2014 (8th International Technology, Education and Development Convergence), poster session, Valencia, 2014. március 10–12.
- Sági Matild – Széll Krisztián: *A tanárok tanítással kapcsolatos beállítódásai és a tanulói eredményesség*. XIII. Országos Neveléstudományi Konferencia, Eszterházy Károly Főiskola, Eger, 2013. november 8.
- Széll Krisztián: *A pedagógusmunka jellemzői az alacsonyabb társadalmi, gazdasági státuszú iskolákban*. HuCER 2013 (Hungarian Conference on Educational Research) éves konferencia, Debrecen, MTA DAB Székház, 2013. június 13.
- Széll Krisztián: *A pedagógusképzés szelekciós folyamatát javítandó feltételekről*. V. Képzés és Gyakorlat Nemzetközi Neveléstudományi Konferencia, Kaposvári Egyetem, Pedagógiai Kar, Kaposvár, 2011. március 25.