WHAT IS THE NATURE AND EXTENT OF THE INFLUENCE OF EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP ON STAFF MORALE, JOB SATISFACTION, AND MOTIVATION?

Ruba Mohamed Najia

English Language Lecturer at Kuwait College of Science & Technology, English Language Department
Email: r.najia@kcst.edu.kw

Abstract. In a time where retaining qualified teachers is crucial, one cannot ignore the importance of teacher job satisfaction, morale, and motivation in shaping teachers' intentions to remain in the profession. This is where educational leadership comes into play. This paper looks at the nature and extent of the impact of educational leadership on three important aspects of the job, namely staff morale, job satisfaction, and motivation. The latter constructs are each redefined and reconceptualized as the lack of consensus and the ambiguity in their respective meanings can greatly affect how they are applied as well as their results. When applied to the teaching context, Herzberg's motivation hygiene theory was found to be unapplicable in relation to theory transferability and the separate categorization of job satisfaction and dissatisfaction. The latter are greatly affected by not only leadership style per se, but more precisely by the teacher's perception of a certain leadership style. This individuality dimension also affects the ideological compatibility between teachers and work contexts, having a direct impact on job satisfaction. Nonetheless, although educational leadership has proven not to be the sole factor in teacher job satisfaction, morale and motivation, leaders must possess the right knowledge and understanding about the needs, expectations, attitudinal responses, and characteristics of their staff as individual members of a group in order to be able to positively affect their perceptions.

Keywords: morale, job satisfaction, motivation, leadership.

1. INTRODUCTION

Teacher morale, job satisfaction, and motivation: three related attitudes that, if achieved, are precursors for school success, with evidence that higher levels of job satisfaction among teachers contribute to better teaching, and hence better student results (Rodgers-Jenkinson & Chapman, 1990). Why do teachers go into teaching? There are many intrinsic factors that drive teachers into the profession, such as working with children and watching them grow, relationships with colleagues, as well as extrinsic factors such as pay, holidays, and working conditions. It is crucial to consider that the impact of teacher job satisfaction, morale, and motivation in shaping teachers' intentions to remain in the profession. This is where educational leadership comes into play. In a school setting where

leaders are seen or heard from on a daily basis, leadership is bound to have an influence on teachers whether directly or indirectly. However, teachers must also acknowledge the role they play in shaping their own views about job-related attitudes through individual characteristics that are leader-independent. This paper will attempt to look at both major influences on job-related attitudes: the leadership dimension on one hand, and the individuality dimension on the other. Before embarking on this journey, and for the purpose of conceptual clarity, the three concepts related to job-related attitudes will be explored. Then, the pioneering work of Herzberg's Motivation-Hygiene Theory will be examined in order to study its implication on educational leadership in terms of sources of teacher satisfaction and dissatisfaction. Different leadership styles will later be addressed along with key features of leaders in order to examine their impact on job-related attitudes and teacher perceptions.

The diversity in teacher perceptions will lead to a discussion about the extent of the influence of educational leadership in terms of the individuality dimension. Finally, having combined both influences, aspects of the teacher-centered approach will be used as a basis for the skills, knowledge, and understanding leaders need in order to satisfy, motivate, and higher the morale of their teachers.

Corresponding Author

Ruba Mohamed Najia

English Language Lecturer at Kuwait College of Science & Technology, English Language Department
Email: r.najia@kcst.edu.kw

2. EXPLORING THE CONCEPTS

A section of this paper will be dedicated to exploring these concepts, and the rationale behind it is their centrality to this paper, especially considering the conceptual issues relating to their definitions in application to educational leadership.

2.1. Job Satisfaction

Despite the fact that job satisfaction has been studied extensively, namely in the industrial and business fields, its most significant conceptual issue lies in the lack of clarity and consensus regarding the meaning of the term, especially in relation to teachers (Evans, 2001). Researchers and academics in the field have tended to give their own interpretations of the term, generally emphasizing a certain aspect of it. For instance, Lawler (1973, quoted in Evans, 1998, p.5) focuses on expectations claiming that: "overall, job satisfaction is determined by the difference between all those things a person feels he (sic) should receive from his job and all those things he actually does receive." I disagree with this definition because one's personal judgment about what s/he should receive is often obscured and selfish and may also be exaggerated, seeing as how setting high unrealistic expectations can result in constant disappointment and decreased satisfaction. On the other hand, Sergiovanni & Schaffer (1968, 1953, cited in Evans, 2001) interpret the term according to a person's needs' fulfilment in the sense that satisfaction will occur when the needs in a job are fulfilled, depending also on the strength of the need. Sharing this view is Evans (1998, p. 12), who developed her own definition: "a state of mind encompassing all those feelings determined by the extent to which the individual perceives her/his job- related needs to be being met".

I choose to adopt Katzell's (1964, quoted in Evans, 2001, p.321) who includes values, goals, desires, and interests, in his "frame of reference" in the following way: "job features which a person perceives as attractive or repellent, desirableorundesirable" interpreting job satisfaction as "a response to the activities, events and conditions which compose the job". By adopting Katzell's definition, I draw on my own: "an individual response to job-related situations and/or circumstances that affect a person's attitude towards her/his job." The reason I adapt this definition is because it stresses the circumstances surrounding a job, and not only a person's needs. A person may be satisfied by a certain "condition, activity or event" in his/her job that is not a need, or that s/he has not previously considered being a need waiting to be fulfilled. There are things that satisfy you that you might not have previously thought would. There is no denying that needs should be fulfilled, however, there is more to be considered, depending on the context of the job. The strength of Katzell's interpretation of job satisfaction lies in its comprehensiveness, encompassing all aspects of the term, and this, I believe, is the reason behind the complexity of defining the term. Depending on what brings you job satisfaction, you tend to focus on that particular aspect of the term, which is why the term "individual" is greatly emphasized in my definition.

This brings us to what Evans (1999) refers to as lack of construct validity, which constitutes a methodological problem when researchers and participants do not share the same interpretation of the construct studied. In a need for reconceptualisation, Evans (1999) acknowledges the ambiguity behind job satisfaction, represented by the duality of what is satisfactory in contrast with what is satisfying, or being satisfied with or by something. The dividing factor in between is whether there was personal achievement associated or not. Evans (1998) thus differentiates between what she calls, job comfort and job fulfilment. The former "relates to the extent to which the individual is satisfied with, but not by, the conditions and circumstances of his/her job", whereas the latter is "a state of mind encompassing all the feelings determined by the extent of the sense of personal achievement which the individual attributes to his/her performance of those components of his/her job which s/he values" (ibid, p.11). For example, a study conducted on secondary school teachers in Hong Kong revealed that they are most satisfied with income (Tinghong, 1989), whereas in Jamaica (Rodgers-Jenkinson & Chapman, 1990) and Canada (Ball & Stenlund, 1990), satisfaction is linked to school prestige: the higher the prestige of the school, the higher the job satisfaction. However, by failing to define the term especially in relation to different national contexts, both the participants and the audience are oblivious to what aspect of job satisfaction is considered, which in turn, might jeopardize the validity of the results. Therefore, in order to conduct sound valid research, one has to explain beforehand to his/her participants what s/he means by key con-

structs that might be ambiguous or interpreted differently by different people.

2.2. Morale

Similarly, the concept of morale is also ill-defined. Having said that, one of the main issues with morale is whether it should be applied to individuals or to groups. According to Bohrer & Ebenrett, 1988 (quoted in Evans, 1998, p.23) morale is "a prevailing temper or spirit in the individuals forming a group." In contrast, Evans's (1997, p.832) research on 19 teachers in a primary school in England, has demonstrated to her that morale is "a state of mind encompassing all the feelings determined by the individual's anticipation of the extent of satisfaction of those needs which s/he perceives as significantly affecting his/her total work situation." Evans's (1998) evidence stemmed from research at Rockville County Primary where she found that responses to morale, influenced by a passive headteacher, were individually- based, emanating from differences in life experiences and biographical factors. Based on personal experience, I agree with Evans's findings. Having worked in a college where the vice president was thought to be autocratic engendering low morale upon her staff, I was satisfied with my job and had high morale because my perception of her leadership was that it was firm and responsible, which in turn affected me positively by challenging me to become better. Adapting Evans's definition, I see morale as a "prevailing individual state of mind surrounding one's work-related situations and/or circumstances, determined by the extent of satisfaction emanating from one's job".

2.3. Motivation

According to Bennell (2004, p.3), motivation refers to "the psychological processes that influence individual behaviour with respect to the attainment of workplace goals and tasks". Evans (1998, p.34) defines it as "a condition, or the creation of a condition, that encompasses all those factors that determine the degree of inclination towards engagement in an activity." I see motivation more as a "psychological process", as Bennell names it, rather than a condition. Nonetheless, I adopt both Bennell & Evans's definitions in the following manner: "motivation is a psychological process, subject to individual and/or job-related situations and/or circumstances that determines the degree of inclination towards engagement in an activity." Motivation, in my opinion, not only depends on the nature of the task or activity, but also on the perceived results as well as the circumstances surrounding it, which can be viewed differently from one person to another. Moreover, how motivated one is towards engagement in an activity can, I believe, be influenced greatly by individual circumstances that are work-independent, as well as job- related circumstances directly affected by the job. This is why I consider motivation to be psychological, within the individual. There are many tasks that we perform on a daily basis without being motivated to achieve them due to diverse individual reasons.

3. EXTRINSIC VS. INTRINSIC

This section introduces the pioneering work of Herzberg on job satisfaction with particular reference to its implications on teacher job satisfaction.

3.1. Herzberg's Motivation-Hygiene Theory

Herzberg's research into the job satisfaction of engineers and accountants in Pittsburgh led him to formulate a theory called the Motivation-Hygiene Theory, or the Two-Factor Theory. His theory is grounded on the premise that causes of satisfaction are distinct and independent from those of dissatisfaction. On the one hand, the "motivation" factors are intrinsic to the job and are capable of causing satisfaction and motivation, whereas on the other hand, the "hygiene" factors, derived mainly from the context in which the job is performed, are capable of creating dissatisfaction and demotivation. Moreover, Herzberg identifies five features of "motivation": achievement, recognition, the work itself, responsibility, and advancement. In contrast, the "hygiene" factors are composed of interpersonal relations, policy and administration, and working conditions (Herzberg, 1968, cited in Evans, 1999 & Nias, 1981).

The underlying assumption of Herzberg's theory is that "the opposite of job satisfaction would not be job dissatisfaction, but rather no job satisfaction; similarly, the opposite of job dissatisfaction is no job dissatisfaction, not satisfaction with one's job" (Herzberg, 1968, quoted in Evans, 1999, p.10). Herzberg's work is relevant to this essay in the

sense that, if leadership is considered to be a "hygiene" factor then, following his theory, it is thus not capable of satisfying teachers.

3.2. Practical Application of Theory on Teachers

3.2.1. Evans's Research

When applied to teachers, Herzberg's theory was questioned on several levels, including researchers such as Evans (1998, 1999) and Nias (1981, 1989). Evans (1998)

suggests that Herzberg's five "motivation" factors may be reduced to only one which is: achievement, arguing that the rest are merely reinforcers of achievement. According to Evans's (1999) dimensions of job satisfaction, she classifies Herzberg's "motivation" factors as "job fulfilment" (i.e. satisfying), and his "hygiene" factors as "job comfort" (i.e. satisfactory). However, unlike Herzberg, Evans's (ibid.) research has revealed to her that the removal of "dissatisfiers", i.e. "hygiene" factors can actually lead to satisfaction, but the "job comfort" aspect of satisfaction, rather than the fulfilling one. It is clear to Evans that Herzberg does not acknowledge this distinction, due to his failure to recognize the ambiguity behind job satisfaction, which is crucial in interpreting job-related situations.

3.2.2. Nias' Research

Nias (1981) questions the applicability of Herzberg's theory on the grounds of theory transferability, claiming that in teaching, one cannot distinguish between the contextual factors (hygiene) and the work itself (motivation). I agree with the latter because I believe that extrinsic matters of the job, such as physical conditions, can impair enormously on the performance of the job, and thus cause job dissatisfaction, and by that – referring to my definition of job satisfaction- I mean, a negative response to this particular job circumstance. Furthermore, I also believe that "job fulfilment" can be affected by such a negative circumstance through inhibiting a feeling of achievement. For instance, if you were a physics teacher and your laboratory is not functioning properly, causing you to use unwanted methods of teaching, this will directly have an impact on your achievement level, i.e. your "job fulfilment" level. Moreover, applied to leadership, if your leader inhibits your auton-

omy in the classroom controlling each and every way you "do things", this will affect your intrinsic sense of achievement. If your sense of achievement stems from responsiveness of students, such as the primary teachers interviewed by Nias (1981), then having a leader implementing a teacher-centered approach to learning would reduce your students' responsiveness, and in turn, reduce your level of personal competence and achievement.

Stemming from her research, Nias (ibid.) distinguishes between "dissatisfiers" (extrinsic factors which cause dissatisfaction) and "negative satisfiers" (intrinsic factors which cause an absence of satisfaction, and not dissatisfaction). However, my own reasoning goes against that of Nias. Acknowledging the fact that the intrinsic factors are more likely to cause satisfaction than extrinsic factors, then it is only natural that "negative satisfiers", which are intrinsic to the job, should cause dissatisfaction, and not an absence of satisfaction, as argued by Nias, considering their higher potential in causing "job fulfilment". Nonetheless, picking up on my last argument about achievement, I see a correlation between extrinsic factors and job fulfilment: the higher the effect of extrinsic factors is on achievement, the stronger their effect is on "job ful-filment"; be it a positive or negative correlation. With this in mind, I introduce my own criticism of Herzberg: agreeing with Evans (1999) that his "motivation" factors can be reduced to achievement only, I see that his justification for having two distinct categories for job satisfaction and dissatisfaction is flawed because both have the potential of satisfaction. Building up on Evans's (ibid.) point that the removal of "dissatisfiers" can create satisfaction, in terms of "job comfort", I take it one step further claiming that "hygiene" factors can positively or negatively affect "motivation" factors depending on their extent of influence on achievement. It is true that "motivation" factors are more likely to have an impact on achievement (Seco, 2002) but that should not obscure the fact that "hygiene" factors can also play an important role depending on the circumstance and/or situation. Moreover, since I define job satisfaction as a response to job circumstances and/or situations that affect one's attitude towards his/ her job, I do not believe satisfaction and dissatisfaction should be placed under two independent, separate categories. Having said this, one of the most important extrinsic influences such as educational leadership is thus capable of causing both satisfaction and dissatisfaction

depending on the nature of the leadership.

4. LEADERSHIP STYLE

"Many teachers face poor prospects, low morale and even lower pay levels, but treat them right and they'll move mountains for you" (Stephens, 1998b, cited in Evans, 1999, p.18); "teachers have the capacity to make their staff dread going to work every Monday morning" (Evans, 1999, p. 17). These quotes illustrate the importance of leadership's impact on teachers' attitudes towards their work (Shechtman et. al, 1994). Whichever leadership style s/he chooses to adopt, a headteacher is "the key influence on his/her school, since his/her leadership, whether it be autocratic, democratic or laissez-faire sets the tone of the school's micropolitics and establishes the parameters within which other sources of influence may operate" (Evans, 1998, p.118).

4.1. Type of Leadership and its Impact on Teacher Job Satisfaction, Morale, and Motivation

There has been a considerable amount of research carried out on leadership styles and their impact on attitudes of staff, disseminating from different theoretical frameworks. Burns (1978, quoted in Bogler, 2001, p. 663) refers to transformational leadership where leaders and followers inspire each other to achieve "higher levels of morality and motivation", and transactional leadership based on exchange relationships whereby the role of the leader is to maintain "the status quo by satisfying the needs of the followers." Transformational leadership is more favourable because of the collaborative and responsive nature of the relationship between leaders and followers as opposed to the "routinized, non-creative environment" displayed by transactional leaders. Leadership styles are associated with decision making styles; at one end, an autocratic leader does not consult his/her staff and makes the final decision, whereas at the other end, a participative leader refers to a more democratic leader, characterized by open channels of communication with staff.

Shechtman et.al's (1994) research on teachers' perceptions of school organization climate based on 160 Arab teachers in 20 schools in Israel found that the strongest contributor of teacher satisfaction was principal leadership style. The schools whereby the principal demonstrated an authoritarian leadership style was a cause for teacher job dissatisfaction and burnout, whereas those where teachers were considered equal partners, illustrated by an involvement in decision making, contributed to high levels of job satisfaction. Likewise, extensive research between 1987 and 1994 on 5,088 first-year teachers in the United States found that autonomy at work accompanied by supportive school leadership played a big role in positively shaping teachers' attitudes about their work (Weiss, 1999). As first-year teachers, they might not know what to expect from the job; therefore, such supportive situations create in them a positive response that, in turn, shapes their attitude towards their job, encouraging them to remain in teaching. Moreover, as first-year teachers, their response to job-related situations and/or circumstances might then shape their needs and desires towards the job. Another important factor of teacher satisfaction, morale, and motivation is the extent to which the organization stresses recognition and accomplishment (Anderman et.al, 1991). Consistent with the latter, one of the participants in Evans's (1998, p.18) research on professionality said the following about her headteacher: "I don't know what it is about her, but she made you want to do your best – and not just for her, but for yourself...". The latter deals with the type of personality of the headteacher, something that Evans (1998) has explored in her key influential factors of headteachers.

4.2. Key Influential Features of Leaders

Delving deeper into leadership approaches, Evans (1998) developed five interrelated features of a leader which, combined, create a certain leadership approach. These are: "personality, interpersonal behaviour, 'mission', professionality, and management skills" (ibid, p.119). Despite the fact that individuals' personalities impact heavily on their work, there is no cause and effect relationship when it comes to leadership quality. Likeable people do not necessarily make good leaders and vice versa; both are capable of engendering both positive and negative work-related attitudes. In Evans's research (ibid.), Geoff Collins was the most adequate illustration because he was liked on a personal level, but was a very ineffective and poor manager, creating feelings of frustration and dissatisfaction amongst his staff. My own experience with the person-

ality factor was opposite to that experienced by the staff at Rockville Country Primary. On a personal level, I disliked my manager because she had a very harsh and unfriendly personality, but as a leader, she was very effective, which made me very satisfied at work. I believe that her personality played a part in her credibility as a leader. Having said that, I am not insinuating that in order to be a good leader, one needs to be unfriendly and harsh but with the large amount of staff under her, she needed to be firm. Again, it depends on the given job- related situation. I prefer such a leader to Geoff Collins because his managerial skills are more important and affect me more than his/her personality.

Associated with personality is interpersonal behaviour whereby leaders' communication skills affect their relationship with staff. Again, good interpersonal skills do not replace management skills which greatly influence job satisfaction. As mentioned earlier, a participative and transformational leadership style is more likely to impact positively on teachers. Furthermore, according to Evans's research (1998), recognition of staff needs, feelings, efforts, and achievements was an effective motivator and a key-influencing factor of headteachers' management skills. However, it must be emphasized that teachers' tastes and preferences of managerial skills are very diverse and that there is no one style that guarantees positive job-related attitudes in all teachers. Part of the reason is the degree of teachers' professionality ranging from restricted to extended. As defined by Evans (2001, p.293), professionality is an ideologically, attitudinally, intellectually, and epistemologically-based stance, on the part of an individual, in relation to the practice of the profession to which he/ she belongs, and which influences his/her professional practice.

Positive attitudes are more likely to appear when there is a good match of professionality between headteachers and teachers. Generally, extended professionals are more challenging to satisfy because they are more demanding (Nias, 1981). One of the contributors to satisfaction in my job was the fact that my manager, an extended professional, always challenged me to do better by giving me more responsibility and allowing me to explore more innovative ways. This kind of challenge was my strongest motivator and its successful completion always boosted my morale and job fulfilment. Acrucial component of a good match is whether or not headteachers and teachers share the same school mission, which "provides focus, direction and purpose to leadership" (Evans, 1998, p.124). The more there is congruence, the more the mission is likely to perpetuate positive attitudes amongst teachers. The diversity of all these five influential leadership factors within headteachers themselves accounts for the diversity in teachers' responses to them, responses based on teacher perceptions.

4.3. Teacher Perceptions of Leadership

According to Rogers' (1951, cited in Shechtman et al., 1994, p.54) self-concept theory, individuals' interaction with meaningful others is based on their perception of the self. In the school context, these "meaningful others" are headteachers. Therefore, because the perception of self tends to be subjective, Anderman et al. (1991, p.5) argue that "it is important to consider how subjective perceptions of leadership may work through the overall culture of a school to contribute to teachers' satisfaction and commitment".

Our interpretations of the situations and circumstances are based upon our individuality and "self", which is why I see job satisfaction as an individual response, based on our own perceptions. Therefore, just as I perceived my manager to be firm and responsible and my colleagues perceived her to be autocratic, it is implied that, due to differences in perceptions, the interpretation of one headteacher's behaviour can be perceived differently by two different people under the same leadership. To support my claim, I use Bogler's (2005) research on 930 teachers in 98 schools in Israel examining the influence of teachers' occupation perceptions on their job satisfaction. The findings concluded that the variance of job satisfaction present among the participants was due to teachers' perceptions of their principals and their occupation.

After exploring the notion of teacher perceptions and seeing that the influence of leadership is translated differently depending on teachers, it is clear that applying generalizations to sources of teacher job satisfaction, morale, and motivation, namely leadership style, is both inaccurate and inadequate, considering the individuality factor present in each and every teacher. The next section is devoted to examining the dimensions of this individuality and its impact on job satisfaction, morale, and motivation.

5. THE "I" IN INDIVIDUAL

5.1. The Individuality Dimension

In her fifth level of elucidation, Evans' (2001) talks about determinants of job satisfaction which, congruent with her definition of the term, are individuals' needs' fulfilment, expectations' fulfilment or values' congruence. These determinants account for the fact that job satisfaction is more likely to be influenced by job-specific factors than by externally-initiated factors such as salary and educational policy. In that, Evans (ibid., p.293) considered leadership as "a key attitudes-influencing factor". The individuality dimension that causes disparity in sources of job satisfaction amongst teachers is underpinned by three key interrelated, influential factors: realistic expectations, relative perspective, and professionality orientation.

Realistic expectations reflect what the individual realistically expects from his/ her job, reflecting individuals' values and ideologies. March & Simon (1970, cited in Mercer & Evans, 1991) have identified factors that determine the level of job satisfaction, claiming that the common feature is that they all revolve around conflict. One of the conflicts that can be related to realistic expectations is that of the "conformity of job to self-image" whereby a teacher's self-image is determined by how he/she perceives her/his abilities and interests in comparison with the responsibilities allocated to him/her by leadership (ibid., p.293). Furthermore, Butt & Lance (2005) analyzed the views of secondary school teachers in 32 pilot schools in the UK involved in the Pathfinder Project, a project addressing issues of teacher workload and job satisfaction. The excessive workload found in their jobs, stemming mainly from non-teaching tasks such as paperwork, did not match teachers' realistic expectations of their job, which, in turn, was a cause of dissatisfaction (ibid.). However, while I agree with the fact that a dissonance from realistic expectations may cause dissatisfaction, I still believe one should enter his/her job with an open-minded philosophy of "+/-" expectations of the job so as to keep room for discrepancies which, in my opinion and experience, are inevitable and indispensable. This is also in line with my own assumption that needs and expectations' fulfilment are not the most important components in job satisfaction. As advocated by Butt & Lance (2005) and Evans (1999), the level of commitment to the job also plays a role in accepting these discrepancies, such as working long hours, as teachers are not all equally committed, depending on their relative perspective. The latter deals with one's perspective on his/her job-related situation in relation to comparable situations such as previous jobs, colleagues' situations, as well as one's personal life. The more central teaching is to their lives (Ball & Stenlund, 1990), the more commitment and engagement teachers will demonstrate, and the more committed they are, the more the school-specific factors and decisions are likely to influence them, and vice versa.

Finally, the last interrelated factor is that of professionality, as previously defined. Depending on their degree of professionality orientation, teachers will respond differently to job-related situations and circumstances; restricted professionals are more likely to respond negatively insofar as the situation relates to their classroom only, whereas more extended professionals are concerned with wider issues relating to decision-making and school policy (Evans, 1998, 1999). Therefore, importance attached to, as well as sources of, achievement and job fulfilment is dependent upon those three interrelated factors, which influence the development of a job-related ideal whereby it is the "perceived proximity to their job-related ideal that underpins individuals' job-related attitudes" (Evans, 2001, p.293). Since job-related ideals vary from individual to individual, what satisfies and/or motivates one teacher does not necessarily satisfy and/ or motivate another and the school that suits one teacher may not suit another. Therefore, from research on schoolteachers' job-related attitudes, Evans (1998) essentially believed that the degree of individual-institution match was dependent upon the ideological compatibility between school leaders and teachers, which lead her to believe that leadership was the most potent influence on job satisfaction, morale, and motivation.

5.2. Ideological Compatibility between Teachers and Work Contexts

However, delving deeper into the effect of leadership on job-related attitudes through a comparative analysis of school teachers and academics, one of her most significant findings was that in fact "leadership, is not, fundamentally, in itself, an attitudes- influencing factor" (Evans, 2001, p.300). The values and ideologies specific to work contexts are

translated into leadership; which makes its effect indirect. Therefore, based on the compatibility between their own values and those that shape the context, the more acceptable those contexts are to individuals, the more positive their job-related attitudes are.

Evans (2001, p.300) defines a work context as: "the situation and circumstances, arising out of a combination and interrelationship of institutionally- and externally- imposed conditions, that constitute the environment and culture within which an individual carries out her/his job." In congruence with Evans's (2001) revelations, other research studies have also alluded to the connection between the work context and the level of teacher satisfaction. Butt & Lance (2005, p.407) refer to the emergence of reforms in the past two decades, characterized by managerialism, market forces, competition, and consumerism which "meant that some teachers found themselves working in a system which was less in tune with their caring values". According to Evans (2001), the latter example would be referred to as a "compromising context" whereby individuals were required to compromise their own values and ideologies to accommodate to the work context, which negatively affects one's job satisfaction, morale, and motivation. The nature of these values and ideologies, as advocated by Evans (2001, pp. 300-301) cover six issues: equity and justice, pedagogy and andragogy, organizational efficiency, interpersonal relations, collegiality, self- conception and self-image.

Nonetheless, I believe that it all starts off with your commitment level which is mainly based on your relative perspective. When it comes to the ideological match between your work context and your own values and ideologies, the latter will stand in the way insofar as you are engaged and committed to your job, and how central it is to your life in general. In other words, the less you are committed to your job, the more you are able to separate your "teaching self" from your "non-teaching self", and the more you are able to separate your "teaching self" from your "non-teaching self", the less the values and ideologies of the work context will matter to you or affect you negatively ("compromising context") in case of an ideological mismatch. However, the concept of ideological compatibility, in my opinion, depends to a certain extent, on the degree of centralization or decentralization of the educational system of the country of a given school. For instance, in the country I reside in, Kuwait, the public system is highly centralized supported by a high power-distance culture; all schools follow the same centralised policies and procedures from the Ministry of Education, which allows no room for diversity and innovation of work contexts. Therefore, with such a highly centralized system, to what extent can one speak of person-organization fit or an ideological compatibility between the work context and the teacher? I believe it is worth investigating the applicability of such notions in different national contexts with different types of cultures and educational systems. After underlining that the compatibility between the work context and the values and ideologies of a teacher is crucial to job satisfaction, morale, and motivation, it is now useful to examine the implications of such a conception on the practice of educational leadership.

6. SKILLS, KNOWLEDGE, AND UNDERSTANDING FOR A TEACHER-CENTERED APPROACH TO LEADERSHIP

6.1. Key Features of Motivational Leadership

Teachers represent a school's most important resource with schools allocating their biggest budget to human resources. Therefore, keeping teachers satisfied should be considered high on the agenda of school leaders. First of all, in order to increase their satisfaction, headteachers need to be aware of the needs and expectations of their staff, what has been termed as "consideration behaviours" by Halpin (1996, cited in Bolger, 2005, p.668). The latter corroborates with one of Evans's (1999) five features of motivational leadership - as part of a teacher- centred approach to leadership - which is interest, whereby headteachers show interest in their staff's professional development, ideas, concerns, whether it be work-related or not. This goes in line with awareness, another feature of motivational leadership which involves knowing what is going on in your school. Both these features would enable leaders to know the sources of their teachers' satisfaction and dissatisfaction, what matters to them and what doesn't, what contributes to their morale and motivation, which should in turn, prompt leaders to adapt their leadership style accordingly in order to get the best out of their staff (Evans, 1999, Mercer & Evans, 1991).

However, having established that sources and contributors to job satisfaction depend on the compatibility between values and ideologies of institutions and teachers, one should then beware of the role that the national context plays in shaping these values and ideologies. The importance allocated to certain sources and values differ from country to country depending on the culture as well as the worth placed on teaching as a profession (Rodgers-Jenkinson & Chapman, 1990, Tinghong, 1989). A crucial representation of values and ideologies lies in the direction of the school, i.e. its clearly stated vision and mission (Evans, 1999). This brings us to one of the most significant features of motivational leadership: individualism; whose main premise revolves around treating your staff as individuals and not as a whole group. Individualism suggests that leaders should be aware of individual needs, sources of dissatisfaction and satisfaction, job-related ideals, values and ideologies, professionality orientations, in order to cater for the teacher diversity amongst staff (Evans, 1999). There is no denying that manageability of individualism could be an issue. However, instead of treating the staff as a whole, one could group people according to certain significant features in order to accommodate their differences as much as possible.

As I have demonstrated earlier, leadership does not affect everyone in the same way; this is because people are different in all aspects, namely in relation to biographical factors such as gender, age, tenure, marital status, educational level, and personal characteristics, which makes everyone respond differently to given situations (Ladebo, 2005, Crossman & Harris, 2006, Rodgers - Jenkinson & Chapman, 1990, Seco, 2002). Therefore, leaders should know how much of an impact they have on teachers with varying biographical characteristics (Anderman et.al, 1991).

Finally, one of the most vital aspects of motivational and teacher-centered leadership is recognition (Evans, 1999). Recognition is a very strong motivator due to its contribution to job fulfilment. As much as one can get job fulfilment from his/her own achievements, if they are not recognized properly, this will lead to frustration and disappointment. Recognition involves giving praise, acknowledging achievements and efforts, commenting on people's work, promoting people or giving them a pay raise. In some high-power distance cultures, recognition is often neglected due to the gap between leader and follower. For instance, one of my colleagues from China mentioned that she only met with her headteacher two times during the whole year. In contrast, my manager was always present, walking around staff rooms, giving feedback and praise; it motivated me and at the same time, always "kept me on my toes". These two extremes respectively illustrate "distant leadership" whereby the leader is not in close, regular, contact with his/her staff and therefore does not give constant feedback as opposed to "nearby leadership" (Alimo-Metcalfe & Alban-Metcalfe, 2005). Finally, it is clear that teacher-centered leadership represents a type of leadership that gives great consideration to teachers, to their needs and expectations, and most importantly to their differences.

7. CONCLUSION

The measure of success for any school is through teaching and learning. Responsible for the latter are teachers whose satisfaction plays a great role in the classroom. Getting the best out of teachers has to first go through the process of satisfying them, motivating them, and raising their morale, i.e. investing in their job-related attitudes. Although leadership is not the most potent influence on job satisfaction, morale and motivation due to the fact that teachers are very diverse in a wide range of aspects, its varied and personalized impact cannot be disregarded. However, looking at the wider picture, in order to be a good leader, one needs to realize that his/her leadership style indirectly affects the work context, representative of the values and ideologies of the institution, and that this ideological framework is a crucial component of compatibility between the teacher and the institution. Having this in mind, with the right knowledge and understanding about the needs, expectations, attitudinal responses, and characteristics of their staff as individual members of a group, leaders can use their direct and indirect influence in the direction of teacher satisfaction, morale, and motivation by catering to their individuality.

Conflict of interests

The author declare no conflict of interest.

REFERENCES

Alimo-Metcalfe, B. & Alban-Metcalfe, J. (2005) "Leadership: Time for a New Direction?", Leadership, vol.1, no.1, pp. 51-71.

Anderman, E., Belzer, L. & Smith, J. (1991) "Teacher Commitment and Job Satisfaction: The Role of School Culture and Principal Leadership" In: The Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, 3-7 April 1991, Chicago. Urbana: National Center for School Leadership.

Ball, C. & Stenlund, V. (1990) "The Centrality of Work, Working Conditions and Job Satisfaction of Teachers in Canada: an Ontario study", Comparative Education, vol.26, no. 2/3, pp. 319-330. Bogler, R. (2001) "The Influence of Leadership Style on Teacher Job Satisfaction", Educational Ad- ministration Quarterly, vol.37, no.5, pp. 662-683.

Butt, G. & Lance, A. (2005) "Secondary Teacher Workload and Job Satisfaction", Educational Management Leadership & Administration, vol.33 , no.4, pp. 401-422.

Crossman, A. & Harris, P. (2006) "Job Satisfaction of Secondary School Teachers", Educational Management Leadership & Administration, vol.34, no.1, pp. 29-46.

Evans, L. (1997) "Addressing problems of conceptualizations and construct validity in researching teacher's job satisfaction", Educational Research, vol.39, no.3, pp. 319-331.

Evans, L. (1997) "Understanding Teacher Morale and Job Satisfaction", Teaching and Teacher Education, vol.13, no.8, pp. 831-845.

Evans, L. (1998) Teacher morale, job satisfaction and motivation, London: Paul Chapman.

Evans, L. (1999) Managing to motivate: a guide for school leaders, London: Cassell.

Evans, L. (2001) "Delving Deeper into Morale, Job Satisfaction and Motivation among Education Professionals: Re-examining the Leadership Dimension", Educational Management and Administration, vol.29, no.3, pp. 291-306.

Ladebo, O. (2005) "Effects of Work-related Attitudes on the Intention to Leave the Profession: An Examination of School Teachers in Nigeria", Educational Management Leadership & Administration, vol.33, no.3, pp. 355-369.

Mercer, D. & Evans, B. (1991) "Professional Myopia: job satisfaction and the management of teachers", School Leadership & Management, vol. 11, no.3, pp. 291-301.

Nias, J. (1980) "Leadership Styles and Job-Satisfaction in Primary Schools", in Bush, T.,

Glatter, R., Goodey, J. & Riches, C. (eds.) Approaches to School Management, London: The Open University Press.

Nias, J. (1981) "Teacher Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction: Herzberg's 'two-factor' hypothesis revisited", British Journal of Sociology of Education, vol.2, no.3, pp. 235-246. as, J. (1989) Primary Teachers talking: A Study of Teaching as Work, London: Routledge.

Rodgers-Jenkinson, F. & Chapman, D. (1990) "Job Satisfaction of Jamaican Elementary School Teachers", International Review of Education, vol.36, no.3, pp. 299-313.

Seco, G. (2002) Teacher satisfaction: some practical implications for teacher professional development models. In: The European Conference on Educational Research, 11-14 September 2002, Lisbon. Urbana: University of Lisbon.

Shechtman, Z., Zou'bi, M. & Katz, M. (1994) "Principal Leadership Style and Teacher Feelings and Behavior: Arab Schools in Israel", The School Community Journal, vol.4, no.2, pp. 53-66.

Ting-Hong, W. (1989) "The Impact of Job Satisfaction on Intention to Change Jobs among Secondary School Teachers in Hong Kong", CUHK Education Journal, vol.17, no.2, pp. 176-185.

Weiss, E. (1999) "Perceived workplace conditions and first-year teachers' morale, career choice com- mitment and planned retention: a secondary analysis", Teaching and Teacher Education, vol.15, pp. 861-879.