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The Motivation and Commitment of Teachers in Arab Secondary Schools in Israel: Problems and Improvement Strategies

Author: Nassar Kasabri

Abstract

When the state of Israel was established in 1948, about 150,000 Arabs remained in the country. Since then, this minority, now more than a million, has faced a massive educational problem. For example, the Arab educational system, which was not headed by an Arab until the early 1970’s, is segregated from the Jewish system. This segregation militated against Arab children’s education, in terms of, funding, buildings, the restricted curricular aims of Arabic language and literature teaching, civics and history of the Arabs. Furthermore, unqualified teachers and head teachers were appointed, thereby lowering teacher status in the Arab community.

The consequent loss of motivation and commitment among Arab school teachers contributed to the high drop-out rate of Arab pupils in the Local Education Authority (LEA) schools, reaching about 50 per cent in 1992, while the Matriculation pass rate averaged only 30 per cent.

Significantly, however, the 33 private Arab secondary schools, affiliated to Christian Churches (PC), revealed both a minimal drop-out rate and the highest Matriculation pass rate, namely 59.5 per cent in 1998 (Statistical Abstract of Israel, 2000, 22.21).

To investigate this discrepancy, the present research compares the motivation and commitment of Arab LEA school teachers with those in the PC schools. The research also analyses the effect of segregation and discrimination on Arab pupils’ achievements, and how the performance gap between Arab and Jewish schools might be bridged.

The investigation further reveals significant job dissatisfaction among LEA teachers, an unacceptably low level of school culture, teachers’ motivation and commitment in school staffs, together with a lack of vision, of school policy and of teachers’ involvement in the process of decision-making. Conversely, the PC school teachers motivation and commitment to these factors was found to be more professional and dedicated.

Furthermore, the PC teachers displayed a more positive attitude than their LEA colleagues towards the issue of educational discrimination.

The research concludes that cultural and motivational change in Arab schools is needed to produce better educational results.
1. Introduction

1.1 The rationale and purpose of the thesis

School improvement and teacher motivation and commitment are important themes throughout the world, but there is a particular need to ensure improvement in Arab schools in Israel. Hence,

the purpose of this thesis is to improve the motivation and commitment of teachers in these schools, for the following reasons:

There is low motivation among Arab teachers due to the stigma attached to them (as will be explained on p.6) which does not encourage University or Teachers’ College graduates to apply for teaching jobs. Moreover, there is a high drop out rate in the secondary schools, about 54 percent in 1992, (Statistical Abstract of Israel, 1997, vol. 48, p.5-7) and a low percentage of those passing the Bagrut examinations, which is equivalent to the G.C.S.E., this was about 32 percent of the ‘Bagrut’ class in 1999 (Table 1.3). Another important, although political reason, is the assumed segregation and discrimination against Arab education, one aspect of which is funding. The Israeli State Controller’s Annual Report in 1992 revealed many inequalities, which were also stressed by Hawkins (1993, p.84); for example, classrooms in Arab schools are poorly heated, poorly lit and overcrowded.

Moreover, 77 percent of all rented classrooms are in the Arab sector; special education is limited to 1 percent of Arab pupils compared to 6% for Jewish pupils; and in terms of counselling only 10 percent of the Arab pupils have access to a counsellor, while 90 percent of Jewish pupils have such access. Confiscation of Arab lands, which were their source of livelihood, is another political reason, Since it meant uprooting people from their homeland. But, ‘nationalizing the concept of education’,
which was suggested by Mazzawi (1997, p.172) might help to grow new roots.

‘Nationalizing’ here, does not mean conventional education, but also fostering commitment and learning in national groups (Tamir, 1988). It conveys education for all, with minimum drop-out, with minimum failure in the Bagrut exams, and with high teacher and learner competence; but this is a political issue, which can only be solved politically and, until then, our present problems can be solved mainly by improving the academic achievements of the students. This in turn requires improving the motivation and commitment of teachers in Arab schools in order to face the assumed policy of segregation, discrimination and confiscation of Arab lands, insofar as this affects education. Confiscation of Arab lands caused a diversion from the agricultural way of life of most Arab citizens in Israel, who became wage earners, (Mari’1978). This diversion, requires higher technical, vocational and academic qualifications in all aspects of daily life, which can be supplied only by means of scholastic achievements in the schools, through increased professional dedication on the part of the head teachers and their staffs. Thus, changing the motivation and commitment of teachers in Arab schools in Israel is likely to be a key issue to school improvement. Hence, the explicit purpose of this thesis is:

1. To examine the perception of motivation and commitment of teachers in Arab schools by teachers and head teachers in Israel.

2. To examine aspects of how senior managers in schools could best change motivation and commitment in teachers.

3. To recommend ways to change motivation and commitment in teachers.

4. Overall, to promote “School Improvement” in the Arab education sector.

Pertaining to this purpose, are the following research questions:
1. What are the perceptions of teachers and head teachers of the factors associated with the culture of their school that affect motivation and performance of teachers?

2. What factors, derived from the motivation theories, are likely to produce commitment and motivation amongst teachers in Arab schools in Israel.

3. What are the perceptions of teachers and head teachers of the political contextual factors related to motivation and performance of Arab teachers in Israel?

4. What appear to be the differences in motivation, commitment and cultural factors between Local Education Authority school (LEA) and Private Church school (PC) teachers in the Arab educational sector?

Methodologically, these questions are to be examined by two methods. Firstly a semi-structured interview to be conducted with the principals of the schools and a teacher from each school participating in the sample of the research population, in order to find out their conception of commitment and what factors will promote teachers’ commitment and finally internalize it; and, in addition, what factors are affecting the motivation of teachers. They will also be asked whether the different components of educational management, such as vision, policy, collaboration, teachers’ involvement, beliefs, teachers’ self actualization, satisfaction and dissatisfaction of teachers, and profile of the principal, are being implemented to motivate teachers towards improving school achievements, and if so, to what extent. Another aspect of the interviews will be focused on the contextual political issue of ‘segregation and discrimination’ against Arab schools in Israel, how it can be solved and what the role of the teacher is in this situation. (A full description of the organization of the
interviews and the problems linked to it are located in the Methodology chapter.)

The second method is a questionnaire, to be distributed among all the teachers of the schools in the sample. Some teachers in the sample will be asked earlier to answer the questionnaire, this will be used as a pilot. The questionnaire will be based on the research questions that appear in the Methodology chapter. After collecting the pilot questionnaire, it will be amended and then distributed among the teachers. These two methods, on the one hand, the interviews with the head teachers and the teachers, and on the other hand, the questionnaire to the teachers, are used in order to give answers to the research questions, an analysis will then follow. Would changing the motivation and commitment of teachers in Arab schools in Israel lead to school improvement? Would it lead to minimizing the drop-out rate of students from the schools?

Would it lead to an increase in the percentage of passes in the Matriculation exams? The answers to these questions might lie in the process of changing the motivation and commitment of the teachers. Accordingly, we must first examine the demographic background of the pupils and teachers in the Arab school sector.

**Background**

About 85 per cent of the Arab population in Israel live in rural areas, the majority of whom used to earn their living by cultivating their lands. The continuous confiscation of the lands by the government of Israel, whether for ‘security’ reasons, or ‘Judaizing’ Galilee, (Mari’ 1978, p.6), or in order to provide the Jewish new-comers with land, and more recently to construct a highway ‘crossing Israel’, led many of the Arab people to shift to become wage earners. An additional reason for this change was that the quality of their crops could not compete with the crops grown by more technically advanced Jewish farmers.
“...they are discriminated against in their employment, living and learning opportunities.”  (Hawkins, 1993, p.81)

All jobs need training and qualifications, if these are not obtained, the chances in competition for better jobs will be minimal. The diversion of the agricultural way of life of Arabs in Israel to become wage earners means that they need better training and better qualifications. This need is linked directly to academic achievement and there is, therefore, a need for school improvement. However, academic achievement as expressed by the Bagrut (Matriculation) results in the Arab schools is low, only 31.54 percent passed these exams in 1999 and 29 percent in 2000. School improvement is linked to so many factors, for example, integrative implementation of strategies and the drive towards institutionalization (Hopkins, 1991); development planning and ‘school culture’ (Reynolds, et al 1997); and the role of the teacher in the classroom being another important component of school improvement, (Hopkins, 1984). Teacher motivation and commitment is also an important aspect for school improvement, as it is a part of the school’s culture, Cheng (1993), Hargreaves (1982) and others. Hopkins et al (1997, p. 270) argue that culture and school improvement are tightly linked together:

“The link between school improvement strategies and the culture of the school is of crucial importance.”

Mazzawi (1997) suggests that there is a need to nationalize education in the Arab community in Israel in order to keep their roots in the country, after the process of the confiscation of lands which cut the original links. Nationalizing education in the Arab community is a
political issue that cannot be managed directly in schools, since it needs the interference of political leaders, but as far as school performance levels are concerned, it can be replaced by changing the motivation and commitment of teachers to improve the schools. In addition, the high drop-out rate of Arab students from the twelfth grade 54 percent in 1992, compared to 18 percent among the Jewish students; and the low percentage of those passing the Bagrut exams 31.54 percent among the Arab students compared to 45.92 percent among Jewish students in 1999. [The figures used are according to the circular of the Ministry of Education (1999, p.5-7)] is a good reason to improve Arab schools. The rights and duties of both Arab and Jewish teachers in Israel are the same, but the motivation of the teaching process differs in many respects due to the segregation and discrimination against Arab schools. One of these respects is the setting of goals in the education process. Hawkins, (1993, p.83) reported this problem of the setting of goals in her comparative research into education in the West Bank, Gaza Strip and Israel (both Jewish and Arab schools):

“The aims of the education system in Israel are crucial in examining the marginal treatment according to education in the Arab sector. They achieved legislative status in the Law of State Education in 1953, which stated that one of the primary goals of state education is to ‘base elementary education in the state on the values of Jewish culture... on love of the homeland and loyalty to the state and the Jewish people’. This emphasis on the ‘love of the homeland’ reflected the perceived need of policy makers in the early years of the state to inculcate a sense of national identity into the hundreds of thousands of Jewish immigrants who poured into Israel at the end of the British Mandate. No
attention, however, was paid to the cultural and national uniqueness of the Arab minority in Israel.”  (Hawkins, 1993, p.83)

In fact, government policy towards the education of Arab children was based to a great extent on ‘security’ needs, based on the fear that Arab schools were good potential for nationalism. A very important factor which de-motivated Arab teachers, and still does, was the stigma attached to them in the early years of the establishment of the state of Israel. At this time candidates for teaching in the Arab primary school were accepted if they were graduates of a secondary school, with or without a Matriculation certificate, who replaced qualified teachers with “a national past or who were supposedly communist sympathizers” (Hawkins 1993, p. 83) and in some cases, candidates who had only finished Class Eight were appointed, (Educational Encyclopedia, vol. 3, p.1175). In secondary schools, candidates were accepted to be teachers only if they had a Matriculation certificate or in the best case a B.A. degree. Nowadays, most of the secondary school teachers have a B.A. and a very few have an M.A. degree, but the stigma still holds. In the same source, (Educational Encyclopedia, 1967, vol. 3, p.787) regarding Jewish education, it is argued that, basically, external variables are those that affect the status of the teacher in the primary school, on the one hand, promoting its importance as a result of the lack of qualified teachers and, on the other hand, promoting a feeling of disrespect caused by the employment of unqualified teachers. Today (1967), this status is changing because of the increasing number of academic graduates in schools. Moreover, the most important form of the assumed discrimination against Arab education is in funding: The State Controller’s report in 1992 showed that the Ministry of Education’s expenditure per Jewish student in 1991 was NIS 308 while the expenditure per Arab student amounted to only NIS 168, (Hawkins,1993, p.81). In the Times Educational Supplement of 18.1.2002, Sue Surkes reported the following:
“The US-based Human Rights Watch has accused Israel of ‘systematic discrimination’ against Arab pupils. Its research found that Arab schools received significantly less funding than Jewish ones.”

This discrimination is a result of the segregation adopted since the establishment of the State of Israel in 1948, when the Arab population was a small minority.

1.2 The National Context

The Arab population who remained in Israel, after the establishment of the state of Israel (approximately, 150,000), were mostly villagers, who owned lands, planted various kinds of crops and lived on them.

“Arab society in Israel is rural and traditional.” (Mari’, 1978, p.28)

The Arab population’s approach to education remained limited to the British Mandate period when learning was not compulsory, since until the 1930’s it was part of the Arab people’s culture, especially in villages, to send only male children to school.

“The fact that a very limited number of females attended private schools is probably due to the preference of traditional families to invest in their male children” (Mari’, 1978, p.13)

After 1940, the British government in Palestine encouraged school building also for girls and extended elementary education up to class seven, (age 13). In some villages, in the best case,
there was one school for boys and one for girls; in other villages, the children would walk to a
neighbouring village which had a school. In towns, there was one secondary school only and in
some of them education went up to the second secondary level (that is between 14-16 years of
age). Only in Jerusalem were there 3-4 full secondary schools, to which only successful and rich
students from all parts of the country, went to complete their studies. The highest grade in a
village school, (if there was one), was the fifth grade, which took pupils up to the age of twelve.
During the first decade of the existence of the state of Israel, most children went to school under
the law of compulsory education (1949), which included all children between the ages
of 5-14 and those between 14-17 who had not finished their elementary studies. The law was
successfully applied to about 97% of Jewish children in the age range 5-9 and about
87% from 10-14 years of age, while among Arab children, the percentage was much less.
(Buber, et al. 1967, Vol.3 p.1163). Between the years 1948-1990, the number of Arab children
in public schools increased by twenty times the 1948 figure, i.e. from 12,000 to 220,000.
During this period qualified teachers increased by five times their number in 1948. In the
1950’s unqualified teachers in public schools numbered about 70 percent, but in the 1990’s this
number had dropped to 15%. These changes were linked to the development of three community
levels:

1. **The national level:** after the confiscation of the Arab lands by the government, the owners
   of these lands lost their economic power. Mazzawi, (1997, p.172), argues this point:

   “This policy led to a nationalization of the concept of education as a resource which
cannot be confiscated, it is considered as a major tool for the struggle to exist as a
collective whose roots are in the country and whose identity is defined.”
The attempt to establish an Arab university and a follow-up committee for education (1984), and the organization of three national conferences on education between 1983 and 1989 are examples of the development of the educational process.

2. **The educational cultural level:** a bourgeois Arab stratum was developed not through lands, but through the services that are based upon vocational specialization. In this stratum, the absorption of Arab university graduates was a problem, for which the teaching market was a partial and available solution. At the same time, vocational education was very limited, which, in practice, was the central complaint of the Arab political speakers. (Shavit. 1989)

3. **The local-community level:** Culturally, the community differences and conflicts were transferred into the school. As such, the level of democracy was low, formalism and authoritarianism being dominant. Economically, there was a difference in financing the Arab and the Jewish schools, according to the Israeli State Controller’s annual report in 1992; this may have contributed to a drop-out of about 30 percent of children between 14-17 years of age. Still missing is a solid grounding in the curriculum of civil-political values in Arab schools; teachers are afraid of educating their children in these values, because they do not want to be involved with the Security Service (Kashti, et al. 1997, p.172). A similar argument, even stronger, was mentioned by Hawkins (1993, P.83):

   “In fact, government policy towards the education of Arab children has instead been motivated to a great extent by ‘security’ needs, based on the fear that Arab schools are potential breeding grounds for pan-Arab national sentiment. For this
reason, in the early years of the state, oral literature with a national content was prohibited, and teachers were given instructions to skip parts of history and geography books defined as ‘nationally oriented’. Over 30,000 Arab books were destroyed under the pretext that they were ‘against the state’, and teachers who had a nationalist past or were supposedly communist sympathizers were sacked from their jobs. Many of the teachers who replaced those who had been sacked were unqualified.”

The Arab teacher is caught between the hammer and the anvil, on the one hand, he is supposed to be loyal to his job, as an employee of the Ministry of Education, while on the other hand, he is an Arab, who feels loyalty to his culture. The Ministry of Education imposes the Israeli culture through the curriculum and through all other regulations, so, to some extent, the Arab teacher is caught in the middle:

“This is education at the cross roads of cultures. Arab education in Israel is caught in the middle of the Israeli-Arab conflict. The Arab teacher is expected to play two conflicting roles. If he emphasizes Israeliness, then he is playing the role which the authorities - his employers- expect him to play. If he emphasizes Arabness, he is playing the role which the community - his community- wants him to play. Whichever role he chooses, he finds himself in a difficult situation. The Arab education system in Israel is not only pressured by the expectations of the authorities and the community, it is also caught in the internal culture conflict of traditionalism versus modernism- forces with great impact upon Arab education in Israel. Although traditionalism tends to reduce the options of the Arab and puts him at a
disadvantage when he tries to compete in a predominantly Western-Jewish context, it is significant in helping the Israeli Arab to preserve his ethnic identity.” (Mari’, 1978, p. xii)

In addition to the development of these three levels; the national, the educational and the community levels, another external factor continued to develop, it is:

1.3 ‘Segregation and discrimination’

Arab children attend their own schools, in villages and in towns; Arab teachers teach only in Arab schools. The Arab education system is administered by a separate department in the Ministry of Education which was headed for a long time by a Jewish individual. This segregation might have led to discrimination in many aspects: including funding for Arab schools, which, according to the Israeli State Controller’s annual report in 1992, was much less than for the Jewish schools. The assumed discrimination is not limited only to pupils but also applies to other areas of education; for example, the ratio of the number of pupils per teacher in the Jewish school is twenty-seven pupils per teacher, while in the Arab school this ratio is thirty-five pupils per teacher. The average number of pupils in a classroom in the Jewish elementary school is 25.8 while in the Arab school this average is 35.1. In the secondary school, this discrimination still holds, the pupil/teacher ratio in the Jewish schools is 11/1 while in the Arab schools it is 18/1. In the year 1974/5 more than half of the teachers in the Arab elementary school were unqualified in comparison to 15 per cent in the Jewish school (Shavit, 1989). Another aspect of the assumed discrimination is what is called ‘the longer school day’. In 1990, the Minister of Education announced that a longer school day (an addition of 4-8 hours per week) would be introduced in all elementary schools. It proved to be a tool for school improvement. In 1989, 50% of the
Jewish pupils who previously failed in mathematics and reading skills passed these exams (Hawkins, 1993). In the Arab sector, this longer day was introduced in only six schools out of 564. The goals set for the different subjects of study also showed a significant difference between the Jewish school and the Arab school. This is not likely to produce teacher commitment, since only ‘a clear sense of purpose, translating the purpose to realistic objectives and removing barriers, will internalize commitment in teachers’ (O’Neill et al, 1994). As an example, the difference between the goals set in the study of ‘history’ in the Jewish school and in the Arab school as translated from (Al-Haj, M. 1996, p.104-105) is:

**In the Jewish school:**

1. To present human culture as a result of the integrated efforts of the Jewish people and other nations.
2. To evaluate our part in the formation of this culture.
3. To underpin the recognition of human collaboration.
4. To develop the aspiration to peace and good will.
5. To establish a national Jewish consciousness and to reinforce the sense of common national destiny.
6. To plant in the heart of the pupil, the love of the Jewish people all over the world.
7. To reinforce the spiritual experience of the pupils, in the Jewish people as a whole.
8. To internalize the recognition of the importance of the state of Israel as a means to secure the biological and historical existence of the Jewish people.
9. To develop personal responsibility for the development of the state.
10. To create readiness to serve the state in all ways.
11. To mould the pupil’s characteristics according to the nation’s and the world’s great
persons’ works.

12. To qualify and to familiarize the pupil to examine social problems, to derive conclusions and to try solve them by means of self-critical thinking.

**In the Arab school:**

1. To present human culture as a result of the integrated efforts of all nations.

2. To evaluate the part of the Jewish people, the Arab people and all nations in its formation.(that is, the human culture)

3. The third and fourth goals are parallel.

4. There is no parallel goal for the fifth goal mentioned above.

5. To internalize the recognition of the importance of the state of Israel for the Jewish people in all ages and to establish a sense of common destiny for both peoples.

Two goals in the original list are similar to those in the Jewish school.

6. To mould the pupil’s characteristics according to the work of the world’s greatest persons and according to those of the greatest Jewish and Arab persons.

As can be seen, a stress is also put on Jewish culture, even where it might not be necessary. It is not a mere difference between the two sets of goals, it is a clear discrimination. In the Jewish curriculum, the Jewish identity is stressed, while in the Arab curriculum it is not. In the Jewish curriculum, love of the Jewish people and reinforcing the spiritual experience of the pupils in the Jewish people as a whole is stressed, but in the Arab curriculum the least of these values is not mentioned. It is possible to maintain that this discrimination may, on the contrary, be a motive to strengthen commitment of Arab teachers to their job, and may motivate them to teach more hours and to internalize these values to their students, but Hawkins, (1993,p.83) has already
pointed to the reason why the Arab teachers cannot do that:

“In fact, government policy towards the education of Arab children has instead been motivated to a great extent by ‘security’ needs…”

As such, the Arab teacher may find himself or herself involved in security complications, which leads him or her to be more neutralized from the point of view of motivation and commitment, this situation applies to all teachers in all school levels.

1.4 Types of schools

During the British Mandate in Palestine, schools were divided into primary and secondary. The primary school included children from grade one to grade seven, that is from age six to thirteen; while the secondary school included pupils from the first level secondary to the fourth level secondary, at the end of which students sat for the Matriculation exams of London University. This division was preserved in the private Christian schools till the middle of the 1950’s, ( after the establishment of the state of Israel ) while in the public schools ( government schools ) this division was changed to: primary school from grade one to grade eight, age 6-14 and secondary school from grade nine to grade twelve, ( age 15-18); at the end of which the students sat for the ‘Bagrut’ (matriculation) government exams. Kindergartens for both Arab and Jewish children existed during the British Mandate, although not on a large scale, and these continued after the establishment of the state. In the late sixties a middle school was established, on a narrow scale, in the Arab sector, which included children from classes seven to nine; the curriculum of this school included technological subjects besides other basic studies, such as languages, mathematics, sciences, history and geography. Another change introduced since the
establishment of the state was coeducation; during the British Mandate there had been segregation, with boys and girls in separate schools. In Christian schools coeducation was introduced as well. In 1948-1949 the Christian private schools did not charge fees, due to the state of war in the country, but soon afterwards fees were paid by the pupils until the law of free compulsory education was passed in the early 1960’s for secondary education. Elementary education was free in public schools by the end of 1949, but not in the Christian private schools. Only in the beginning of the 1980’s, did the government begin subsidizing these schools by about 50% of the tuition fees. The distribution of Arab and Jewish pupils can be seen in tables 1.1 and 1.2 below.

**Distribution of all Arab children in the different schools**

The following tables are taken from the Statistical Abstract of Israel, 1997, No.48

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>1948/49</th>
<th>59/60</th>
<th>69/70</th>
<th>79/80</th>
<th>95/96</th>
<th>96/97</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>K.G.</td>
<td>1124</td>
<td>7274</td>
<td>14211</td>
<td>17344</td>
<td>27200</td>
<td>28200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>9991</td>
<td>36729</td>
<td>85449</td>
<td>121985</td>
<td>152530</td>
<td>160127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>2457</td>
<td>14803</td>
<td>44183</td>
<td>47547</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1956</td>
<td>8050</td>
<td>22473</td>
<td>42293</td>
<td>45395</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Statistical Abstract of Israel, 1997, No. 48).

In the Jewish sector, the distribution of the children is as follows:

**Table 1.2  Distribution of the Jewish children in the different stages of school in the Jewish sector, between the years 1948 and 1997**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>1948/49</th>
<th>59/60</th>
<th>69/70</th>
<th>79/80</th>
<th>95/96</th>
<th>96/97</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>K.G.</td>
<td>25406</td>
<td>75699</td>
<td>107668</td>
<td>246600</td>
<td>293300</td>
<td>297105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>91133</td>
<td>375054</td>
<td>394354</td>
<td>436387</td>
<td>539259</td>
<td>536836</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>7908</td>
<td>72792</td>
<td>149831</td>
<td>163830</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>10218</td>
<td>55142</td>
<td>129436</td>
<td>143810</td>
<td>242522</td>
<td>247293</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In the year 1966, 12,600 pupils from all communities, even from the Jewish community, were studying in Christian schools. Until that year the students were sitting for either the G.C.E. exams of the London University, or for the French Baccalaureate (according to the affiliation of the school). Since then, all students have sat for the Bagrut exams. The following tables show data concerning the Bagrut exams according to the circular of the Ministry of Education, 1999. P. (5-7).

Table 1.3 shows the percentages of the Arab pupils studying in the Matriculation class, drop-outs, the group age and the passes in the Matriculation examinations— the Bagrut.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>94</th>
<th>95</th>
<th>96</th>
<th>97</th>
<th>98</th>
<th>99</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age group in the Arab population</td>
<td>15400</td>
<td>15200</td>
<td>15400</td>
<td>16000</td>
<td>13700</td>
<td>13200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% studying in the Bagrut class</td>
<td>55.53</td>
<td>56.76</td>
<td>58.16</td>
<td>58.78</td>
<td>63.39</td>
<td>73.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of drop-outs from Sec. Ed.</td>
<td>44.47</td>
<td>43.24</td>
<td>41.84</td>
<td>41.22</td>
<td>36.61</td>
<td>26.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% passing the Bagrut exam out of the Bagrut class</td>
<td>18.81</td>
<td>22.21</td>
<td>23.11</td>
<td>23.2</td>
<td>27.9</td>
<td>31.54</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


In comparison,

Table 1.4 shows figures for Jewish pupils.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>94</th>
<th>95</th>
<th>96</th>
<th>97</th>
<th>98</th>
<th>99</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age group in the Jewish population</td>
<td>79500</td>
<td>77200</td>
<td>76000</td>
<td>77000</td>
<td>82000</td>
<td>82700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% studying in the Bagrut class</td>
<td>82.92</td>
<td>83.80</td>
<td>89.45</td>
<td>87.46</td>
<td>84.16</td>
<td>85.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of drop-outs from Sec. Ed.</td>
<td>17.08</td>
<td>16.20</td>
<td>10.55</td>
<td>12.54</td>
<td>15.84</td>
<td>14.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% passing the Bagrut exam in the Bagrut classes</td>
<td>39.50</td>
<td>43.82</td>
<td>45.06</td>
<td>43.71</td>
<td>43.07</td>
<td>45.92</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Statistical Abstract of Israel, 1997, No. 48).
(Statistical Abstract of Israel, 1997, No.48).

(Table 1.4 is also taken from the same reference mentioned above and on the same page 5-7)

1.5 Teachers in Arab schools

In the early 1950s, candidates for teaching in the Arab primary school were accepted if they were graduates of a secondary school, with or without a Matriculation certificate. Some candidates, both men and women, were accepted to teaching who were only graduates of class eight of the primary school; this tended to stigmatize the job of teaching. Buber et al, (1967, p.1175) explains:

“At the beginning, there was a serious lack of teachers, many unqualified teachers were accepted to teaching…”

The context refers to the beginning of the establishment of the State of Israel. As in other parts of the world, teaching is becoming a job for women in Arab schools in Israel, which could affect the motivation and commitment of teachers. The following table shows the distribution of teaching between men and women in Arab schools in Israel.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>1948/49</th>
<th>59/60</th>
<th>69/70</th>
<th>79/80</th>
<th>89/90</th>
<th>95/96</th>
<th>96/97</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>1,195</td>
<td>2,524</td>
<td>6,279</td>
<td>6,640</td>
<td>8,992</td>
<td>9,652</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of which women</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>377</td>
<td>783</td>
<td>2,894</td>
<td>3,250</td>
<td>5,400</td>
<td>5,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post primary</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>997</td>
<td>1,938</td>
<td>3,254</td>
<td>3,507</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(13-15 yrs.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of which women</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>627</td>
<td>1,181</td>
<td>1,328</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>286</td>
<td>1,342</td>
<td>2,677</td>
<td>3,504</td>
<td>3,720</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
of which women  -----  2  33  212  694  1,014  1,285

(Statistical Abstract of Israel, 1997, No.48).

Although Arab university graduates are increasing yearly and many of them go into teaching, the percentage of students passing the Bagrut exams is still very low, as table 1.3 shows.

A detailed description of each school which participated in the research will appear in the Methodology chapter, while an implicit description of the whole population follows.

1.6 The Institutional Context

The present research was conducted in ten Arab secondary schools in Israel, in the northern district of the country, more specifically in Nazareth, in upper Galilee and in the Haifa district. These included seven schools belonging to the Local Education Authority (LEA), one of which is a Bedouin comprehensive school and another, a girls’ vocational school, the other three secondary schools being private schools belonging to different Churches. This sample could be considered a representative one, since in other parts of the country there are very similar types of schools; for example, in the central district of the country, or in the Jerusalem district, there are private schools belonging to Christian Churches, as well as secondary schools belonging to the LEA. There are Christian schools in Jaffa-Tel Aviv, in Lydda and in Jerusalem. There are Bedouin schools in the Northern and in the southern districts of the country, but, it has to be mentioned that the problems facing the Bedouin schools in the North differ greatly from those facing the Bedouin schools in the South. At least, the sample could be considered a representative one in the Northern and Haifa districts, since, in these two districts, there are 79 secondary schools belonging to the LEA out of a total of 96 Arab secondary schools belonging to the LEA in Israel; while there are 33 private church schools in all Israel, 28 of them being in
the Northern and Haifa districts. The rationale for the sample is explained in the Methodology chapter. The pupils in these schools are mostly Moslems, except in the Christian schools where the ratio is about 50% on average. Two of the head teachers are women. Details of each school appear separately in the Methodology chapter.

1.7 Motivation and commitment as a factor in school improvement

One of the most important goals of any educational management system is to improve the achievements of students both academically and socially (Hopkins, 1994). In a changing world, school improvement is a continuous process, both in the academic and the cultural areas. The question is always how to improve the achievements. It seems that one way is through internalizing teachers’ commitment and changing their motivation, which is one of the main purposes of this thesis, that is, to internalize or change commitment and motivation in teachers in Arab schools in Israel.

Reviewing the literature of educational management such as, school improvement, school culture and teaching motivation, it can be seen that it is full of such expressions as ‘commitment is prerequisite to’ or ‘without the commitment of…’, this indicates the importance of the concept of professional dedication. Hopkins et al, (1996) emphasize the importance of the relation between school improvement and the leadership of the school in order to internalize teachers’ commitment. They also draw attention to the importance of clear goals in establishing staff commitment, as such, they place ‘commitment’ as their last and highest aim to be achieved. Although to produce ‘commitment’ in a materialistic world is difficult, where school improvement is the goal, it is still an aim of the managers of a school to produce commitment in its teachers. It is reasonable to think that designing a clear vision, adopting certain beliefs,
values and behavioral regularities (of the students, the teachers and the managers, and all those who work in the school), whether these are academic, social or ethical, might all lead to the feeling of being committed. Other factors are likely to internalize this feeling of commitment, involving the teachers in the process of decision-making, ownership, interpersonal relationships, common goals and the head teachers’ culture. In fact, school improvement is a function of many factors: ‘vision’ is one of them, according to Hopkins et al (1996). O’Neill et al, (1994, p.5) stress ‘clear purposes’ as linked to school improvement, this is likely to produce ‘a wider angle of vision’, where all are involved in it; the principal, the managers, the coordinators and the teachers. The factor of ‘involvement’ is not only linked to commitment, but also to school improvement as indicated by considerable research work. Stoll and Mortimore, (1995) refer to the following factors in school improvement: the involvement of the teachers, leadership roles and decision making, team work and collegiality and involvement of pupils in the management of learning. Joyce (1991) enumerates six components of school improvement, one of which is collegiality and partnership, where partnership is the involvement of parents, community representatives and even agencies. Sergiovanni (1994) referred to the term ‘involvement’ as ‘interdependence’ - the extent to which the staff felt themselves as part of the school- as owners of the school. Brundrett, (1998, p.308) argues the question of ‘involvement’ as based on shared values within a culture moulded by the leader. Involving the teachers in the process of decision-making, or in drawing up a certain policy, or in the ‘vision’ of the school, in order to produce their commitment, is not taken for granted, since any negative attitude such as hostility or apathy or opposition will certainly lead to failure. Bush, (1998, p.323) raises the importance of the head teacher’s role in school improvement. The qualities of the head teacher are likely to shape the qualities of the school he or she leads. If, for example, he or she is committed, the teachers will
probably be committed. Greenfield (1991) noted that head teachers were themselves committed 
to, and proclaimed their commitment to, the service of other people, such as their pupils. To 
some extent the qualities of the head teacher either promote improvement or retard it, this 
depends upon the way the factors referred to above are dealt with: vision, clear purposes, and a 
style of management that involves being collaborative, consultative, a good listener, decisive but 
not a dictator (Bush, 1998), motivated, committed and collegial (Greenfield, 1991). Clark and 
Clark (1996, p. 19) stressed that a successful principal has to be in the centre of any change. 
This field of leadership qualities is likely to be an area of research, since it seems there are more 
qualities and strategies of leadership that are likely to add to motivation, commitment and school 
 improvement. Goldring and Pasternack (1994, p. 251) concluded their research by saying that the 
image of school leadership is a direction for future research. 
The head teacher is not first among equals; he or she is the leader of the whole school, he or she 
is the leader of his or her pupils by shaping norms of behaviour for example, (Greenfield, 1991); 
he or she is the leader of the teachers, by shaping a mission for them (Goldring and 
Pasternack, 1994); such as, commitment and motivating enthusiasm for the teaching-learning 
process. Also part of the job- satisfaction of the teacher is the responsibility of the head teacher, 
through ‘involvement’, for example. Job satisfaction and commitment are linked together by the 
‘high performance cycle’ of Locke and Latham (1994). The motivation of the teacher is likely to 
be stimulated by his or her commitment to the goals, values, culture, beliefs and vision of the 
school. Commitment is reinforced and more internalized if satisfaction occurs. The question is: 
how to internalize commitment to the desired change in teachers? The answer to this question 
depends on many factors: Torrington and Weightman, (1989, p. 47) indicate that one important 
factor of this is the head teacher himself /herself.
Hence, motivation and commitment of teachers, are produced by many stimulators such as: vision, values, beliefs, goals and culture, to which the individual will be committed, and by which he or she will be motivated. These stimulators are also factors for school improvement. Hence, as can be seen, commitment pervades so much of the literature on educational management and motivation and commitment are concepts that are close to each other in educational management theories. These themes will be developed further in the literature review, especially ‘commitment’ which is a central factor in this thesis.
2. Literature review

2.1 A rationale

The focus of this thesis is on changing the motivation and commitment of teachers in Arab schools in Israel, for the purpose of decreasing the percentage of drop-outs and increasing the percentage of passes in the Matriculation exams, within the context of ‘school improvement’. Therefore, it is necessary to survey, as much as possible, the literature linked to this topic, namely, motivation, commitment, school improvement and the linkage between them. In addition, it seems that there is a deep link between school improvement and school culture; as such it is reasonable to review the literature pertaining to it and its linkage with motivation and commitment.

Motivation and commitment is a central topic in this work; it is relevant then, to search for its development, its different definitions and the theories that might be linked to strengthening the motivation and commitment of teachers in Arab schools in Israel.

2.2 Motivation and Commitment

Every human behaviour is motivated, the link between the behaviour and the motive becomes stronger if the motive is stronger; changing the motive might lead to a change in the performance and consequently a change in the quality of the goals. Changing the motives of teachers might lead to a change in their performance and a change in the results. This is the case with the teachers in the Arab schools in Israel; because of the stigma that was and still is attached to them, and for other reasons which were explained in the introduction, they are poorly motivated. If their teaching motivation is strengthened, there is a hope then, that students’ achievements will be improved.
Most of the motivation theories speak about ‘needs’, such as: the need for affiliation, power, growth, belongingness, achievement, love, autonomy and security; but for teachers, an important motive, it seems, is the related-pay.

“Outside the academic community there seems to be a commonly held assumption that motivation is pay-related.” (Evans, 1998, p.40)

This research tries to explore the existing motivation of the Arab teachers in Israel and their unsatisfied needs, then to explore ways for its improvement, for the sake, in turn, of improving their schools.

Educational management is linked to many factors, some of which are: people, quality, performance and commitment, (O’Neill et al, 1994). Each of these aspects includes factors and sub-factors; for example, people management includes taking notes of factors such as: skills; experience; age; cost and culture. One way of summarizing management of people is through the sequence:

Motivation → Performance → Objectives

Managing quality, in particular the quality of people working in the organization includes: competence; culture; motivation and commitment. Managing performance includes the consideration of: students’ achievements; teachers’ input; learning and teaching processes and feedback. As can be seen, ‘commitment’ is a central factor in educational management, as it is a central factor in this thesis.

**Commitment**

‘Commitment’ is defined by O’Neill (1994, p.5) as:
“Wanting to do well, to feel a sense of belonging to a group or team of people working towards the same goals and being determined to achieve those goals or targets, are natural aspirations for staff in any organization.”

This definition is recognized by Sergiovanni (1990) as ‘organizational commitment’, which can be managed as suggested by O’Neill (1994, p.5) by the following:

1. Articulating a clear sense of purpose, and translating it into clear and realistic objectives, removing barriers and providing opportunities for the achievement of those objectives.

2. Involving staff in developing that sense of purpose and integrating them within the school’s work and evaluating the skills and expertise they bring to the organization.

While ‘moral commitment’ is a feeling that usually resides in oneself, it can be thought of as linked to conscientiousness, which is a:

“Feeling of professional obligation to complete work regardless of the hours required or personal cost.” (Cambell and Neill, 1997, p.193)

Commitment is prerequisite in every area and in every aspect of educational management, if that area or that aspect is to be improved. Hence, it appears almost everywhere in the literature review. In this section, some examples are provided, in order to highlight its importance.

One aspect is school culture. Hopkins et al (1996, p.28) stress the importance of leadership and school strategies in generating staff commitment:

“We have suggested that a school’s improvement plans need to be clearly linked to the school’s vision for the future. Indeed the notion of priorities for planning arise from the vision, and where there is a lack of congruence between the school’s long-
term goals and a particular initiative it is hard to build commitment amongst staff.”

In the same area of culture, Hopkins et al (1996, p.28) highlight the importance of clear goals and vision of the school in order to secure staff commitment:

“ This account demonstrates that widespread involvement in the creation of the development plan is a key to both quality and commitment. It also shows us that linking planning to action is every bit as important as knowing how to plan- it is the result of the exercise when viewed in the classroom which will determine the future commitment of the staff.”

Torrington and Weightman (1989, p.47) indicate that it is the responsibility of the head himself to internalize commitment in teachers:

“The most frequent response to any question about commitment was that it has something to do with the head. Members of staff perceived him as a person who, when he was in school, was constantly involved with children and the general affairs of school life, other than sitting remote in his office.”
On page 48 of the same source, Torrington and Weightman (1989) stress the importance of ‘collaboration’ in producing commitment:

“The whole school and interdisciplinary meetings, which operate within the school also contribute to the patterns of team building and commitment.”

Commitment is also linked to ‘motivation’ as in the ‘High Performance Cycle’ of Locke and Latham (1990); if satisfaction is reached, rewards will lead to commitment, whether these rewards are substantial or insubstantial. As will be seen, ‘commitment’ is a concept that appears in every educational area, it will be further developed later in the literature review; moreover, its close linkage with ‘motivation’ is essential; the High Performance Cycle of Locke and Latham (1990) and McGregor’s Y theory (1970) being examples of this linkage.

**Motivation**

Motivation in general is an important concept, since it leads to the performance of the individual and to the goals achieved. In teaching, it is no less important, since it reflects the nature of the teacher’s performance and the level of the students’ academic achievements. Commitment of teachers to the educational process and to the organization is likely to be viewed as a motive for their performance. As such, there is a need to know what the factors are that rule motivation, and thereupon how to change motivation in teaching. First, it is reasonable and important to know how the concept of motivation has developed.
2.3 Development of the concept of Motivation

The study of motivation started a long time ago, for example, the Greeks’ Hedonistic philosophy maintains that every behaviour is aimed at producing a positive result. Then the concept of a cognitive approach has developed, which assumes that the main motives of the individual are known to him and are rational, in this case the motive is known as intrinsic, but if the motive is inspired by the outer environment it is known as extrinsic. All motives then, can be categorized as intrinsic or extrinsic; intrinsic motivation might lead to commitment and extrinsic motivation is likely to be adapted. Whatever the case may be, any motive needs stimulation to activate it. These stimuli are also known as motivators. The study of motivation is affected by the sequence: stimuli (motivators) → motive → behaviour → objectives. Is there any sequence or hierarchy amongst the different motives?

Maslow’s Hierarchy of Motivation (1946)

Usually, there is a scale of preferences in our life, even in our daily life. Maslow, in his theory, suggested a certain hierarchy in man’s needs. He assumed that the physiological are the most important and have to be satisfied first, then come the security needs, which include the need to be secure, at least in the short-term future. Later come the needs for belonging and love, which include belonging to a social group. Frustration of these needs leads to the individual’s difficulty in adjustment. Then comes the need for self-esteem, for example, the need for a positive evaluation and respect as a result of one’s achievements. On the top of his pyramid, Maslow put self-actualization, which is the need to satisfy one’s personal and intellectual potential. The implication of Maslow’s
hierarchy might be looked upon as universal, but any individual can adopt for himself or
herself another hierarchy which is more relevant. Can there be any kind of hierarchy in
educational motivation? What are the basic needs of the school for the sake of school
improvement? Is it school culture, school vision, its policy, teachers’ involvement in all
aspects of school life, collaboration and team work, teachers’ in-service training, or
teachers’ commitment to their job? Which comes first? Would a hierarchy similar to
that of Maslow be applied to the above factors for the sake of satisfying motives for
school improvement?

Some theoreticians on motivation developed theories that depended mainly on Maslow’s
theory. Herzberg (1959) developed the terms: ‘satisfaction’ and ‘dissatisfaction’, which
are linked in some way to Maslow’s theory. For example, satisfaction of higher needs in
Maslow’s hierarchy leads to satisfaction of lower ones and dissatisfaction leads to
frustration.

**Herzberg’s two-factor theory (1959)**

Herzberg proposed two factors to his theory: ‘satisfaction’ and ‘dissatisfaction’, the first
is caused by factors in the work itself, in the content, and were called ‘motivators’,
dissatisfaction is caused by the environment of the work and its factors are called
‘hygiene’. Maslow (1946) links satisfaction and dissatisfaction to the goals set, if these
are fulfilled satisfaction occurs, if not, dissatisfaction occurs. Herzberg explains that
motivators are factors such as: the work itself, achievements, responsibility, recognition,
advancement and personal growth, while the hygiene factors are: organizational
policies and administration, management, working conditions, interpersonal
relationships, money, status and security. The implication of this theory in education is reflected in that dissatisfaction occurs when the school environment is affected by that cause, for example: poor management, bad discipline, lack of teachers’ collaboration, or the head teachers’ failure to communicate.

Nias (1981) explains that satisfaction was obtained by means of intrinsic factors not only by ‘content’. She also found that if negative motivators were removed satisfaction would occur. As an example: sometimes there are barriers facing effective teaching, a teacher might like her/his job but the existence of a certain manager who behaves badly with the teachers weakens teaching effectiveness; the removal of such a manager and the replacement of her/him by an acceptable one, is likely to produce satisfaction and more effectiveness. Many questions may arise from this theory, one important question is: how to decide if a certain factor is a motivator or hygienic? There is some kind of ambiguity; hygiene factors or motivators are almost subjectively ruled and it may be a question of mal-adjustment of the individual to the environment. Satisfaction and dissatisfaction at work is one important area in teaching that needs to be managed. As an example, dissatisfaction occurs if teachers are not treated on an equal basis; equity amongst the teachers is a prerequisite for the educational climate of the school.

**The Equity Theory (Adams, 1965)**

This theory can be summarized in that the individual’s motivation is a result of the desire to be treated equally with the others in the organization. This equity is based on the relationship between the ‘input’ and the ‘outcome’ which should be seen to be equitable or in balance. The implication of this theory in education can be detected in the assessment process of the teacher’s input, represented by his/her method of teaching,
his/her relationship with his/her pupils, his/her collaboration with his/her colleagues and
the school management, and his/her commitment to his responsibilities. The outcome can
be assessed by the achievements of the pupils in the different exams. A change in the
input is likely to bring a change in the outcome, as such the motivation is changed.

Inequity arises when teachers compare themselves with each other as having the same
qualifications, the same amount of work (effort-performance) and the same outcomes,
but their rewards are different.

“The fact that perceptions of equity and inequity arise from a process of

social comparison (people comparing themselves to one another) helps

underline the interconnectedness and interdependence that exists with

organizations. Organization members are not totally isolated and

independent of one another. As a result, the way that management

treats one employee influences not that particular employee, but all

other employees in the organization who come in contact with that

person.”    (Feldman and Arnold, 1983, p.64)

As a result of inequity, the individual will feel frustrated, which will lead to complaint or
in an extreme case, quitting the organization, which is obviously a potentially serious loss
to the institution.

Some motivation theories are based upon the sequence : Motive, performance and
objective or goal, and the linkage between one concept and the other. There is no doubt
that motivation can sometimes be explained by means of the performance or by means of
the goals set.
The Goal Theory (Locke, 1968)

This theory can be summarized by the linkage between goal setting and motivation, the goal being likely to satisfy the motive. Between these two, there are attributes that may intervene:

“a. The more difficult the goal-set, the more difficult the performance will be.
   b. The more specific the goal-set, the greater the impact is on the performance.
   c. The person’s involvement in the goal-setting produces a positive impact on
      the performance.”  (Riches, 1994, p.236)

The implication of this theory in education is about involving the teacher in the goal-setting and in the process of decision making, since it produces her/his commitment and positive results are expected, because if she/he is involved her/his performance will be more effective, or at least the impact on performance will be more effective. An example of another implication of this theory in education is fulfilling the goals of the curriculum. A curriculum tries to answer the following questions:

“1. Why should we teach this rather than that?
2. Who should have access to this knowledge?
3. What rules should govern the teaching of what has been selected?
4. How should parts of the curriculum be interrelated in order to create a coherent whole.”  (Kliebard, 1977, p.262)
The answers to these questions are themselves goals to be fulfilled by acquiring the knowledge, its discipline, the teaching methods and its integration into the curriculum. It is not only knowledge that is to be acquired by the learner, there are other goals to be achieved, such as moral goals.

“Is the curriculum primarily a means of transmitting useful knowledge? 

Or does the curriculum have a moral dimension, where process is as important as content in shaping both the learner and the future citizen?”

(Lofthouse, 1994, p.140)

Once again, to have a greater and positive impact on the performance, the goals have to be made specific, clear, and involve teachers in the process of goal-setting, such as, the ethos of the school, behavioral regularities, the day-to-day targets and so on. Another development of Maslow’s theory of motivation was shaped by McGregor in 1970.

**McGregor’s X and Y Theory of Motivation (1970)**

Theory X is based on the assumption that the individual’s motives reside only in physiology and self-security. The reason is that the average man is lazy and is controlled and threatened with punishments in order to achieve, moreover he/she avoids responsibility and is not ambitious. (Bush and West-Burnham, 1994: p.231-232)

Theory Y is based on the assumption that the motivation of the individual occurs at the affiliation level, or the self-esteem level, or even at the self-actualization level (Riches, 1997), which are all high in Maslow’s hierarchy. He also assumes that commitment to the objectives is linked to rewards or achievements. His approach also includes elements of the Hedonism philosophy, where the individual seeks positive results. The Y theory is
likely to be closer to the motivation in education than the X theory, since, according to Maslow, every one seeks to satisfy the basic needs (physiological and safety) and then seeks to satisfy higher motives. The question that arises after this theory, especially the Y theory is: Who is the teacher? Is he ambitious? Is he responsible? Or, does he or she become lethargic after a number of years in the service? Innovation, collaboration, commitment and in-service training are all linked to responsibility and ambition, these are likely to be part of the teaching management. However, the teacher’s performance is the crucial stage which decides his or her Y motive, such as his or her self-actualization, which is expected to be the result of the performance.

**The Expectancy Theory (Vroom, 1964)**

This theory supposes that the motivation of the individual is influenced by the expectation of the impact of the behaviour, and is based on four elements:

a. the individual’s perception of the result.

b. through the personal perception, the motive and the behaviour can then be explained.

c. the possibility of measuring the strength of the motive.

d. that the rationality of human behaviour makes it possible to be aware of the behaviour and the motive.

It seems that there is one assumption missing in this theory and that is ‘feed-back’.

Continuous feedback between the individual’s behaviour and the result creates the individual’s expectation.

One’s expectation of one’s performance or one’s behaviour with clients depend upon the feedback one gets from them. This could apply in the case of the teacher’s performance
in the classroom and the level of collaboration with colleagues and the achievement of school objectives. The feedback one gets from her/his students and from the principal enhances one’s expectations and promotes her/his motivation or commitment to her/his work. Also, expectations depend upon outcomes, whether these are highly positive or highly negative, as such the individual will be highly motivated or weakly motivated and the expectancies will vary from high to low according to the valence of expected outcomes (Feldman and Arnold, 1983, p.58-59). ‘Valence’ as referred to by Feldman and Arnold is the ‘degree of satisfaction that the person anticipates’ from his outcomes.

The implication of this theory in education is that the head teacher should attempt to ensure high teacher effort in order that the performance will be high and consequently the achievements of the pupils will be high.

**The High Performance Cycle (Locke and Latham, 1990)**

This theory is based on other theories of motivation. As any behaviour is motivated to produce a certain result (the goal) which is likely to satisfy the motive, this goal produces consequences, if the performance is rewarded. One important consequence is commitment, as the high performance cycle shows (Locke and Latham, 1990, p.4). Commitment to the organization produces individual challenges, which motivate a new performance which might be moderated by other factors such as, feedback, ability and commitment, and mediated by some others such as, persistence, effort and direction, as such the cycle starts again.

One of the difficult questions that arises from this theory and others, is how to produce commitment in the individual and then how to manage commitment. Is it likely to be through the rewards which Locke and Latham propose? Would this apply if the
individual is a teacher? In their high performance cycle, Locke and Latham put ‘reward’ as the central dimension of the cycle, rewards (positive results) were the central issue for Hedonism. They also explain that satisfaction comes as the result of rewards; what are these rewards in the case of the individual being a teacher? While if dissatisfaction occurs (Herzberg’s two factors), punishments are many: complaints, protests, avoidance, illegal acts, aggressive responses or even substantial abuse (Henne and Locke, 1985). This is what teachers may achieve if they reach satisfaction; positive rewards whether substantial or non-substantial that might lead to commitment, but negative responses will surely not lead to it.

The Self-Motivated Achiever, or McClelland’s Learned Needs Theory (1961)

This theory identifies four specific needs: the need for achievement, the need for power, the need for affiliation and the need for autonomy. What is basically relevant to this work is the need for achievement, either on the level of the teacher or on the level of the pupil. The need for achievement is based on three characteristics, (Everard et al, 1990, p.32-34):

1. achievers like to select their own goals, in order to commit themselves to it and to be fully responsible for its attainment;
2. achievers tend to avoid extreme goals in order to be realistic, they prefer goals with moderate difficulty; the choice is rational and not arbitrary;
3. achievers prefer immediate feedback to their performance, in order to know how good the progress is.

Achievement is a need that emerges at a very early age (McClelland’s experiments, 1961), children with a strong need for achievement tend to manifest the same motivation
afterwards. The question that arises is, can low achievers become one-time strong achievers? Gage and Berliner (1975) found three characteristics of strong achievers:

1. they tend to be disciplined;
2. they collaborate with people like them, that is, strong achievers;
3. they work with intrinsic rather than extrinsic motivation.

Is it possible to educate pupils to these characteristics of Gage and Berliner, and thus to change them from low achievers to strong achievers? McClelland believes that the level of achievement motivation can be increased in low achievers through building more characteristics in the job, such as, personal responsibility, personal participation in goal setting, moderate goals and immediate feedback. The implication of McClelland’s theory of motivation in education could be at the pupils’ level and at the teachers’ level, maximizing the pupils’ achievements and the teachers’ motivation.

McClelland notes that financial motivation is stronger with weaker achievers than with strong achievers. His explanation for this argument is that weak achievers seek an alternative reward for their efforts. But, does the strong achiever give up the financial reward? Or, is the financial reward a motive? If it is not, then, what is a motive and what is motivation?

2.4 Different Definitions of Motivation

This chapter attempts to outline all the possible effective definitions of motivation as put by different writers, especially those linked to teaching. Motivation can only be inferred from the behaviours caused by it or sometimes from the goals set; in most cases, motivation is likely to be stimulated by some internal or external factors, as such they are named intrinsic and extrinsic motives. For example, if the teacher is involved in the
process of decision-making in the school, then his/her motivation and performance are expected to be better, since an extrinsic stimulator (teacher’s involvement) leads to intrinsic motivation. The definitions of motivation can be viewed from two vertices: psychological and educational. One of the psychological definitions is:

“That which generates a behavior towards a certain goal, or it is a state of tension (psychological or physiological), or a state of disequilibrium which drives one’s behavior until the tension is discharged or until the state of equilibrium is restored.” (Rajeh, 1973, p.68-69)

Reviewing many sources on the literature of motivation showed general definitions of the concept such as:

“Processes or factors that cause people to act or behave in certain ways.”

(Johannson and Pasge, 1990, p.196)

Or,

“What drives individuals to work in the way they do to fulfill goals, needs or expectations.” (Riches, 1994, p. 237)

Or,

“Incentives for effective performance are in the task or job itself or in the individual relationships with members of the working team.” (Vroom and Deci, 1997, p. 237)
Or,
“Motivation is getting results through people or getting the best out of people.” (Everard and Morris, 1990, p.24)

The above definitions did not identify exactly what motivation is but pointed to something residing in one’s self, for example, a teacher does not feel in a state of stability unless he or she is sure that his/her students are ready for the exam (the definition of Rajeh, 1973) or the case of involvement of teachers in a school’s decision, which activates some kind of a specific behaviour that is directed towards a wanted goal. The definition of Everard and Morris conveys almost the same meaning, although it is not always ‘getting the best out of people’. However, if their definition is aimed at education, it might convey a better meaning; it might be understood as having nuances relating to a child’s potential in the learning-teaching process, which is the expected goal to be reached in education. In order to understand motivation it is necessary to search for the type of behaviour or the specific goals stressed to be achieved. However, it can be inferred that a motive is some kind of potential energy that generates the behaviour. This potential energy or force needs a stimulus to activate it. Therefore the study of motivation is then likely to be focused on the stimulation process (motivators) or on the specific behaviour or performance.

There are many factors or stimuli that create motivation of the individual, such as: vision, culture, policy, collaboration, beliefs, norms, habits, rituals and involvement.

“A change in the school’s vision or its policy is likely to change the motive and the performance of the teachers.” (Hopkins, 1996, pp. 28, 29)
“A change in the political life of the community or the school might lead to
a change in the motive and performance of the teachers and the
principals e.g. through a change in the curriculum by outside factors.”

(Bush and Coleman, 1998, p.187)

and,

“A change in the culture of the school might lead to a change in the
teachers’ performance and motives through a change in some regularities
such as a change in the beliefs.”      (Bush and Coleman, 1998, p.189)

and,

“Collaborative planning might lead to a change in the teachers’ motives
and performance, through a change, for example in initiating effective
team work.”              (Hopkins et al, 1996, p.8)

As such, it is necessary to study the stimuli (or motivators) of motivation in order to
understand it. Motivation is a complicated concept, and is linked to many factors: it is
linked to human needs, either physiological or psychological (Maslow, 1946), it is linked
to the feelings, such as the feeling of being collaborative, or being committed, or
innovating, or being involved; it is linked to one’s attitudes, beliefs, values (religious,
economic, ethical or cultural) and it is linked to the vision of the organization. Some-
times, motivation is linked to the goals set for the organization, as the desire to be, for
example, a physician, an engineer or a lawyer and so on.

According to the sequence: Motivation → Performance → Objectives,
performance is another area affecting ‘motivation’. In Human Resource Management, the process of evaluation is essential (Riches, 1994, p.240). Torrington and Weightman (1989) even linked it to Maslow’s esteem needs, since it is the evaluation of the performance.

After every evaluation process, there is a need to restudy the components of this educational management process, to see why the improvement process did not progress. Was it in the area of motivation or in the area of performance or in the goal-setting process? It is necessary then, to study performance in order to understand motivation. The concept of performance is also complicated, since many factors are involved:

“The quality of people, their commitment to the organization, inputs, outputs, quantity, quality, feedback, goals, achievements, and even acknowledging the possibility of making mistakes.” (O’Neill et al, 1994, p.5-6)

In addition, it is not easy to understand the concept of performance because it differs from one person to another even if the motive is the same; also two different motives might lead to the same performance. However, one definition was given by Drucker (1989) in Bush and Middlewood (1997, p.204).

“The consistent ability to produce results over a prolonged period of time and in a variety of assignments.”
“The consistent ability” is that which leads to the performance and which is intended to produce the results, if it is applied to the sequence: motivation, performance and objectives. As an example, O’Neill et al (1994, p.2) defined a teacher’s performance as the implementation of the curriculum. In this definition, there is a clue to the motive, it is linked to the curriculum, the goal of which is the achievement of the students and the performance is the ‘implementation’. There will be a difference in performance depending on whether the motive is intrinsic or extrinsic. For example, if the teacher is not involved in the curriculum setting, the motive is extrinsic and the implementation is less effective but if he/she is involved in the setting, the motive is intrinsic and the performance will be more effective; the behaviour in both cases will be different. The involvement of the teacher in the goal-setting of the curriculum changes his/her performance (Per Dalin et al, 1993, p. 111).

To conclude this argument, the linkage between motivation and performance is two-way, one is influenced by the other and sometimes it is inferred from it, so defining one may help to understand the other. The definitions mentioned earlier are not the only known ones but there was always a development process of the concept, started by Maslow (1946) and continued through the 90’s.

2.5 Conclusion

All human motivation is either intrinsic or extrinsic; if it is intrinsic the performance is more effective (Gage and Berliner, 1975) since it expresses the need of the individual. Maslow (1946) built his theory on human needs, physiological and psychological; McGregor (1970) separated the physiological and the safety needs from the social and the psychological needs (X and Y); while McClelland (1961) has focused on the need for
achievement. the need for affiliation, the need for power and the need for autonomy. Whether it is the students’ achievements or the teachers’ achievements or the school’s achievements, McClelland’s theory is likely to be in the centre. Herzberg’s theory (satisfaction and dissatisfaction through motivators or hygiene factors), the equity theory (Adams), the goal theory of Locke and the high performance cycle of Locke and Latham are all auxiliary motivation theories to human needs. Changing motivation might change the performance and consequently might change the results.

The motivation theories of Maslow, McGregor, Herzberg, Locke and Latham, McClelland and others illuminated the way to develop motivations for other aspects of our life, one of which is ‘teaching’.

2.6 Teaching Motivation

There are both personal and organizational facets of the concept of motivation when related to teaching. The teacher’s personal motivation includes such aspects as job obligation and self-actualization. Job obligation might be financial and might be ethical, or in the case of teaching, an academic obligation, for example, obligation to the curriculum. On signing a contract, an individual feels obliged to perform according to its demands and requirements. Teachers in Israel are employed by the Ministry of Education or by the Local Authority or by private schools, but without signing a contract. The difference is that teachers employed by the Ministry of Education or by the Local Authority hold permanent jobs if they were not dismissed during the first three years of their service, while teachers employed by the private schools do not get permanency and are exposed to dismissal at any time if they do not show effective performance. Teachers
employed by the Ministry of Education and by the Local Authority do not feel obliged to their work; only those who have a conscience are committed to their job. Teachers’ conscientiousness, as previously defined by Cambell and Neill, (1997), is their:

“feeling of professional obligation to complete work regardless of the hours required or personal cost.” (Campbell and Neill, 1997, p.193)

Changing the way of employing teachers today to an obligatory kind of employment may lead to school improvement, as in New Zealand (McCall and Williams, 1994). Also, conscience is the overall set of values and beliefs, whether these are religious, ethical, social or economic. If the teacher has a conscience, her/his motivation is intrinsic, the performance will be high and the goals are likely to be achieved. Intrinsic motivation leads to high achievements (Gage and Berliner, 1975 and McClelland, 1961). While the stimuli of the extrinsic motivation are different and many, in education most of them are a result of the organizational culture of the school. The factors of the school culture may be looked upon as stimuli, such as values, beliefs, norms and behavioral regularities, which might lead to school improvement.


Ideology is a personal culture, which can motivate performance, for example, political ideology can be a strong motive if it is linked to national goals. In Israel it is prohibited for a teacher to show political tendencies in the school. The implementation of the curriculum is a fertile ground to internalize ideological beliefs in the students’ feelings.

“If there is a close fit of ideologies between the teachers and the school,
Another aspect of personal motivation is self-actualization. Although it is an acquired motive (extrinsic), it is linked to the mental ability level of the individual and her/his likes and dislikes; as such it becomes an intrinsic motive. Individuals may arrive at a state of self-actualization in different ways, for example, some women teachers like the job because of their maternal feeling, they find their self-actualization there, (Froebel, F. in Educational Encyclopedia, Thesaurus of Jewish and General Education, pp.536-545). Another aspect of personal motivation in teaching is pay-related, for example, the teachers’ unions in Israel are in perpetual conflict with the government authorities about their salaries. In the United Kingdom it is considered a key motivator:

“In relation to teachers in the UK, for example, the media and the teachers’ unions have promulgated the notion that pay is an important determinant of three aspects of motivation: recruitment, retention and improvement…..in relation first to recruitment and, secondly, to improvement, pay could be a key motivator.” (Evans, 1998, p.42)

Some aspects of motivation stem from the organization and are called organizational motivation, as a result of the designed vision, policy or philosophy of the school, these are initiated by the school’s principal. (Goldring and Pasternack, 1994, p.251) The culture of the school, which is a system of values and beliefs that the school adopts, some pertaining to the school, some to the teachers, some to the community and some to the students (a separate chapter will deal with culture), also promote aspects of motivation. Goal-setting, which every organization should strive to achieve since there is no organization without goals, (Culbertson 1983; and Cyert 1975), also promotes motivation. Teachers’ involvement in the process of decision-making is an aspect of a number of approaches, including Total Quality Management (TQM) which has proved to be effective, (Murgatroyd and Morgan 1992; Sallis 1992), also internalize
motivation and commitment. In addition, involving teachers in all aspects of school life, which is also seen as an aspect of TQM (West-Burnham, 1992), promotes team work and motivation (Hopkins, 1987, p.93)

A change in the daily life of the school might produce a change in the teachers’ motivation, commitment and attitudes. Changing certain behaviours may lessen the power barriers and as such make the teachers’ life easier and more comfortable and consequently improve cooperative work (Per Dalin et al,1993, p.98). The obligation of the teachers’ accountability to all “those who have the legitimate right to know” (Bush and West-Burnham 1994, p.310) is likely to be a motive for better performance.

Moreover, ‘obligation’ and ‘sanctions’ are likely to internalize motivation (Sockett, 1980 and Kegan, 1986 in Bush, 1994, p.310)

The vision and the culture of the school, the involvement of the teachers in the process of decision-making, and their active involvement in the daily life of the school, in the process of goal-setting and the process of perpetual change in all aspects of school life, all contribute to the organizational motivation of teaching.

The first purpose of this research is to examine the motivation of teachers in Arab schools in Israel. To do this, they were asked about their self-actualization, whether it is satisfied or not (Maslow,1946; Herzberg,1959; McGregor,1970), their achievement, substantial or moral (Herzberg,1959; McClelland, 1961); their commitment (Locke and Latham, 1990), their working conditions and related-pay (Herzberg, 1959, McClelland 1961, and Maslow, 1946) and their affiliation (McClelland, 1961, and McGregor, 1970). The second and the third purposes of this thesis are to examine aspects of how senior managers in schools could best change motivation and commitment of teachers; and to recommend ways to change motivation and commitment in teachers.

To do that, the teachers were asked about their involvement in goal-setting (Locke, 1968) and their feeling of being treated equally in their growth process in the school (Adams, 1965; Herzberg, 1959; McClelland, 1961). The overall purpose of this thesis is Arab school improvement, through strengthening the teachers’ motivation and commitment (Vroom, 1964), by means of satisfying their expectations of their performance. Accordingly, a combination of all the theories of motivation summarized above constitute the backbone of this research. It might be that the culture of the school is an effective factor in teaching motivation and school improvement. School culture is every behaviour of everybody in the school community every minute; it encompasses all
behavioural regularities of the students, of the teachers, of the head teacher and all personnel of the school.

One of the research questions in this thesis is to examine the differences in motivation,
commitment and cultural factors between LEA schools and Private Church (PC) schools, in the Arab educational sector in Israel. On one hand, there is a link between school culture and school improvement (see sec.3.2) and on the other hand, there is a link between motivation, commitment and school improvement, (see sec. 5.1). Hence, it is necessary to discuss the basis of this linkage, first by learning about culture in general and then about school culture which is composed of sub-cultures, the head teacher’s culture, the teachers’ culture, the students’ culture and, amidst these, the Arab minority culture and the Arab teachers’ culture, which is almost identical with the Arab community culture.

3. **Culture**

3.1 **Definition**

Culture is related to people and to organizations, so that a school’s culture is of great importance, since it is tightly linked to school effectiveness and to school improvement (Cheng, 1993; Joyce, 1991; Hargreave 1997; Deal 1988). Thus, the community’s culture, which is reflected in education and accordingly linked to school improvement and school effectiveness, is also the teachers’ culture and, to some extent, the students’ culture. It is relevant first to find out how culture is interpreted in general and more particularly in schools. A general definition is given by Deal, (1988, p.204):

> “Culture in everyday usage is typically described as ‘the way we do things around here’: it consists of patterns of thought, behaviour and artifacts that symbolize and give meaning to the workplace. Meaning derives from elements of culture: shared values and beliefs, heroes and heroines, rituals and ceremony, stories and an informal network of cultural players.”
Schools, factories, companies and hospitals are organizations where people interact to produce results, so that organizational culture forms the basis for the interaction of the members.

Per Dalin et al, (1993,p.97) focus on what has been achieved in the organization:

“The written and the unwritten rules that regulate behaviour, the stories and the ‘myths’ of what an organization has achieved, the standards and the values set for its members.”

Rules, assumptions, beliefs and ideologies also convey the same meaning of culture, as put by Bush (1995,p.130):

“Cultural models assume that beliefs, values and ideology are at the heart of the organization. Individuals hold certain ideas and preferences, which influence how they behave and how they view the behaviour of the other members. These norms become shared traditions which are communicated within the group and are reinforced by symbols and rituals.”

The structure of the organization is also linked to its culture and they are complementary to each other. Morgan (1986, p.131) argues that organizations, as cultural phenomena, should lead to a different perspective of their structure based on shared meanings. Bush, (1995, p.136) stresses the individuals’ roles and the recommended patterns of its holders. O’Neill, (1994, p.108) argues the relationship between structure and culture:

“The relationship between organizational structure and culture is of crucial importance. A large and complex organizational structure increases the
possibility of several cultures developing simultaneously within the one organization. A minimal organizational structure, such as that found in most primary schools, enhances the possibility of a solid culture guiding all areas of organizational activity.”

A culture is likely to regulate the behaviour of the people in the organization, formally and informally, for the sake of implementing its goals (Bush, 1995). Handy and Aitken (1986) in their ‘Four Culture Model’ as applied to schools, also point to the importance of the ‘role’ rather than the ‘person’. Cheng, (1993, p.86) summarized the definitions of ‘culture’ of some writers:

“Organizational culture is a pattern of basic assumptions invented, discovered or developed by a given group as it learns to cope with its problems of external adoption and internal integration”. (Schein, 1985)

Another interpretation is given by Schein,

“Observed behavioral regularities, including language and rituals; norms that evolve in working groups; dominant values espoused by an organization; philosophy that guides an organization’s policy; rules of the game...feeling or climate...” (Schein 1985, p.6)

Schwartz and Davis (1981) in Cheng (1993, p.86) added ‘expectations’ to be encompassed in the ‘culture’ definition:

“Organizational culture is a pattern of beliefs and expectations shared by the organization’s members.”
Deal and Kennedy (1982) and Schein (1985) focused on what seemed to be the nucleus of ‘culture’ in general:

“The common core of most of the definitions used in the analysis seems to be a total set of norms, values, beliefs and assumptions shared by the members in the organization.”

It is relevant to conclude that the overall components of culture are beliefs, values, norms, vision, patterns of behaviour, ideology, rituals, ceremonies, heroes, heroines, stories and habits, and that these are common to all communities. Culture is not likely to be linked to people but to roles (Handy and Aitkin, 1986) if the organization is to keep its identity. In some communities, as among the Arab communities in Israel, the school was known by the name of its head teacher until the late 50’s, in some cases even until today, when it was changed to public school A, or public school B and so on. Naming the school after the head teacher gave it its identity and characteristics. This is why the head teacher is likely to be in the middle of the web, propagating his thoughts, ideas, beliefs and values to all around him (Handy and Aitken 1986). Sometimes the head teacher is ranked as first among equals in order to promote the culture. Being at the centre of the web, he reflects both positive and negative approaches since he is clearly the one who makes the decisions, both negative and positive. On the other hand, being at the centre, he also receives and sends, like a relay station. It can also be assumed that a feeling of ownership might be another component of the culture in the future, that is, when the teachers feel that the school is theirs. It is possible that a community culture may demand a written constitution for schools through the involvement of the parents’ committees, that would regulate not only the
students’ behaviour but also the teachers’ and the head teacher’s behaviour and the inter-
relationship between the different sub units. Doing so might bring about a healthy challenge and lead to school improvement.

3.2 The linkage between school culture and school improvement

One, and perhaps the most important, of the results of school improvement is the students’ achievements in public exams; Cheng (1993 p.87) revealed that:

“Schools with a strong culture achieved not only high teacher satisfaction and commitment but also high academic achievement in public examinations.”

The role of the organizational culture is mainly to regulate the learning-teaching standards, besides other behaviors. Real improvement will not be attained unless deep applications of the culture and the organizational conditions of the school take place, these are, according to Joyce, (1991 p.59): **Collegiality**, which develops cohesive and professional relations within school faculties and connects them more closely to their surrounding neighbourhood; research, which helps school faculties study findings about effective school policies or instructional alternatives, site specific information which helps faculties collect and analyze data about their schools and their students’ progress; **curriculum initiatives**, that is, introducing changes within subject areas as in the case of computer studies, across the curriculum areas, and finally **instructional initiatives**, organizing teachers to study teaching skills and strategies.

School improvement is not only a function of academic achievements, but is also linked to social achievements. Hargreaves (1997) pointed to the expressive outcomes of teachers in his welfarist type of organizational culture, oriented to a relaxed, carefree and cozy atmosphere,
whereby the focus is on individual student development within a nurturing environment and poor learning outcomes. His ‘hot house’ school culture emphasizes high instrumental and high expressive outcomes. The stress is on high achievements and high academic behaviour, but at the same time it is a highly effective emotional and parental type culture. The ‘formal school’ culture emphasizes high academic achievements and poor effective emotional development. The ‘survivalist school’ culture is poor in both academic and expressive behaviour. In his second typology, there are two types of schools: the collegial and the traditional; in the collegial school, the head teacher is elected and bears a collective responsibility; while in the traditional school, the focus is on the head teacher being at the centre of the web with the senior teachers around him. This second typology depends upon two factors: architecture and culture; architecture is related to the social structure of the teachers, or patterns of members’ social relationships, and culture is related to values, beliefs, norms, assumptions, and patterns of behaviour. Collegiality, by which collaborative relationships are developed, might bring rapid change, but may or may not correlate with the students’ academic attainments. Practically, this classification of Hargreaves applies to individual teachers rather than the whole school. He suggests (1997, p.246) that the effective school is:

“The school of a ‘balanced’ culture achieving some optimum position in both domains might claim to be the most effective, but only when the criteria of effectiveness design equal weight to both instrumental and expressive outcomes.”

Culture and school improvement are reversibly oriented; that is, school culture may lead to school improvement and, on the contrary, school improvement may lead to school culture and may induce community culture. Hargreaves, (1997 p.248) also argues that:
“School culture may be a cause, an object or an effect of school improvement, indeed all three are possible.”

He adds that school culture will influence students’ outcomes, which in turn ‘reinforce’ or, ‘redefine’ the culture, while Deal (1988 p.203) stresses that:

“A strong performance is dependent on cohesive culture- a set of shared values that motivates and shapes behavior inside the company and inspires commitment and loyalty from customers or clients.”

He argues also, that schools can learn from effective businesses:

“To most people, operating like a business entails planning, setting specific goals and objectives, measuring performance, linking costs to results, and evaluating programs and the performance of employees regularly and systematically.” (Ibid, p.203)

He provides an example from ‘Mary Kay Cosmetics’:

“Spirit that makes this a meaningful place to work - even on a part time basis.”

from ‘Anhauser-Busch’:

“Quality and pride- two values that have governed the successful beer company for more than a century.”

and, from ‘Johnson and Johnson’:
“... relying heavily on their ‘credo’ a short statement of the company’s philosophy that puts the customers first and shareholders fourth.”

The cohesiveness of the culture and the people adopting it is an important component of effective performance; the example that Deal (1988) provides from the Nissan Company of America, and Mary Kay Cosmetics, illustrates that the hero or the heroine creates this cohesiveness of culture and people. People who are committed to their organization are usually proud of their affiliation to it. Graduates of schools, colleges and universities are usually proud of their institutions, often because of its culture. Deal (1988) mentions ‘pride and quality’ as two values that distinguish successful companies and can be applied to schools. There might be some resemblance between the business world and schools in some of their organizational culture, but they are not totally identical. Some limitations, for example, are linked to sub-cultures. In schools there are more sub-cultures: those of the students, the teachers, the head teacher and the parents or the outer community. The integration of these sub-cultures is a problem for school improvement, whereas in the business world it is not so. Moreover, to secure school improvement, the culture should be cohesive and should include the head teacher’s, the teachers’, and the clients, who in the case of the school, are the students and to some extent, the parents. Deal (1988) quotes McDill and Rigsby (1973) as stating that there is an interesting linkage between school culture, student achievement and student educational aspirations. The linkage between culture and school improvement or effectiveness is clear and is documented by most writers. Perhaps ‘culture’ alone is not enough, which is why Deal (1988) described it as ‘cohesive culture’ and Cheng (1993) as ‘strong’. What makes a culture ‘cohesive’ or ‘strong’? It is reasonable to assume that agreed values, beliefs and behaviors among the teachers, the head teacher, the community and the students are those that make the culture cohesive or strong. It is
also reasonable to assume that the glue for this cohesion may be the loyalty and commitment of the members of the institution. It is true that school improvement aims at the academic achievements of students as its final end, but on the way to it, cultural improvement is required as an innovation of the teachers’ culture (Smith et al, 1992) or the innovation of the community culture, and that of parents, patrons, and individuals in the school. As an example: in-service training might cause a teacher to change his/her views, for example, on the relationship with his/her students, by becoming convinced that every child has the right to education; and as a result he becomes more patient.

Sergiovanni (1984) argues that school improvement also includes the head teachers’ culture, from which, to be decisive and certain and to eliminate any ambiguity, as ambiguity is an organizational sickness, a head teacher has to define clearly the way of life within the organization, to build for unity, to assign the place of the school in the community, to put meaning to day-to-day activities and to be attentive to goals, issues and outcomes. School improvement is affected also by sub-cultures, since they exist in the community, among both teachers and students. It is a hard management task for the head teacher to integrate these sub-cultures into one. Also performance, either that of the teachers or students is affected by these sub-cultures. Deal (1988) maintains that one aspect of culture is tradition and that there are three classes which make up this cluster. Traditions, which come partly or entirely from outside the school, traditions which are partly indigenous, and traditions which are almost entirely indigenous.

“The first class exists in the community at large, that of the second class among teachers, and that of the third class among students.” (Deal, 1988, p.210)
One of the students’ sub-cultures is the formation of peer groups, who influence, directly or indirectly, scholastic performance and educational aspirations. Also the teachers’ sub-cultures influence achievements and performance:

“The teaching sub-culture can directly influence teacher expectations or the amount of time teachers spend on instruction and thus can also influence student performance and achievement.” (Deal, 1988, p.210)

Even an administrative sub-culture has an effect on teachers’ performance. Deal, (1988, p.210) reported that:

“The administrative sub-culture had often become preoccupied with accountability, control and change. These values frequently place principals in direct conflict with teachers- a factor which can erode teachers’ motivation and their effectiveness in the classroom.”

If sub-cultures are integrated, although it is a hard job, it will have a positive result on performance and effectiveness, but if these are contradictory and conflicting, the result is likely to be negative. In Arab schools in Israel, a school sub-culture has its origin mainly in the community, whether on a religious or a family basis.

3.3 The Arab Minority Culture

Communities are ethnic, religious, economic or political groups, and every group is characterized by its culture and is shaped as such. The group culture is reflected in day-to-day life and also in the school. The Arab community in Israel lives side by side with the multicultural
Jewish community, which has immigrants from many parts of the world. Although what distinguishes the culture of the Arab community is the conflict between traditionalism and modernism, this culture is affected by that of the Jewish community. The Arab community is composed also of sub-cultures: the culture of the community living in rural areas, distinguished by authoritarianism and more traditionalism, especially among the Bedouin Arabs; while the community living in towns incline to more modern views and expect the school to relate to their children as individuals worthy of respect (Mari’, 1978). Besides these sub-cultures stand two other sub-cultures, Moslem and Christian, which are also reflected in the schools. Children attending Christian schools are educated partly according to the culture of the country sponsoring that school, and partly according to the culture of the local community. The Arab minority (about 18 per cent of the whole population in 2000 as compared to 15 per cent in 1948), experienced a drastic change in its culture. In 1948, authoritarianism in the family and in the school was the dominant factor. Due to their awareness of a more advanced Jewish society, the Arabs in Israel adopted new patterns of behaviour in all aspects of daily life, such as agriculture, labour and in democratizing family life.

“The unintentional forces of modernization have a great impact on the culture and structure within Arab society in Israel: Interpersonal relationships within the family are far more democratic than before; the level of intellectual functioning is
improving; females are becoming more independent; the extended family is fading out; status and power are being redistributed in favor of the formerly oppressed farming class; social and cultural tensions are commonplace; the culture is dynamic rather than static; a sense of nationalism is being re-established; and, more than at any time in its history, the educational system is challenged to be relevant and functional in the sense that it must accompany, if not lead, this overwhelming and all-embracing process of modernization.” (Mari’, 1978, p.175)

One of the aims of segregation and discrimination against Arab schools in Israel was intended to affect the Arab culture in general and more specifically the educational culture, as could be learned from the confidential document of Dr. Hershberg in 1949 (archives of the State of Israel, No. 45/1733/c), who was the director of the Moslem Department in the Ministry of Religious Affairs, and whose document was sent to the Minister of Education:

“ We have to reconsider the concept of ‘Arab Minority’. We have to look upon them as Israeli citizens of different religious communities; such as: Moslems, Christians, Druze, Sharkas and not as Arabs. The Druze claim that they are not Arabs and the Sharkas are not Arabs, it is not understood why to teach them Arabic. In other words, we do not have a problem of ‘Arabs’, but, we have problems of different communities; which we have to solve separately and to stress the contradictions of these different communities. As such, lessening their Arabism.. At the same time, they will forget that they are Arabs and they will internalize that they are Israelis of different kinds.” (Al Haj, 1996, p.98)
The suggestion of Dr. Hershberg was not only intended to affect the culture of the Arab minority in Israel, but to abolish it completely. A similar letter was sent to the Minister of Education on April 20, 1949 by the supervisor of the Arab schools, Bloom, (Archives of the State of Israel, No.45/1733/c). Moreover, part of the Arab school culture is that of the community, especially if that part is linked to beliefs, values, and traditions. It creates a management problem if the school’s culture does not fit the demands of the community.

“The external environment (the community) is regarded as the source of values and beliefs that coalesce to form the school culture.” (Bush, 1995 p.137)

*Can the school be a source of a change in the community culture? Certain habits are developing* in some communities which might not be acceptable as a value, so could the school be a source of change for such habits? For example, ‘double face’ is assumed nowadays as becoming a habit in some communities, that is, when the individual shows two contradicting attitudes in front of two different people, which is ruled as a ‘bad’ culture. If a school’s culture is built through the teachers, the head teacher, the students and all personnel, on loyalty, commitment and honesty, will this culture induce a change in the community’s culture? Bush, (1995, p.137) notes that:

“The professional background and experience of teachers yield the educational values that provide the potential for the development of a common culture.”

It is assumed that the community’s culture and the school’s culture interact and affect each other; this is what O’Neill (1994, p.104) suggested in the form of a chart:
This linkage is underpinned also by Caldwell and Spinks (1992). The existence of conflicting sub-cultures is a problem that faces educational management, which is exactly the case facing the head teachers and teachers in Arab schools in Israel.

Ethnic groups are found in almost every community, even if they have been there for a long time, the difference in cultures still exists. Deal, (1988, p.211) notes that:

“These sub-cultures’ influence school-wide values, create sub-culture battles, or neutralize each other.”

Effective management is noted when the pressure of the ethnic, religious or political groups are directed to the same goal, as for example: minimizing the dropping-out of children from the school. It is of great importance to integrate all sub-cultures in the school community. There are many sub-cultures in the Jewish schools due to the wide variety of immigrants; in comparison, there are far fewer sub-cultures in the Arab schools and these are mainly due to different religious affiliations or to differences in cultural development, such as authoritarianism, traditionalism and modernism.

3.4 School Sub-cultures

Head teachers’ culture

A school culture is an integration of the community’s culture, the head teacher’s culture, the teachers’ culture and the students’ culture. The responsibility for this integration is mainly that of the head teacher; the difficult part of it is to integrate across the differences (Christie, 1988). Every sub-culture has its beliefs, values, traditions and patterns of behavior; they may coincide or they may be contradictory or even conflicting. The vision and the philosophy and the daily life
pattern is that which composes the head teacher’s culture as well as the school culture, and which shapes the school’s image. Hopkins et al. (1996, p.28), as previously quoted, emphasize the importance of the leader’s role in establishing a clear vision in order to generate staff commitment:

“..... the responsibility of school leaders in establishing clear ‘vision’ or set of purposes for a school. The methods through which the vision is developed seems to be as important as the vision itself, in generating staff commitment.”

In addition what characterizes a school is its organizational culture, which is also believed to be shaped by the head teacher (Cheng,1993; Schein,1985; Sergiovanni, 1984). The following are some of the definitions of organizational culture, which is a part of the whole social culture:

“ ‘Integrated’ organizational culture whereby normative power is used to secure organizational members’ commitment to organizational goals through the sharing of common norms and meanings.” (Levacic et al, 1999. p.221)

In this context, ‘integrated’ means: consistency, consensus and centredness. (Meyerson and Martin, 1997)

Or,

“The formal structures and processes of an organization ‘are themselves cultural artifacts’ and beneath the transparent intentions, embody the values and beliefs of the school or college. The representations of structure reflect current norms and values and can be amended to reflect the
direction of cultural change.” (O’Neill, 1994 a, p.103)

According to Cheng (1993, p.100) strong organizational culture is characterized by:

“...teachers tend to have higher working morale, more friendly social relations and greater involvement in school activities: teachers seem to be more committed to school, more satisfied with intrinsic rewards, social relationships, and participation in decision making, having a stronger feeling of job challenge; and students tend to have higher academic achievements in the public examinations.”

School improvement may be oriented also to the area of school culture. Hopkins, (1987, p.65) points out two such improvements which are considered as part of the daily life of the school:

“The first is to broaden the teaching approach and the second is to achieve a closer relationship between the school and the surrounding community.”

Innovation is another field of school culture (Goodson, 1992), the reflection of which is the renewal of the daily life, if that is in teaching; or among the parent’s community in renewing the meaning of life for themselves; or in the students’ community through the renewal of their conception of values and behaviors. The main purpose of innovation is school improvement, through enhancing the teachers’ competence; the head teacher’s role in this is essential and is linked to his/her personal qualities, which are part of his/her culture. The role he/she plays in managing all aspects of school life is also linked to his/her culture. It is reasonable to believe that without commitment of all members in the institution, school improvement is doubtful, as
Cheng (1993) argues. Sergiovanni (1984, p.107) puts commitment in the centre of qualities of leadership. He enumerates ten qualities, of which the last is commitment; these he calls the 10p’s.

1. Prerequisites: refers to leadership skills needed to develop and maintain leadership competence
2. Perspectives: ability to distinguish between tactical and strategic leadership.
   (Strategic, involves policies and purposes for the long-range plans. Tactical, involves minor actions which serve larger purposes.)
5. Policies: the ability to influence others.
6. Purposes: meaning the day-to-day activities of people at work, it contributes to their success and failure.
7. Planning: is the articulation of purposes into concrete but long-term operational programs.
8. Persisting: refers to the attention leaders give to important principles, issues, goals and outcomes.
9. Peopling: means that the leader does little without the good wishes of the others. The leader seeks to fine-tune and match more closely the goals, objectives, and desires of people with those of the organization.
10. Patriotism: is the commitment and loyalty largely to the characteristics, (beliefs, goals, values, and patterns of behavior) which give an organization or
organizational sub-units unique meaning”.

Miles, (1998, p.12) illuminates the way to leadership by means of culture.

“You internalize the culture and when you know how well the culture has taught you, maybe you will become a leader.”

The subject of ‘internalization’ is one which needs exploring. The head teachers’ culture, as explained by Miles (1998), included the following:

“1. The policy of decentralization when the full energy of the teachers is used and the head teacher is there.

2. Immanent value; the interpretation of all events and behaviors using the immanent values of the head teacher.

3. The Head Teacher’s responsibility to bring changes to individuals through the school culture, that is, his culture.

4. The manipulation of the head teacher’s image- that is to serve this culture.

5. There is no awareness of the leader’s time”.

The essence of the head teachers’ culture according to Miles (1998), is the subject of ‘internalization’, ‘loyalty’, and ‘commitment’. Although the leader is the one who represents and symbolizes the school everywhere, inside and outside (Bush, 1995), all other influential people portray the school image and culture, through their formal or informal behavior (Bridge, 1994). This true image cannot be portrayed if their culture is vague. The vision of the school appears to be derived from the head teacher’s beliefs, philosophy and previous experience
in education. There is little evidence that teachers have played a significant part in shaping the school vision (Bolam et al, 1993, p.44); but, in case there are qualified teachers who take part in the process of decision-making, the role of the leader is still of central importance, Brundrett (1998, p.308) argues this point as follows:

“If all members of the staff who are professionally qualified are to take part in decision-making there must, however, be a common set of values held by the organization. Such shared values are not of course necessarily a natural part of any institutional culture and thus, it is argued, the role of the leader in such collegial organizations becomes one that encourages, enhances and helps to define such shared beliefs.”

Brundett (1998) quotes Campbell and Southworth (1993:66) to underpin his argument:

“It is only through such a shared ‘vision’ that realizable objectives can be brought about which will lead to genuine school improvement operationalized through ‘jointly held beliefs and values’.”

Another perspective of the head teacher’s culture is his responsibility to create a relaxed atmosphere in the school and to minimize stress as much as possible, as continuous stress may be a cause of teachers’ absenteeism (Imants and Zoelen, 1995, p.81), a factor which hinders school improvement. Micro politics is another perspective of the head teacher’s culture, it is the use of power to achieve desired outcomes. Leadership in this perspective is that of power and control, although more effective administration occurs when contrived collegiality takes place in particular places and at particular times (Hargreaves, 1992, pp. 83-86). Teachers’ headship is
not confined to men. In the sample taken in this research, there are eight men head teachers and two women, one of the women being head teacher of a complete school, that is a school which has children from the kindergarten to the twelfth grade, for boys and girls. The culture of the head teacher, clear vision, or norms of behaviour, or set of beliefs, or values and others is not differentiated because of gender. What rules the effectiveness of the head teacher is his/her qualifications, traits and experience in education (Coleman, 1994, p.190). It is worth noting, that in some cases, gender is important when it comes to managing teenage boys or girls, (Hall, 1999, p.159). It is also worth noting that there are barriers that face discrimination against women’s leadership which is the stereotype question, when it comes to appraisal, and this might be the most important barrier (Coleman, 1997, p.135).

Without the involvement of teachers in every aspect of school life, such as the integration of the head teacher’s culture with that of the teachers’ culture, which is unavoidable, there is little hope for school improvement to occur.

**Teachers’ Culture**

Individuals are distinguished by their culture, beside other things. The feeling of belonging to some group is likely to be motivated by one’s culture, but it is not only culture which motivates their belonging to their job.

“Most jobs are located within an ‘occupational culture’ with which we must come to terms - a set of beliefs, habits, traditions, ways of thinking and feeling and relating to others that are shared and understood by those already in the occupation.” (Hargreaves, 1982, pp.192, 193.)
One facet of teachers’ culture is the reflection of the question of professionalism. Teaching has not been considered a profession until now and, because of this, teachers are de-motivated and dissatisfied (Hargreaves, 1982). Moreover, the stigma attached to the Arab teachers in Israel (Buber et al 1967, p.1175) increased their de-motivation and their dissatisfaction. What distinguishes the professions is, self-management and a high level of remuneration, two factors which are not available in the teaching job. So, as a result, another aspect of the teachers’ culture is their commitment to autonomy,(Hargreaves,1982).

Autonomy is identified by the teacher as being the leader of his class and his disapproval of the presence of others (but this does not mean self-management). Moreover, Hargreaves (1982, p.200), argues:

“one of the most striking characteristics of teachers is their addiction to didactic talk.”

Still this characteristic does not make teaching a profession, since physicians or engineers or lawyers also have their own language. Language is a part of the individual’s culture. However, teachers of subjects such as chemistry, physics or mathematics, consider themselves as professionals, because their university degree has given them expertise in the subject, similar to the technical vocabulary used by professional scientists. However, primary teachers lack sophisticated talk because of:

“The direct consequence of their intuitive conceptions of teaching”. (Hargreaves,1982, p.198)

All terms learned from education, psychology, sociology, or philosophy tend to be left in the teacher-training college, and not used in class. Another aspect of teachers’ culture is their ‘close’
stereotype in connection with ‘competence’, that is, their sensitivity to external factors. They are so sensitive in matters of competence among colleagues that they do not like the presence of strangers in the class-room, head teachers, inspectors, or even other colleagues. This is also why they are committed to autonomy, even though they are free to some extent, to choose how subject content is taught. Hargreaves (1982, p.203) explains this aspect of the teachers’ culture, ‘competence’, by their:

“Tendency to be curiously modest about their achievements and skills as teachers and they rarely boast how good they are at their job. The reason is simple, it is very difficult to judge the professional competence of the teachers.”

‘Culture’, conveys a positive meaning, but sometimes it reflects bad habits or bad behaviors or bad reputation to some people. Teaching becomes over time, a boring occupation, because of the routine way of life and lack of novelty, and sometimes for the stigma attached to it in some communities, such as in the Arab community in Israel (Mari’, 1978). Hargreaves, (1982, p.202) analyses the boredom among teachers:

“Once teachers have mastered the basic arts of teaching, knowing how to teach one’s subject and how to control a class, the teaching become too predictable. The challenges and stresses of the early years of teaching may fade, but they are replaced by a new boredom. After ten years of teaching the same subject to the same age range, teachers naturally find it difficult not to be bored by their
constant repetition of the same predictable lessons.”

Boredom is likely to be a cause of degeneration, or of school disfunctioning, exactly as the absence of culture may be a cause of degeneration and disfunctioning. Christie (1998, p. 290) explains the organizational breakdown in South African schools as a result of:

“The absence of school vision and purpose; de-motivation of students and their lack of interest in their studies; de-motivation of teachers who felt underpaid, blamed for the problems and disempowered; de-motivation and lack of professional skills of management figures, who felt disempowered and unable to perform competently.”

On the contrary, teachers tend to have high working morale, commitment to school objectives, more friendly social relations and a strong feeling for job competence, if the organizational culture is clear and more formalized (Cheng, 1993). Another perspective of teachers’ culture which is becoming common and frequent, is ‘sickness absence’. In Israel it is acceptable that a teacher can report him/herself as sick twice a year, for two consecutive days each time, without the need for a physician’s sick report. A teacher is credited with a month’s absence for sickness reasons yearly; if he/she is absent only ten days or less yearly, he/she will be compensated when pensioned with eight days pay per year of service. Many teachers make exact calculations for their absence; a committed teacher does not do that. A school with a relaxed atmosphere, with no stress and with good culture does not find such ‘absentee’ teachers on its staff. Imants et al (1995) argued this problem of absenteeism from the point of view of the school’s climate:
“Long term exposure to stress in the workplace provokes sickness absence, psychosomatic symptoms and burn-out. Teachers’ stress, is affected by school climate and teachers’ sense of efficacy.” (Imants and Zoelen 1995, p.79)

And, again:

“School climates are distinguished as ‘open’ and ‘closed’ climates. In an ‘open’ climate a high degree of trust and esprit and low disengagement is prevailing, both the principal and the staff members are genuine and open in their interactions with each other. The ‘closed’ climate is an antithesis of the ‘open’ climate.” (Ibid, p. 80)


“The working conditions of teachers contributed to the creation of a positive school climate. ……… the climate created by the head for the teachers was an important aspect of the school’s effectiveness.”

The Arab teacher’s culture is identical to the Arab community’s culture; some are traditional, some belong to the authoritarian community and some adopt modernism, thus their behaviour inside the classroom is shaped. In addition, the Arab teacher’s culture is hallmarked by the stigma attached to him; as a result, he is not proud and not happy at being a teacher. Hence, Arab school improvement is difficult to effect unless these barriers are removed. The open climate paves the way to the involvement of the students in the process of decision-
making and in designing the philosophy and vision of the school. Students also have their own culture, which is likely to help in the process of school improvement.

**Student Culture**

Student culture focuses on the learning process and responds to the needs of the students either internally or externally (Per Dalin, 1993, p.98). Internal needs include:

“Learning is seen in a broader context as personal growth: the development of social skills as well as cognitive development. Group work and group development are seen to be as important as individual achievement. A problem orientation is given increased weight in the curriculum, the relationship between theory and practice is stressed, the need to involve parents and the community actively in the learning process is understood, and a learning strategy that more closely resembles the way we learn in practical day-to-day life is being rediscovered.”

In comparison, today, the learning / teaching process depends mostly on the teacher being at the centre, instead of Dalin’s suggestion, where the student is likely to be in the centre of the process. This change requires management of new norms, habits and values. Students’ values and way of life are changing. Coleman (1987, pp.8-32), in his research, shows the negative attitudes of students to learning and to work; their interest is confined to music, television, sports, national and international problems, and social issues. As such, head-teachers need to manage the integration of the new students’ culture and the school’s culture, a task which is very difficult. Deal (1988) argues that the student culture is often formed to oppose teacher culture. Teachers and parents want to impose on their children certain regularities of behaviour which in many cases contradict those of the students; for example, patterns of dress uniform where the
school imposes a certain pattern which the students reject. Even patterns of language usage are a source of conflict between teachers and students, and so on. Not only is formal culture in dispute, but also the informal, for example, extra curricular activities are accepted by some students and rejected by others. Today’s student culture focuses on disco-type music, smoking and drinking alcohol. Very few of them are interested in a professional career. Most of them do not worry about their future and some come from broken families (Bridge, 1994). It is not an easy task to manage student culture, although it is neglected in most of the literature (Stoll et al, 1996). However, there might be a positive aspect of the students’ culture, which is their role of ‘guardianship’ of the changes taking place in the classroom, especially if the changes are harmful, for example, they can report to the head teacher about a teacher’s misbehaviour in teaching effectiveness or personal behaviour. In addition, student culture might be a cause for conflict, as shown above, if theirs contradicts the teachers’ or the school’s culture. Moreover, within the students’ culture or within the teachers’ culture in the school, there might be conflicting sub-cultures which may retard school improvement.

3.5 **Culture Conflict**

As pointed out previously, a school culture is an integration of sub-cultures, those of the community, the teachers, the students, other staff and of the head teachers. Managing culture is not an easy job, since it requires a wise balance of all its constituents in order to reach an effective functioning of the school. Particular problems lie wherever there are sub-groups, such as ethnic, religious, gender or even peer groups. Moreover, it might be that the teachers on one hand and the head-teacher on the other, are in continuous criticism or conflict due to decisions taken by both sides, or because of unacceptable behaviors, or instantaneous changes. Peer
groups among the students are likely to appear. They are organized because of common habits or common values, or of common interest in studies or, on the contrary, the lack of interest in studies or sports. Deal (1988) stresses the conflict between the head teacher’s culture and that of the teachers, from an administrative point of view. Usually, the rules, accountability, control and change that the head teacher is busy with, are themselves the factors of conflict and those which de-motivate teachers. Consequently, if the school’s culture is weak or is totally absent, sub-cultures will neutralize each other, which leads to the break-down of the school. Christie, (1998, p.290) cites an extreme example of South African black schools:

“Other evidence of more complex organizational break-down was
the break down of formal relationships within school. For example,
the absence of school vision and purpose; de-motivation of students…”

Bush, (1995, p.139) demonstrates the conflict in terms of limitations to the culture:

“Culture may be regarded as imposed by the leaders on other members of the organization.”

On the other hand there cannot be a mono culture. Wherever sub-cultures exist, these add positively to the school and are not to be seen as destructive, since, if they are successful, they are seen and perceived as vital units for school effectiveness. Also symbols, rituals and ceremonies may be an aspect of cultural conflict if they contradict or misinterpret other sub-cultures in the organization. One must also include political cultural conflict, in case the head teacher’s political trends are inimical to the teachers’ trends or to other sub groups in the
community or among the students. Accordingly he/she is likely to keep his/her beliefs to
himself/herself. Macro-political changes influence all aspects of the micro-political processes in
the school. Busher (1997) for example, starting with the commitment of the head teachers to the
macro political change and going on to more explicit factors such as symbols, rituals, customs,
myths, beliefs, values, language, rules and norms as micro levels. Collegiality might be a
necessary condition to achieve the change; the head teacher alone cannot change the behaviours
of all the people in the organization connected to the micro political levels. There is no doubt
that conflict may arise between the teachers on one hand and the head teacher on the other, or,
the teachers may be committed to macro political change and the head teachers opposed. An
example of the above is the problem of segregation and discrimination against Arab schools in
Israel, which is a macro political change entailing so many micro political elements, as indicated
in pp.11-14.
However, any change in both levels, the micro and the macro, entails the commitment of the
members in the organization. As such, changing the school culture should be underpinned by the
commitment of the teachers and other personnel in the school.

3.6 Commitment as an underpinning component of school culture
Commitment, defined in a previous chapter as the free-will obligation to do something, lies in
the individual’s level of culture. Commitment is a prerequisite for the success of vision, beliefs,
values, rules, behaviors and habits, (rituals, symbols and ceremonies) of the organization. If
commitment is internalized in every member of the organization: the head teacher, the teachers,
the students and all personnel, school effectiveness is likely to be maximized. For this reason, all
that is written about educational management and school improvement stressed this component
‘commitment’. Hargreaves, (1997, p.248) argues:
“In the collegial culture there are likely to be found not just examples of collaboration but also other cultural and architectural features such as:
Commitment to a shared vision for the school, providing teachers with clear purpose and direction, and so, potentially, strong morale.”

Commitment is likely to be viewed as a highly personal value, it is an internalized feeling due to beliefs, values, norms of behaviour, habits or even sometimes symbols that the individual shares with others in the organization or in the school. If members of the organization have internalized this feeling, the performance will be most effective. Deal, (1988, p.203) also discusses the same idea:

“A strong performance is dependent on a cohesive culture, a set of shared values that motivates and shapes behavior inside the company and inspires commitment and loyalty from the customers or clients. The real lesson that schools can learn from business refocuses attention on the culture of the school.”

In an active and energetic ethos, with work under pressure, high expectations, perpetual innovations and in-service training, the school is in a continuous cycle of experimental work as if everybody is competing for a high goal, as such ‘commitment’ and ‘enthusiasm’ are internalized. This is what Hargreaves (1997) typified as a ‘hot house’ school. Although it looks to be an extreme type, nevertheless shared vision, values, beliefs and creating a sense of high morale and promotion among teachers, might be effective factors in such ‘commitment’. The stronger the culture of the school, the more motivated and more committed the teachers are; it conveys the more detailed and more explicit kinds of behaviour, those of the students, teachers, head teachers
and all personnel of the school. As such, effectiveness and school improvement are reached, resulting in, for example, high achievements in public examinations (Cheng, 1993).

Sergiovanni, (1984) adds ‘clear sense of purpose’ besides ‘strong culture’ to internalize teachers’ commitment and enthusiasm and loyalty that are related to students’ achievements and even teachers’ own job attitudes. Cheng, (1993, p.88) assumed also:

“The stronger the school’s organizational culture, the more satisfied, motivated and committed the teachers, and the higher the students’ academic achievements.”

In his research into effective schools Cheng (1993, p.100) found:

“Teachers tend to have high working morale, more friendly social relations and great involvement in school activities; teachers seem to be more committed to school, more satisfied with intrinsic rewards, social relationships, and participation in decision-making, having a stronger feeling of job challenge; and students tend to have higher academic achievements in the public examinations.”

Sergiovanni, (1984, p.111)) in his 10 p’s model of leadership, equates patriotism with commitment:

“Organizational patriotism can be defined as commitment and loyalty to the characteristics which give an organization or organizational sub-units unique meaning.”

Busher, (1997, in his paper given in the symposium on Leading and Managing Schools and Colleges, British Educational Research Association Annual Conference, University of
York) quoted Greenfield (1991):

“Head teachers were themselves committed to, and proclaimed their commitment to the service of other people, such as their pupils.”

and quoted Sergiovanni (1994) in the same source, as saying:

“People become tied together for a common purpose more through sharing values than through signing contracts.”

4. **School Improvement**

4.1 **Introduction**

Among Arab schools in Israel the pressure for school improvement is confined to very few. This pressure is represented by competing over some of the activities, such as offering new learning options, for example, computer science or electronics, or competing over cultural activities,
whether organizational or behavioral. Organizational cultural factors include the collective administration of the school, encompassing the head teacher, the deputy head, coordinators of the different subjects of study and the counsellor. But the majority of schools are inert and do not have this desire for competition. This is what emerged from interviewing the head teachers in this research. Therefore, there is a need for school improvement in Arab schools in Israel, not because there is a lack of competition but mainly because of the low academic achievement and the high drop-out rate from schools. A change in the culture of the school, and a change in the motivation and commitment of teachers, are necessary for this improvement, although there is always a resistance to such change.

School improvement is not necessarily synonymous with ‘change’ (Hopkins, 1996, p.6), it is coherently linked to it, but then any school improvement is an outcome of change. On the other hand, ‘culture’ may be briefed by ‘regularities of behavior’ (Dalin, et al, 1993, p. 97). Changing these regularities means changing the culture. Therefore, changing the culture of the school will have an impact on school improvement. Hopkins et al, (1997, p.270), stress this point:

“In our experience, outstanding head teachers manipulate priorities, strategies and conditions, in order to affect culture, for they know that ultimately this is the only way of enhancing the quality of educational outcomes and experience of all pupils. The link between school improvement strategies and the culture of the school is of crucial importance,”

If teachers change their behavior, not only in relation to the disciplines of subject matter, but also socially, there might be an impact on students’ performance:
“Outcomes were better where teachers provided good models of behavior by means of good time-keeping and willingness to deal with pupil problems.” (Reynolds, 1993, p.13)

The involvement of teachers in the process of decision-making and collaboration is a facet of school culture, thus a change in school policy for the better might also have an impact on students’ outcomes.

“Outcomes were more favorable when there was a combination of firm leadership together with a decision-making process in which all teachers felt that their views were represented.” (Ibid.)

Even if the change in a school’s culture is at the pupils’ level, such as the uniform, which is symbolic, or at a more effective level, such as preparing lessons or homework, or in the general discipline of pupils’ behavior, there might be an impact on students’ outcomes.

“Findings upon group management in the classroom suggested the importance of preparing lessons in advance, of keeping the attention of the whole class, of unobtrusive discipline, of a focus on rewarding good behavior and of swift action to deal with disruption.” (Ibid.)

‘Culture’ was defined by Schein (1985) as the total set of norms, values, beliefs and assumptions shared by the members of the organization. Rutter et al (1979) referred to this ‘total’ as the ‘ethos’ of the school, including, teachers’ actions in class, availability of incentives and reward, good conditions for
pupils and children taking responsibility. It is possible to conclude that every bit of behavior might lead
to school improvement, but the question is: what outweighs what?, and what are the priorities among the
different components of culture that lead to school improvement?. The answers to these questions are
suggested by Hargreaves and Hopkins (1991, p.116) from what researchers concluded about which is
prior to which: teaching or culture?

“We do know that the more structured and reflective the approach to teaching, the more likely it is that
students’ academic performance will improve.”

To sum up, it is reasonable to assume that there is a coherent link between culture and school
improvement, such as: strategies, priorities, teachers’ behaviors, involvement of teachers in decision-
making, classroom atmosphere, structured and reflective approach to teaching, collaboration and clear
vision.

The main purpose of this thesis is to contribute to improving schools in the Arab educational sector in
Israel, through changing teachers’ motivation and commitment for the better. Therefore, it is necessary
to highlight the factors that lead to school improvement and how they are linked to the motivation and
commitment of the teachers and the organizational culture of the school.

But it is necessary first to be acquainted with the concept of ‘school improvement’:

School improvement is aimed mainly at academic achievements, but it may not be confined to that
alone, since it is linked to other aspects of school life, such as behavioral regularities inside the
classroom and outside it (Reynolds, 1997, p.254). School improvement may also be aimed at any change
that manipulates school outcomes (Stoll, 1994, p.131). Miles et al (1985, p.48) define school improvement as:

“ A systematic sustained effort aimed at change in learning conditions and other related internal conditions in one or more schools, with the ultimate aim of accomplishing educational goals more effectively.”

“Change” is the key word in Miles’ definition; it is relevant to all levels of school activities and personnel and to all people linked to the school, such as parents and Ministry of Education personnel. “Nationalizing the concept of education”, suggested by Mazzawi (1997), is a move to the extreme of the continuum, whose acceptance and internalization by Arab students, Arab teachers, Arab principals or Arab parents is doubtful, and even more so, by the Ministry of Education, yet he assumes nationalization would lead to an improvement in students’ achievement. A more practical definition of school improvement which is relevant to this thesis, is that of Hopkins (1994, P.3):

“What needs to be improved about schools is the level of pupil performance and achievement, best measured by standardized tests.”

and,

“What needs to be improved about schools is their culture, the quality of interpersonal
relationship, and nature and the quality of learning experiences.” (Ibid, p.4)

Hopkins, (1994, p.75) stresses changes linked to strategies and processes in the improvement of the schools themselves:

“…………an approach to educational change that is concerned with process as well as outcomes. School improvement is about raising student achievement through enhancing the teaching-learning process and the conditions which support it. It is about strategies for improving the school’s capacity for providing quality education.”

An example of what Hopkins identifies as strategies and processes is in-service training, which allows teachers to continue their studies for higher university degrees, more collaboration among teachers, and involvement of teachers in decision-making. These he sees as strategies that lead to better student achievements. This work is aimed at exploring whether these strategies could be applied in Arab schools in Israel in order to introduce the change towards improving these schools.

Glatter (1989, p.125) refer the concept of  “school improvement” to the previous concept of “innovation” of the 1960s. ‘Change’ can be conceived as ‘innovation’. As such, the old concept of ‘innovation’ is nothing more than ‘change’. However, ‘school improvement’ might be more comprehensive (Glatter, 1989, p.125) than ‘innovation’ since it covers all aspects of school life.

4.2 Factors affecting school improvement

To differentiate between ‘factors affecting school improvement’ and ‘areas of change’ it may be that the ‘factors affecting school improvement’ are seen to provide a wider perspective than the
‘areas of change’. Areas of change in education are confined to the school community: students, teachers, the head teacher, culture, curricular and extra-curricular activities and parents, while the factors affecting school improvement might include those areas and in addition, research work, national or international. Any change in the school environment is likely to impact on school improvement which is why ‘school improvement’ might be looked upon as a wider perspective than ‘change’. Different researchers point to different conditions that affect school improvement, for example, Hargreaves and Hopkins, (1991, p.109) stress the following factors:

“1. The school is the center of change.
2. The allocation of time to accomplish the change.
3. The internal conditions of the school.
4. The meeting of societal expectations through accomplishing educational goals.
5. A multi-level perspective to ensure that all efforts are linked to the educational system.
6. The linkage of top-down and bottom-up strategies.
7. Change through institutionalizing.”

The ‘Multi-level perspective (factor No.5 above) to ensure that all efforts are linked to the educational system’ can be seen as summarizing all the factors affecting school improvement. If we link Hargreaves’ and Hopkins’ conditions to the Arab educational system in Israel and to the suggestion of changing the motivation and commitment of teachers, then this is likely to include all relevant components, namely,
working conditions of teachers, school policy, vision, ethos of the school, involvement of the teachers in the process of decision-making, related pay and political contextual factors. The political contextual factors are linked to the Ministry of Education; it is about segregation and discrimination against Arab schools in Israel, which have been ignored by the consecutive governments of Israel. The Ministry’s main concerns, in the best case, would be: curriculum, teaching methods, and their goal is to improve Matriculation examination results! The findings of this work will focus on the link between school improvement and the level of motivation and commitment of teachers. Stoll (1994, p.131) stressed another factor for school improvement, that is the concept of ‘ownership’:

“School improvement research emphasizes the importance of teacher involvement in change efforts, and ownership of the process. Consequently, it is important that staff members be involved in the selection of priorities for future development.”

Again, if motivation and commitment among Arab teachers in Israel are to be improved, it is essential to internalize in them this feeling of ‘ownership’ in all the stages leading to school improvement. Another factor affecting school improvement and emphasized by Hargreaves and Hopkins (1991, pp.16-17) is ‘school culture’, whose impact might be powerful:

“Successful schools realize that development planning is about creating a school culture which will support the planning and management of changes of different kinds. School culture is difficult to define, but is best thought of as the procedures, values and expectations that guide people’s behavior within an organization.”
One facet of ‘Culture’ can be thought of as ‘commitment’ to the change that is taking place, after it is adopted by the people concerned in the educational system, or best, after it is ‘owned’ by them. Stoll, (1994, p.131) argues that not any culture can promote school improvement, only that culture which focuses on children’s learning, teachers, collaboration and trust.

“Culture that promotes collaboration, trust, the taking of risks and a focus on continuous learning for students and adults is a key for school improvement efforts.”

Hargreaves and Hopkins (1991, p.122) point to another factor that affects school improvement, the importance of ‘strategies’ that affect school culture.

“Unfortunately not all school improvement strategies work well all the time and in every setting. When they do not, it is often because they do not affect the culture of the school. Many of these strategies implicitly assume that behind the ‘door’ are a series of interconnecting pathways that lead inexorably to school improvement. This is not so. Too often they focus on individual changes, or discrete projects and on individual teachers and classrooms, rather than on how these changes can fit in with and adapt to the organization and culture of the school. As a consequence when the door opens it leads into a cul-de-sac.”

Thus, strategies should always be linked to the culture of the school, otherwise school improvement is not likely to be achieved. Lumby (1998, p.96) highlights the importance of these strategies. For example, if they are not related to the school mission or if they lack the involvement of the people concerned with the strategic plans, school improvement will not occur. The involvement of
teachers in school improvement projects is, as such, essential. Improvement projects will be marginal if they do not impact on all school levels, (Hopkins et al, 1997, p.266). These levels might be: school vision, collaboration, evaluation, structure of the various departments, academic and management, (ibid, p.261). Reynolds et al (1997) add another factor that affects school improvement, that is ‘collegiality’, since it implies ‘ownership’ of the project.

Hopkins (1984) introduced the role of the classroom teacher as a factor for school improvement, including in-service training, curriculum and ‘involvement’:

“The interdependence of these elements, the dialectic emanating from their interaction and the philosophy of education which they espouse gives a vitality and importance to the topic of school improvement.” (Ibid, p.16)

Robinson (1982, p.143) stresses three assumptions for school improvement: voluntary involvement, commitment of the school principal to school improvement, developing and sustaining staff commitment, and collecting data to identify discrepancies between the existing situation and an ideal and valued state. In order to promote ‘voluntary involvement’ it has to be seen as an integral part of the staff’s professional development and not for any other reason, (McLaughlin and Marsh, 1978). The commitment of the school principal to any school project is crucial (Fullan et al, 1980) if it is intended to improve the school, his/her backing and encouragement of the staff is crucial too. A learning school can trace the discrepancies between the existing situation and an ideal one, as such, developing and sustaining staff commitment is secured. A further factor for school improvement is “consonance” which is:

“The extent to which internally identified priorities coincide or overlap with external pressures for reform.” (Hopkins, 1996, p.12)
‘Coincidence’ or ‘overlapping’ of the priorities of the school and the external demands are thought to be a prerequisite for school improvement to occur. In the end, a process of integration is likely to take place between the community’s demands and the school’s goals.

School improvement should be underpinned by continuous processes of ‘change’ in all aspects of school life, otherwise it will not occur.

4.3 **School improvement as a change**

‘School improvement’ is not necessarily synonymous with ‘change’ (Hopkins, 1996, p.6), but it can be assumed that there will not be any improvement in any level of school activity without a ‘change’. The ‘change’ can be in any area, managerial, academic or cultural. Clark and Clark (1996, p.19) explain that:

> “Principals who were successful in school improvement used a variety of mechanisms to stimulate and reinforce cultural change, fostered staff development; engaged in direct and frequent communication about cultural norms, values and beliefs; shared power and responsibility with others; and used symbols to express cultural values.”

Hopkins (1996, p.261) defines ‘school improvement’ in terms of ‘change’ thus:

> “School improvement is regarded as a distinct approach to educational change that enhances students’ outcomes as well as strengthening the school’s capacity for managing change.”
Any change is marginal if it is not aimed at improving student achievements, but people and more specifically, teachers, may resist ‘change’ because they are worried about how the change will affect them personally and whether there will be any benefit for them. Horne and Brown (1997, p.8) suggest that these negative worries be translated to positive action by management processes, such as:

“1. Expect resistance and look for ways to counter it.

2. Encourage staff to be part of the change rather than subject to it.

3. Prompt discussion of the reasons for change.

4. Counter activities related to the rate of change.

5. Treat people with courtesy and respect.

6. Prepare people for change.

7. Support staff when they are insecure.

8. Help staff to believe they can cope with change.

9. Emphasize that change doesn’t necessarily involve more work.

10. Help staff to see the ‘big picture’.”

Stoll and Fink (1996, pp.45-46) indicate almost the same management processes. They list 15 such factors:

“- Here is not only one version of what the change should be.

- People have to understand the change and work it out for themselves in practice.

- Change is often accompanied by stress and anxiety.
- Change is approached differently in each school.
- Conflict and disagreement are inevitable.
- A mix of pressure and support is needed.
- Top-down and bottom-up change together work effectively.
- Change rarely involves a single innovation.
- Effective change takes time.
- There must be times of consolidation.
- Change might not be implemented for valid reasons.
- Some people will not change: “don’t water the rocks”.
- It is necessary to plan, taking into account these assumptions.
- Development is evolutionary, difficult to plan in too much detail.
- The real agenda is changing school culture, not a single innovation.”

As indicated previously, no school improvement can occur without ‘change’. Any change that is decided upon mainly affects the teachers first; they have to implement the change in order to produce new outcomes. This is why Horne and Brown (1997, p.8) in their list, highlight ‘staff management’.

Convincing the teachers to adopt the change is a difficult process, because they are stuck in their routine way of life, which is what Stoll and Fink stress in their list, “some people will not change”. However, both of them, on the one hand, Horne and Brown (1997, p.8) and on the other, Stoll and Fink (1996, p.45-46) point at potential resistance to change.

Basically the reasons for a change in any school are internal, the most important of which is student performance, according to the various definitions of school improvement, but sometimes the reasons are external but no less important, usually accompanied by pressure that imposes change. Schools, which are traditional, tend to resist change. Mortimore et al (1989, p.127) stress this point of ‘traditional’ schools:
“The school being, traditional, will be slow to change without pressures.”

The ‘change’, as Stoll and Fink (1996) previously indicated, is slow and takes time, without external pressure it tends to be slower. The Arab schools in Israel tend to be traditional and very few of them adopt change; unless external pressure is exerted, such as competition among schools or the effect of discrimination and segregation against them by the government, or by trying to change their motivation and commitment, changes will be very slow. This external pressure is expected to come from either the research itself, or from the community (the parents) or internally from the students and the head teacher or the teachers themselves. The question is how to bring about the change.

4.4 The impetus for change

‘Change’ can take place according to either paradigm: the top-down level or the bottom-up level, or both together.

The head teacher’s level: The areas of change from this level are potentially many, since he/she is the initiating power of all projects or ideas in the school. This is mainly his/her job, and includes: staff skills (for example, encouraging and arranging in-service training), specific curriculum weaknesses, strategies, school activities, competitions with other schools, student drop-out, outcomes of standard exams, links with the universities and so on (Lumby, 1998). The major obstacle in this top-down level is the resistance to change, as there are many head teachers who are traditional and tend to impose the change on others without their involvement (Mortimore et al, 1989, p.128).

Group work and team-work are becoming the preferred way of working, incorporating the culture of collaboration, which is an important component of school effectiveness. Previously, head teachers
owned the ‘final say’. This is a potential source of conflict between teachers and head teachers; therefore, involving teachers in decision-making decreases this conflict, and enhances school effectiveness. Consequently, team work leads to a sense of ownership and enhances innovation. Also, team-work is seen as an appropriate management response to the increases in work-load of the head teacher (Coleman and Bush, 1994, p.266). Changes in the ethics of team work are required in order to attain school effectiveness, and as a first step to introducing changes in the values, norms and behaviors in the school as a whole (Dalin, 1993). The changes mentioned above might be enough for the purpose of this research, since the changes that might take place could be in the areas of subject matter, the teaching-learning process, the head teacher’s culture, the teachers’ culture and the students’ culture. Whatever changes occur, there is a need for the commitment of teachers to the change, since without it, the change could only be marginal. Therefore, a new head teacher might carry out changes more rapidly than a traditional head teacher, which is what Reynolds (1992, p.28-29) asserts. In this case, internal or external pressure may help to introduce the desired change. (Stoll and Fink, 1996)

It is assumed that most of the changes that take place in schools tend to be initiated by the head teachers, since they are the primary instigators of change. They are described by Glatter (1989, p.129) as the “agents of change”; this is their main role. The change should be transformational and transactional (Beare et al, 1989, p.43): the central factor of the transformational leadership is ‘commitment’; it is the commitment of the head teacher and the commitment of the teachers to the change, as Sergiovanni, (1998, p.43) asserts:

“The source of authority for leadership is found neither in bureaucratic rules and procedures nor in personalities and styles of leaders, but in shared values, ideas and commitments.”
The ‘transactional leadership’ describes the contact between leader and follower as:

“……from the follower, an agreement to work toward the achievement of organizational goals; from the leader, an agreement to ensure good working conditions or, in some other way to satisfy the needs of the followers.” (Caldwell and Spinks 1992, p.49

The change adopted by the leader must be communicated, to secure commitment among teachers (Beare et al, 1989, p. 108), since they have to be in charge of the change process from the very beginning to the end. This cannot be achieved without the head teacher being the initiator, the motivator and the guide. Teachers should be involved in the decision-making process, as such they become the agents of change and it is not left to the leader alone (Stoll and Mortimore, 1995). Leaders’ professional development is another factor related to school improvement (Stego, 1987, p.74), its need stems from the leader’s routine work. Professional development is a major issue in school management and school improvement, and that is because of the many areas which need competence, such as: vision, policy, culture and school development. Bolam et al, (1993) summarized the features of headship in well-managed schools in the UK, some of which are:

“1. Provides excellent leadership and a clear sense of direction; has a clear vision of the school, based on values and beliefs; actively shapes the culture and ethos of the
school; thinks and plans strategically; encourages quality and high expectations and discourages complacency.

2. Has a consultative, ‘listening style’; is decisive and forceful but not dictatorial; is open to other people’s ideas and is easily accessible to staff.

3. Motivates staff; displays enthusiasm and optimism; is positive and constructive; often expresses appreciation to staff and celebrates special achievements.

4. Models professional behaviour; does not stand on ceremony and is prepared to help out; takes ultimate responsibility and thereby makes staff feel secure; supports teachers in crisis; protects staff from political and external interference; and is supported by the staff.

5. Is well-organized; is in touch with events in the school; keeps abreast of future developments and avoids ‘band wagons’; prepares staff for future developments and avoids crisis management; strongly supports and regularly participates in staff and management development.

6. Often communicates personally with pupils; is regularly seen around school; and is directly involved with pupils.” (Bolam et al, 1993, pp.119-120)

Perhaps the most important and most difficult of these features is the ability of the head teacher to motivate people in the school. Durbin (1995, pp.2-4) stresses that leadership is:

“The ability to motivate people within an organization to achieve organizational goals.”

This implies, according to Durbin (1995) three characteristics:

“a- the ability to set the agenda for the organization,

b. the ability to win commitment to the agenda,

c. the ability to motivate and enable others to carry out the required changes to achieve the agenda”. (pp. 2-4)
In Arab secondary schools in Israel, it might be assumed that professionalism of head teachers is lagging behind. This research will either underpin the assumption or reject it.

Most of the Arab school principals in Israel are executors of the circulars of the Director-General of the Ministry of Education, besides carrying out daily routine work. There is a need for new work, for new procedures, for new strategies, for new policy, for new philosophy and for new vision (Durbin, 1995, p. 75). Without professional development, transformation through change will be stunted. Stego, (1987, p. 75) suggests four needs for leaders in order to perform such a change:

“1. more knowledge,
2. viewing their own role within the school community,
3. to have their management style critically scrutinized by participating colleagues,
4. active participation required not only in the seminar session but also in the work at school, for leader development to serve its purposes.”

West-Burnham (1997, pp. 235-243) lists six needs for leadership to cope with a changing world:

“1. Intellectualism: to strengthen the educative role and reflection.
2. Artistry: relating relationship to vision, creativity and communication.
3. Spirituality: principles or ‘higher order perspectives’.
4. Morality: moral confidence or integrity of values.
5. Subsidiarity, or the ‘willing surrounding of power’ as opposed to the delegation of power.”
6 Emotional intelligence: the ability to know yourself and others, and handle interpersonal relationships."

This area of leadership, and its linkage to school improvement, led Goldring and Pasternack (1994, p. 251) to conclude their research by saying:

“The findings indicate that the image of school leadership which promotes a sense of shared direction and its effects on students’ learning is a direction for future research. Do effective principals exhibit more goal-framing behaviors? Do they exhibit other leadership strategies to develop a shared sense of mission? Are there more leadership substitutes in effective schools? The results of this study hint that the answers to these questions may be affirmative.”

**The teachers’ level:** Teachers are the focus of change, they are the mesh of school improvement, whether through in-service training (Reynolds, 1992), or development of teachers’ skills, or through strategies (such as group work), or through partnership or ownership, or through teachers’ involvement in school activities, (Stoll and Mortimore, 1995). Hopkins (1997, p.263) lists six conditions that underpin school improvement, and which result in the creation of opportunities for teachers to feel more powerful and confident about their work:

“1. Staff development.
2. Staff, student, and community involvement in school policy.
3. Transformational leadership approaches.
4. Effective coordination strategies.”
5. Enquiry and reflection.

6. Collaborative planning.”

In the change process, the teacher is not only the focus, but tends to receive more priority than any other factor (Hopkins, 1987, p.5). The commitment of teachers to change is a result of their involvement in school activities, with the sense of ownership and responsibility for decision-making that is an essential part of the change. Staessons (1993, p.127) stresses the role of teachers in the change process:

“A necessary prerequisite is to capture teachers’ enthusiasm for, and commitment to, change; pressures for improvement which have no perceived rewards for teachers, have little chance for success. Unless everyone in the school has a shared appreciation of a common problem to be resolved, and a sense of ‘ownership’ of the strategies to be used in passing that resolution, teachers will be unconvinced that effort should be expended to bring about change.”

**The organizational level:** If organizational functioning is changed, this will engender academic and social outcomes (Reynolds, 1992) such as assessment procedures (Hopkins, 1997, p.263) or adapting concepts of policy makers or researchers. This top-down management paradigm is argued by Brown et al (1997, p.144):

“One of the more important of these factors is the conceptualization of education, shared by many policy makers and much of the research, as a top-down management process. This has had the effect of placing the initial emphasis at the top of the school and on the formal organizational variables.”
Other areas of change involve the learning–teaching conditions, the curriculum and the related internal conditions, which are sometimes called organizational and pedagogical capacity (Hopkins, 1987, pp.2-3). Changing the school culture means changing all the areas mentioned above. Hopkins (1997, p.269) asserts this:

“The ultimate achievement of school improvement is transformation of the culture of the school”.

and links school improvement, culture and leadership, as follows:

“Outstanding head teachers manipulate priorities, strategies and conditions in order to effect culture, for they know that ultimately this is the only way of enhancing the quality of educational outcomes and experience for all pupils.” (Hopkins, 1997, p.270)

The top-down paradigm is mostly manipulated by the head teacher, as leader of the change, who is supposed to be the igniter of the school improvement process, but the change cannot be implemented without guiding lines.

4.5  School Effectiveness as a guide to school improvement

Definition:

One of the simplest definitions of ‘school effectiveness’ is given by Levin and Lezotte (1990) as referred to by Stoll and Fink (1996, p.26)
“The production of a desired result or outcome.”

A more sophisticated definition is given by Creemers and Reezigt (1997, p.401):

“School effectiveness refers to all theories and research studies concerning the means–ends relationship, between educational processes and outcomes, in particular student knowledge and skills….. aiming at explanations for differences in student achievement between schools and classrooms.”

The emphasis in this definition is on quantitative factors: knowledge, skills, outcomes or achievements and its linkage to the education process and so on. Another definition of school effectiveness which is specific, since it came about as a result of the Gulf war in 1990, is related by Harrison and Kuint (1998, p.196), where cultural factors dominate the effectiveness:

“Israeli schools could be defined as effective, if amongst other goals, they were able to develop: mutual support, integration and commitment among members of the school community.”

The research of Harrison and Kuint (1998) was done among secular and religious schools in Israel, and different school levels (primary, middle and secondary). It gave partial evidence that schools with different cultures respond differently to school effectiveness in emergencies, but in their conclusion of the study they asserted that it is inappropriate to generalize from one culture to another. This is one of the questions to be examined in this work, comparing LEA and PC schools’ culture. Generally, school effectiveness aims at improving students’ achievements, and therefore research studies can identify the elements, components, factors or features of the effectiveness, that may lead to school improvement.

4.6 Features of effective schools
Almost all primary schools in Israel, including the Arab schools, are non-selective schools, since the children are registered according to their geographic location. Secondary schools are also non-selective if they belong to the LEA. This is so in villages because there is usually only one secondary school and at the most, two. Only private schools are to some degree selective, among these are the Christian Church schools. As such, research studies can construct factors for school improvement in all Arab schools in Israel, since they can be assumed to be almost homogeneous, except for slight differences in private church schools, where research may give some or little explanation for these differences (Ouston, 1999, p.171). In Israel, there has been no research into school effectiveness or school improvement in Arab schools; this is another reason why this research is being conducted. Therefore, only international features of school effectiveness will be reviewed here. Hopkins, (1987, p.3); Mortimore et al (1989, p.118-123); Stoll (1994, p.130) and Stoll and Fink (1996, p.31) listed the following factors that are characteristic of effective schools: Purposeful teaching-learning; clear goals and vision; monitoring of progress; staff development; the school as the focus of change; purposeful and professional leadership; intense interaction and communication between various levels of the school; involvement of deputies, teachers, students and parents in the process of decision-making; collaborative planning and implementation within and outside the school; a guiding value system that refers to the culture of the school; pupils rights and responsibilities; and work-centered environment.

The close similarity of the factors of school effectiveness listed by Hopkins, Mortimore et al, Stoll, and Stoll and Fink, proves that there are few differences between schools. Ouston (1999) reached the same conclusion by tracing the works of Rutter et al (1979) and those of Sammons, Thomas and Mortimore (1997). An interval of about twenty years did not show any change in school effectiveness factors, at least in the United Kingdom. Arab schools in Israel can take advantage of some of these factors, as they are likely to apply to almost any school. They include: Purposeful teaching, a learning environment,
shared vision and clear goals, a guiding value system that refers to the culture of the school, parental involvement, teacher involvement, maximum communication between teachers and pupils, a focus on outcomes, on-going staff development and in-service training, maximizing academic learning and committed leadership. Incorporating relevant factors of school effectiveness, school leaders can thereby set a growth plan for school improvement.

4.7 Planning for school improvement

Change, innovation, development planning, as named by Hargreaves and Hopkins (1991), or growth planning, as named by Stoll (1994), are the instruments used that might produce school improvement and school effectiveness. Change and innovation will be difficult to implement if development or growth planning is not accepted by teachers and head teachers, or without effective preparation to convince them to change or to innovate. Obstacles are likely to be found in the convincing process, such as the dual role of the head teacher and teachers in the Arab schools in Israel: their supposed loyalty to their employer - the Ministry of Education and Culture - on one hand, and to their nationalist feelings on the other hand (Mari’, 1976). The purpose of this work is to change the motivation and commitment of teachers in Arab schools. One suggested factor is through adapting ‘nationalizing the concept of education’ of Mazzawi, (1997) which might be an obstacle to school improvement, since it might not be acceptable to the Ministry of Education and Culture and might even be strongly opposed. A change in the culture of the school and, more precisely, the organizational culture, might change the motivation and commitment of teachers in the Arab schools in Israel, which could be more effective than Mazzawi’s suggestion. The aim of Mazzawi (1997) is to keep the roots of the Arabs in Israel in their homeland, after the deterioration of the quality of their crops, as compared with the more advanced Jewish products, by means of replacing the agricultural way of life with a more advanced and modernized future, through learning. ‘Nationalizing the concept of education’ might be considered an
extreme factor for school effectiveness, through which change in motivation and commitment might be doubtful. Whatever the case may be, a development plan such as that of Hargreaves and Hopkins, (1991, p.119) might lead to school improvement, effective in the Arab schools in Israel:

“1. Initiation: This phase is about deciding to embark on development planning, and about developing commitment towards the process.

Hargreaves and Hopkins suggest in this phase that:

“A key person in the school should be prepared to argue the case and encourage others to participate.” (Ibid.)

Who else could that be, if not the head teacher?

“During this phase pressure to be involved is acceptable, as long as it is accompanied by support.” (Ibid.)

This pressure is likely to come from outside the school, e.g. from the Arab community or from published research work.

2. Implementation: This phase normally includes the first cycle of development planning when the school is learning how to carry out the process.

3. Institutionalization: This phase occurs when development planning becomes part of the school’s usual pattern of doing things.” (Ibid)

The three phases of development planning of Hargreaves and Hopkins (1991) are described broadly here, in terms of: embarking on the plan; commitment of all the people in the school to
the plan; spelling it out in full detail; encouragement and participation of all those concerned;
linking the planning issue to the majority of the school so that everybody is involved and
applying pressure where it is needed, ......(The first phase).
Learning how to carry out the process by means of coordination; support; rewards; skills and
understanding. (phase two)

Management arrangements have evolved to support both development and
maintenance,.....wide-spread use of action plans by staff. (phase three). All of these are likely
to be described and discussed in detail in order to be implemented successfully. Growth plans
may differ from each other, such as that of Stoll’s (1994, p.133), which consists of four key
stages:

1. Assessment: The school gathers relevant information to determine its current strengths and
areas of need.

2. Planning: The school selects a small number of goals to which it will direct its attention over three
years.

3. Implementation: The school works through each of the goals with the support of staff development
and resources.

4. Evaluation: The school monitors its process and progress towards the achievement of its goals and
their impact.”

What characterizes Stoll’s growth planning is that it enables each specific school to define its needs and
goals to work and evaluate according to its own strengths and weaknesses. The key to the success of any
growth planning is the person who provides the impetus to school improvement. He/she is likely to be
the head teacher, so that, if the plan is adopted, it becomes part of his/her vision. Stoll (1994, p.133) argues this point:

“More effective growth planning occurred in schools where the principal has a clear vision for a better future for the school that was not imposed on staff but filtered through by a process of engagement and discussion of beliefs and values such that it became a shared vision.”

The four key stages of Stoll (1994) were more developed by herself and Fink (1996), stressing the process of the development planning as the linkage between school improvement and school effectiveness. Their process included the following

“ 1. Invitational leadership: is a characteristic associated with school effectiveness, it merits separation as it fuels the engine of school improvement.
2. Continuing conditions and cultural norms which include climate -setting, vision, the development of collegiality and a collaborative culture, involvement and empowerment, a life-long learning and improvement orientation, monitoring and problem-solving, staff development and amending management structures.
3. The four-stage development planning: assessment, planning, implementation and evaluation.
4. Focus on the learning-teaching process and curriculum
5. The pupil ………at the heart of the school development planning.”

This development planning of Stoll and Fink (1996) is more comprehensive. It highlights very important factors, such as: the pupil, the learning-teaching process, the developing culture of the school and strong leadership, which, if associated with the four key stages of Stoll, is likely to lead to successful school
improvement. Innovation and change are two factors which, as stressed in every research work, are likely to accompany the process of school improvement and school effectiveness. The result of this linkage might be reflected in all pupils’ achievements and outcomes, both academically and socially (Stoll and Fink, 1996, p.190). Although all development planning processes in Europe, the United States of America and Australia (Stoll, 1994, p. 133) are similar, there is a need to review all possible literature that links school improvement and school effectiveness, since any slight difference might be found to be useful. For example Horne and Brown (1997, p. 14-15) list ten factors for the linkage, which are mostly repetition of other researches, but factor number (7) in the list is worth taking into consideration while the development planning is at work. Their development consists of a plan to:

“1. Involve all the staff in the process.
2. Set up a structure to enable all staff to be included.
3. Build a vision of what you are trying to achieve.
4. Write a mission statement.
5. Set priorities.
7. Don’t set the plan in tablets of stone, i.e. school planning should be a continuous process of planning and re-planning, with the flexibility to respond rapidly and appropriately to changing circumstances.
8. Promote collaboration.
9. Link vision-building and planning activities.”
10. Be willing to learn by making mistakes.”

4.8 **Conclusion**

There is no doubt that school effectiveness is correlated with school improvement and that causality cannot be inferred. It is worthwhile noting that school effectiveness is defined as based upon comparing students’ academic achievements, or upon means–ends, or upon teaching and learning or upon individual learners and learning opportunities that might be created to help all learners to realize their potential. Whatever the definition is, “school effectiveness is aimed at explanation for differences in student achievement between schools and class rooms” (Creemers and Reezgit, 1997, p. 401).

There is still little to explain how changes might be brought about to improve schools and what changes work more effectively than others especially when there are barriers that face the improvement process. Removing barriers might slow down the improvement process and lessen the besetting of the ineffective schools. Fighting violence and aggression, as the case in LEA5 school, or as the case of the dual role of the Arab teachers and head teachers, (their supposed loyalty to the Ministry of Education on one hand and their national feelings as Arabs on the other hand) which forms a barrier against school improvement or as the problem of securing the commitment of all the teachers to the development planning, since without it no school
improvement can be secured. It is then reasonable to acknowledge this two-way relationship between school effectiveness on one hand and the barriers facing it on the other hand.

A prerequisite to any school improvement project, is to explore the internal conditions of the school and ways for improvement (Stoll and Mortimore, 1995). Then, to involve all the school community with its various levels in the process of setting a clear vision for the school and in the process of decision-making (Stoll and Fink, 1996 and Stoll and Mortimore, 1995). The third step is to ensure the commitment of the head teacher and the teachers to the intended change, in order to internalize a sense of ‘ownership’ for the project (Brown, 1997), to adapt it and to ensure the commitment of the head teacher and the teachers to collaboration (Hopkins, 1997).

The intended change should include a process of affecting the culture of the school (Hargreaves and Hopkins, 1991) and focus on the learning-teaching process (Hopkins, 1996), through correlating the curriculum and the teaching methods to the proposed change (Stoll and Mortimore, 1995). As the project proceeds, there is a need to highlight any progress in the area of school achievements (Reynolds, 1997). Bush (1998, p.323) emphasizes the importance of the head teacher’s role in school improvement:

“It has become received wisdom that the quality of the head is the single most important
variable in school effectiveness. In the late 1970s Rutter et al (1979) showed that the influence of the head is considerable.”

The preceding points are those which might help in changing the motivation and commitment of teachers in Arab schools in Israel, and which might lead to school improvement; the goal of which is to increase the percentage of those passing the Matriculation examinations and to decrease the percentage of drop-outs.

5. **Motivation and commitment leading to school improvement**

Exploring the components of school improvement is important, but its implementation is most important. The process of implementation is linked directly to the head teacher, the
teachers and all supporting personnel. The head teacher’s role is to set the policy and vision of the school and to lead the change as prescribed by the explored components of school improvement. The teachers’ role is their active involvement in the change process and their motivation and commitment to it. Without the head teacher’s and the teachers’ commitment to the change, school improvement is very doubtful to occur. So, what is the binding element that links motivation and commitment on one hand and school improvement on the other hand?

Again, the purpose of this thesis is to examine the motivation and commitment of teachers in Arab schools in Israel with a view to managing motivation and commitment, firstly in order to improve achievements of pupils in the matriculation exams, that is, the ‘Bagrut’ exams, and secondly to lower the drop-out rate in schools. It is essential then, to consider the relationship between motivation, commitment and school improvement, as these are key areas relating to the different problems facing Arab pupils’ achievements. Ensuring better motivation and commitment of teachers in Arab schools is prerequisite to school improvement, since any change will not occur without the commitment of the teachers and other people in the organization to the change (Brown, 1997). Involving teachers in school life motivates them to effective performance, therefore involving them in the proposed change will ensure their commitment (Hopkins, 1997, p.267).

In order to secure school improvement, a process of change is inevitable, a change in the school’s vision, in the process of decision making, in the teachers’ feeling of ‘ownership’, in the collaboration among all those involved in the process of school improvement, a change in the school’s culture and a change in the teachers’ motivation and commitment.

5.1 Linking school improvement with commitment and/or motivation
Some of the key factors affecting school improvement are:

1. Commitment of the head teacher, teachers and the outer community to the ‘change’ - a sense of ‘ownership’. (Brown, 1997)

2. Clear vision and clear decisions. (Stoll and Fink, 1996)

3. Involvement of all the school community in the process of decision-making. (Stoll and Mortimore, 1995)

4. Commitment of the head teacher and the teachers to collaboration. (Hopkins, 1997)

5. Affecting (that is, introducing a change in) the culture of the school. (Hargreaves and Hopkins, 1991)

Some of the factors affecting ‘motivation’ or more accurately ‘organizational motivation’, which is gained by means of the organization’s policy, culture and other factors (Hopkins, 1987, p.93), are:

1. Vision. (Goldring and Pasternack, 1994)

2. Culture, which is a system of values and beliefs that the school adopts. (Schein, 1985)

3. Involvement of the teachers in the process of decision-making. (Murgatroyd and Morgan, 1992 and Sallis, 1992)

4. Accountability to all “those who have the legitimate right to know”. (Bush, 1994)

As can be seen, some of the factors affecting school improvement and some of the factors affecting ‘organizational motivation’ are the same, which suggests a link between school improvement on one hand and motivation and commitment on the other hand. ‘Change’ is also a concept linking school improvement, motivation and commitment. It can be thought that ‘change’ is the core of school improvement, motivation and commitment.
As such, if school improvement is to occur, any change has to be managed appropriately.

5-1-1 Change

‘Change’ is integrally linked to improvement; it is inevitable if school improvement is to occur.

‘Change’ is likely to take place on two levels: the micro and the macro. The micro encompasses every minute of school life: teacher-pupil relationship (for example, teaching methods), teacher-teacher relationship (for example, collaboration), teacher-head teacher relationship (for example, involvement of teachers in school life). If teachers are not involved in the changes suggested by the head teacher, their performance will be minimal and school improvement will not occur. Involving teachers in school life is one factor of organizational motivation (Hopkins, 1987, p.93), satisfying this motive might lead to school improvement. Their involvement has to be accompanied by their commitment to the change, otherwise their involvement is rather superficial. Leithwood (1994) found that teachers have three distinct psychological dispositions: their perception of various school characteristics, their commitment to school change and their capacity for professional development as quoted by Hallinger and Heck (1999, p.180). Leithwood’s findings underpin the argument that without the commitment of teachers to the ‘change’, school improvement might not occur. In other words, teachers are aware of everything that takes place in the school’s life and therefore their commitment to the change might be ensured if they are convinced that the change is adequate. Another component that belongs to the micro level is teacher-parent relationship, for example, accountability of the teachers to the parents and the mutual collaboration between them for the benefit of the children. The macro level encompasses: policy making, the school vision, the school ethos, the school culture and its strategies. Successful head teachers manipulate strategies, policies and priorities in order to effect change in the culture of the school (Hopkins, 1996, 1997).
Any phase of school improvement entails some kind of change that is likely to need a development plan, which is accepted by the teachers, and whose commitment to it is essential. Teachers’ commitment to the plan is ensured if they are involved in it, otherwise it will be a failure. Hargreaves and Hopkins (1991, p.119) suggest three stages to such a change which they call ‘innovation’. The core of their first stage, ‘initiation’, is ‘commitment’:

“This phase is about deciding to embark on development planning, and about developing commitment towards the process.”

The other two stages are: implementation, which includes the first cycle of the development planning, and institutionalization which occurs when the development planning becomes part of the school’s usual pattern of doing things.

The factors of change in school improvement are many and are linked to every aspect of school life. These factors are discussed in more detail on p.78. Certain factors which are related to school improvement and are linked to motivation and commitment, are discussed in the following section.

5-1-2 Teachers’ involvement

Commercial organizations in the latter part of the twentieth century initiated a new management style, Total Quality Management, which was later applied to schools and colleges (West-Burnham, 1992). Whatever the evidence of its effectiveness in schools, it indicates the importance of involving teachers as a strong motivator in all aspects of school life, if school improvement is to occur.

“….. Levels of motivation increase with the feeling that they are
‘coming to grips’ with real issues. This seems to be equally true whether the data is positive or negative- we have seen a number of cases where negative data has apparently reaffirmed teachers’ commitment to change.” (Hopkins et al, 1997, p.267)

‘Commitment’ alone cannot be internalized in teachers’ feelings, unless there is a cause for it, their involvement and gaining a sense of ‘ownership’ are essential to produce motivation and commitment, and the consequent change leading to school improvement.

“The involvement and commitment of teachers with a sense of ownership and responsibility for decision-making is essential for innovation.” (Brown et al, 1997, p.141)

The involvement of teachers has to be in the depth of the problems to be resolved in the school, it can be argued that they have to be aware of everything going on in the school, they have to be the real partner in the administration of the school, participating in planning or in drawing up its policy, as such they can feel ownership. Without all of this their motivation and commitment to the school, and to their job, is in doubt.

“A necessary prerequisite is to capture teachers’ enthusiasm and commitment to change; pressures for improvement have little chance of success. Unless every one in the school has a shared appreciation of a common problem to be resolved and a sense of ownership of the strategies to be used in pursuing that resolution, teachers will be unconvinced that efforts should be expended to
bring about change.” (Ibid, p.143)

It seems from what Brown et al (1997) are suggesting that a shared common problem to be resolved is a tool to motivate teachers and to capture their commitment. Involving teachers in development planning is likely to create feelings of motivation and commitment.

“ The wide-spread involvement in the creation of the development plan is a key to both quality and commitment. It also shows us that linking planning to action is every bit as important as knowing how to plan- it is the results of the exercise when viewed in the class room which will determine the future commitment of staff.” (Hopkins et al, 1996, p.34)

Organizational culture can be summarized as the minute-by-minute life of the school day. One of the most important activities of a school day is the meetings, including inter-disciplinary meetings, which reflect collaboration or in some cases collegiality. Torrington and Weightman (1989) suggest that it contributes to producing motivation and commitment:

“ The whole school and the inter-disciplinary meetings which operate within the school also contribute to the patterns of team building and commitment.” (Torrington and Weightman, 1989, p.48)

Another aspect of teachers’ involvement in the school life is their involvement in the process of decision-making.

5-1-3 Decision-making

One of the aims of this research work is to examine the extent to which ‘commitment’ is seen as
an internalized value gained through the process of raising a child at home, or is linked to organizational culture. This could be termed: ‘moral commitment’ versus ‘organizational commitment’. ‘Moral commitment’ cannot be gained through the efforts of school management but its existence might help in adopting school improvement plans, while ‘organizational commitment’ can be encouraged by management (O’Neill, 1994, p.5). Levacic et al (1999, p.20) refer to the normative power of an organizational culture to secure organizational commitment, that is, through the active involvement of teachers in all aspects of the organizational culture:

“Whereby normative power is used to secure organizational members’ commitment to organizational goals through the sharing of common norms, values and meanings.” (Ibid)

Doing so should ensure their feeling of belonging to the organization and their feeling of ‘ownership’. Whenever such a feeling is produced commitment might be internalized.

‘Commitment’ cannot be imposed on any individual, it is a result of a long process, whether by education at home or by management skills of those responsible in the organization, or a combination of the two. If teachers are involved in the decision-making process, their commitment is more likely to be guaranteed. Cheng (1993, p.103), in his comparison between ‘strong culture effective schools’ and ‘weak culture ineffective schools’ in Hong Kong, reflected a difference in the teachers’ motivation and commitment:

“Strong primary school principal leaders in Hong Kong schools tended to promote participation in decision-making. This resulted in stronger and more cohesive social interactions, greater staff commitment and high morale.”
Total Quality Management (TQM) has proved to be effective, as purported by Murgatroyd and Morgan (1992) and Sallis (1992). The focus of this kind of management is the involvement of the members of the organization in the process of decision-making and in all aspects of its life. The involvement of teachers in the process of decision-making motivates and promotes team-work, collaboration and, in some cases, collegiality, which is seen by some as essential to school improvement. For example, Stoll and Mortimore (1997) suggest that collegiality facilitates school improvement and reflects the development of cohesive and professional relations within and beyond schools and efforts to improve culture.

5-1-4 Collegiality

Involvement of teachers in school life has been shown to be a factor for school improvement (Stoll and Mortimore, 1995), moreover, teachers’ collaboration is a factor for school improvement (Hopkins, 1997). Collegiality as defined by Bush (1995, p. 52), if secured, might be another factor of school improvement:

“Collegiality assume(s) that organizations determine policy and make decisions through a process of discussion leading to consensus. Power is shared among some or all members of the organization who are thought to have a mutual understanding about the objectives of the institution.”

One of the features of ‘collegiality’ is that it is ‘strongly normative’ (Bush, 1995), that implies ‘commitment’ to the agreed policy and decisions. ‘Strongly normative’ means setting approved rules and instructions for the behaviour of the members in the organization which reflects ‘commitment’
of the members to these rules and instructions. A similar argument was stated by Richman and Farmer (1974, p. 29) as quoted by Bush (1995, p.54):

“{The collegial model} has a very strong harmony bias that assumes away the possibility of conflict. It is only likely to work well…..where virtually all of the participants - especially the more active ones, have a strong spirit of genuine cooperation, similar values and personal goals and a deep commitment to the institution and its goals and priorities.”

Another feature of ‘collegiality’ is the ‘authority of expertise’. Secondary school teachers have prestige by virtue of their being professionals, but they need, from time to time, to innovate the approach to teaching and learning through collaboration (Little, 1990). The collegiality model of Little (1990) “appears to depend on shared professional values” (Bush, 1995, p.60), which reflect ‘commitment’ to the organization – ‘organizational commitment’ or commitment to the concept of ‘collegiality’. Alongside collegiality, conflict among members of the organization may appear because of their tendency to be competitive. However, collegial teachers become committed to what they have agreed upon and this is essential to school improvement:

“It is a demanding approach that requires commitment from the staff if it is to become an effective vehicle for beneficial change. It is also an elusive model to operate even where staff are committed to the concept.” (Bush, 1995, p. 60)

However, if it is ‘restricted’ collegiality, where some of the senior staff together with the
principal share the power and decision making or, ‘pure’ collegiality where all members are involved in decision-making and determining the policy of the school, commitment to the institute or to the collegial forum is produced. In secondary schools ‘restricted’ collegiality is that which is more prominent and partial commitment is rather produced.

Collegiality is a desirable factor for school improvement, but there are other factors which are necessary for school improvement such as ‘job satisfaction’. Job satisfaction occurs when one feels a sense of significant achievement (Evans, 1998, p.14). This is one facet of job satisfaction. School improvement is a remedial process effected mostly by the teachers and is focused on achievements. Therefore, if school improvement occurs, then job satisfaction might be produced.

5-1-5  **Job satisfaction**

This concept stems from satisfaction and dissatisfaction at work; one of its definitions is given by Evans (1998, p.12):

“A state of mind encompassing all those feelings determined by the extent to which the individual perceives her/his job-related needs being met.”

Job satisfaction is a motive that could be linked to ‘commitment’, or it may lead to commitment. Job satisfaction is produced by: achievement, recognition, responsibility, advancement and the work itself (Herzberg, 1968), which might produce a state of mind encompassing the feelings related to her/his job-related needs. For example, dissatisfaction occurs when there is poor school management, such as lack of teachers’ collaboration or bad discipline. Maslow (1943) linked
satisfaction and dissatisfaction to the goals set. If these are met, satisfaction occurs and if not, dissatisfaction occurs. Nias (1981) explains that satisfaction is obtained by intrinsic factors and not only by the ‘content’. On the other hand, Cheng (1993, p.103), in his research in Hong Kong schools, found a link between job satisfaction and commitment through the difference in the organizational culture of the schools. One reflection, due to this difference in school culture, is that it makes a difference in the attitudes of teachers regarding their commitment to the organization or to their job, whether it is ‘intrinsic satisfaction’ or ‘influential satisfaction’.

“What Teachers’ attitudinal level in terms of organizational commitment, social job satisfaction, intrinsic job satisfaction and influence job satisfaction.” (Cheng, 1993, p. 103)

What is meant by ‘intrinsic job satisfaction’ and ‘influence job satisfaction”? Is it not ‘moral commitment’ and ‘organizational commitment”? If not, at least it might be linked to both of them. The first is gained almost intuitively while the second is gained through the organization’s culture. Evans (1998) in her interpretation of job satisfaction, (in terms of the feelings determined by the job-related needs) includes both the ‘intrinsic job satisfaction’ and the ‘influence job satisfaction’, which inspires ‘commitment’. That is, if ‘internal job satisfaction’, which is a feeling gained by the job itself, and if ‘influence job satisfaction’, which is gained through the organizational culture of the school are produced, then ‘commitment’ might be internalized.

‘Commitment’ as a result of job satisfaction means commitment to the policy of the school, commitment to the vision of the school and commitment to the organizational culture of the school,
which all aim at school improvement. The essential role in the process of school improvement is that of the head teacher. He/she is the leader of any change, he/she is the first in any initiative and he/she is the one who carries the whole responsibility. Although he/she involves teachers in the process of decision-making and in mapping the policy of the school, he/she is still the leader of the whole process of school improvement.

**5-1-6 Leadership**

School improvement is also linked to leadership, Reynolds (1997), Mortimore, (1989) and others. School leaders are the agents of change (Glatter, 1989). They need the commitment of the teachers if the change is to occur. Sergiovanni (1990, p.24) highlights head teachers and teachers’ commitment rather than bureaucracy or leaders’ personalities and styles of leaders, as the source of authority for leadership.

“The source of authority for leadership is found neither in bureaucratic rules and procedures nor in personalities and styles of leaders, but in shared values, ideas and commitment.”

Transformational leadership, which is a kind of leadership that promotes ‘commitment’ of the teachers, is based upon teachers’ and head teachers’ commitment, while transactional leadership is that which organizes the work between the leader and the follower and does not necessarily produce ‘commitment’:

” The introduction of change, as in school improvement, cannot be guaranteed by such leadership (transactional). Rather what is termed transformational leadership, ensuring the commitment of the followers, is
required.” (Coleman, 1994, p.69)

Sergiovanni (1990, p.24) has commented upon another type of leadership that is related to ‘commitment’:

“Leadership by building, providing support to increase potential, motivating leaders and thus encouraging ‘higher levels of commitment and performance’”.

and,

“Leadership by bonding, commitment to mutually agreed aims, elevates school goals and purposes to the level of a shared covenant that bonds together leader and follower in a moral commitment.” (Ibid)

Sergiovanni believes that ‘organizational commitment’ produces ‘moral commitment’ and the converse, that ‘moral commitment’ may produce ‘organizational commitment’ if beliefs, values, behavioral regularities, norms and vision are shared by both leaders and followers, and both work for the same goals. If ‘moral commitment’ is gained at home, that is if the child was raised at home to be committed to his/her duties and internalized it as a habit, it might continue with him/her. Then, ‘moral commitment’ might be more powerful than ‘organizational commitment’ and may lead to it if the organizational culture is equitable. It seems that commitment of the head teacher and the teachers to school activities, to its policy, to its vision, to its culture and to its goals, whether long-term or short term goals, is essential in order that development or school improvement may occur:

“……study of school development projects in the United States and
Canada, reported that sixty-two per cent of the respondents perceived the commitment of school administrators as essential to getting the project started.” (Robinson, 1982, p.141)

School principals’ commitment to school projects is not enough without the commitment of all school staff, teachers and other personnel.

“One of the biggest problems in any school development exercise is that of developing and sustaining staff commitment.” (Ibid)

To ensure staff commitment, teachers have to be involved in the decision-making process and in developing a clear sense of the specific projects and problems linked to it. Hargreaves and Hopkins (1991) presented almost the same argument about developing commitment towards the innovation process; to do that, purposes and the process of the development planning have to be spelled out clearly.

Hence, since ‘commitment’ is an essential and a central factor to any change, it is logical then, to work towards managing ‘commitment’ amongst teachers, especially if it is the culture of the school and if school improvement is to be achieved.

5-1-7 Culture

“School culture may be a cause, an object or an effect of school
improvement.” (Hargreaves, 1997, p.248)

Culture is a set of norms, beliefs, values and assumptions shared by the members of the organization (Deal and Kennedy, 1982; Schein, 1985). ‘Sharing’ reflects commitment to what is shared. Therefore, it is reasonable to find a link between ‘commitment’ of the individual and any of the components composing ‘culture’, especially if the target is school improvement.

Clear vision, clear purposes, clear decisions, collaboration and collegiality are some components of school culture that affect school improvement.

“If the relationships between school culture and school improvement are to be tested empirically, it will be essential to look beneath the cultural features, such as collaborative attitudes, to their underlying structures. In the collegial culture there are likely to be found not just examples of collaboration but also other cultural and architectural features such as: commitment to a shared vision for the school, providing teachers with clear purpose and direction, and so potentially strong morale.” (Hargreaves, 1997, p.248)

Reviewing the literature indicates that the link between school improvement and school culture is strong, in the sense that culture as defined by Deal (1988) is “the way we do things here.” That is, all patterns of behaviour, beliefs, vision, decisions, values, even stories and so on. If these are positive and are cohesively bonded together, the performance of the people in the organization will be great and consequently commitment is inspired.

“A strong performance is dependent on a cohesive culture- a set of shared values that motivates and shapes behaviour inside the
company and inspires commitment and loyalty from customers or clients.” (Deal, 1988, p.248)

So, the result of cohesive culture will not only be ‘strong performance’ but also internalizing commitment among the staff, which is a desired, sustained aim of the managers of the organization. Deal’s argument is applicable not only to commercial organizations but also to schools, where commitment can be inspired from the students as well as from the staff, as a result of high academic achievements. A cohesive organizational culture is not easy to achieve or develop because beliefs, values, assumptions and patterns of behaviour should be shared in common among all members of the organization. In practice, individuals usually have different (at least) levels of such beliefs, values, assumptions or patterns of behaviour. The stronger this cohesiveness is, the stronger will be the school improvement, the weaker it is, the weaker the school improvement.

“It is often assumed that the stronger the organizational culture, the more satisfied, motivated and committed the members. A shared school mission seems to be a very important force for motivating both teachers and principals. Schools with a strong culture achieved not only high teacher satisfaction and commitment but also high academic achievement in public examinations.” (Cheng, 1993, p.87)

As could be seen from Cheng’s research in Hong Kong schools (1993), those with strong culture produced teacher satisfaction and commitment, and high academic achievements. Hence, it is reasonable to conclude that in order to achieve school improvement there is a need to improve the culture of the school.
“What needs to be improved about schools is their culture, the quality of inter-personal relationships, and the nature and the quality of learning experiences”. (Hopkins, 1994, p.4)

In order to improve the culture of the school it is desirable to have a clear vision of the school, shared beliefs and values, and an agreed policy and assumptions by all teachers. It is the task of the leaders of the school to establish a strong and sustained culture. Hopkins et al (1996) stress the importance of some facets of school culture in producing commitment from the teachers:

“The methods through which the vision is developed seems to be as important as vision itself in generating staff commitment.” (Hopkins et al, 1996, p.28)

School improvement is linked to many factors, as shown earlier, but initially, a diagnostic survey should take place in order to pinpoint the weaknesses of the school. This needs a qualified staff to perform the research, that is, a learning environment and a learning organization.

5-1-8 Staff Development

A learning organization aims to explore the weaknesses in the organization, to explore where to improve and how to perform the improvement. The task is to learn how to achieve the goals together by applying the full potential of all staff (Aispinwall and Pedlar, 1997, p.230). The
question then is how to motivate teachers to be part of the learning organization and to be committed to it, with or without related pay.

Ouston (1999) points to this factor, the learning organization, for the purpose of school improvement as a motivator to the staff’s commitment, but he argues that it is not always the case that the people in the learning organization will remain committed to it, because teachers have not the will to alter their practice, so that little or nothing is likely to happen.

“What indications were there that in the schools, those involved in the research learning would remain committed?” (Middlewood, 1999, p.112)

School improvement is linked to problem solving, to improve a school means to solve the problems facing its progress. An effective process for school improvement is better if it is based on research work. Therefore it is necessary to acquaint the faculty with the findings of the appropriate research that would solve the problems, and even better if the members of the staff themselves would do the job.

Joyce (1991) underpins this argument by bringing research work of proponents to the faculty in her ‘second door’ of school improvement:

“…bringing research findings directly to the faculty, helping to study the research on effective schools or on topics of their choosing or to investigate the research products.” (Joyce, 1991, p.60)

One of the most important problems facing schools is the teaching-learning process. In addition to other problems, it is considered to be part of any school objective. One suggested way to solve such problems, and others, is through ‘Continuing Professional Development’ (CPD) or
through ‘In-service Training’ (INSET).

“Professional development can have an important impact on teaching and learning quality” (Glover and Law, 1996, p.98)

CPD has the following characteristics according to Bolam (1993)

“1. Adding to teachers’ and managers’ knowledge.

2. Improving their potential.

3. Clarifying their professional values.

4. Enabling their students to be educated more effectively.”

In addition CPD improves motivation and team work (Glover and Law, 1996, p.117), although not for all teachers, especially those who have teaching experience of 31-40 years, who tend to disengage from the educational system and prepare themselves for retirement, (Glatthorn and Fox, 1996, p.11). In Israel, In-Service Training (INSET), is funded by the government, its proclaimed main objective is school improvement. Teachers who participate in the in-service training programmes get a monthly increment of 1.2 per cent of their salaries if they attend 112 hours of the (INSET) programme. The objective of these programmes for teachers has, however, become financial and not school improvement, that is, the teachers are seeking for an increment to their salaries, rather than developing themselves professionally.

“Although some administrators believe that teachers are motivated by higher salaries.” (Glatthorn and Fox, 1996, p.9)
But Glatthorn and Fox found that the teachers are not motivated for their teaching job by salary but by the following:

“1. A supportive environment for quality teaching, that is, the school as a working environment.

2. Meaningful work, that is he or she is making a difference in students’ lives.

3. Belief system: the belief in his or her ability to achieve results.

4. Goals: shared goals with colleagues.

5. Rewards, mostly intrinsic rewards.

6. Feed-back, that is, the satisfaction that comes from the students’ results or praise that comes from administrators, peers or parents.

7. Autonomy and power, that is, the control over the critical aspects of their work.”

The main trend in Israel is that INSET programmes, in addition to the claimed purpose, that is, school improvement, have become a substitute for the teachers’ low salaries and for none of the objectives suggested by Glatthorn and Fox (1996). The overall objective of INSET or CPD is likely to be school improvement, through which school problems are likely to be solved and not through which teachers’ salary problems will be solved.

5.2 Conclusion

Since commitment is described as completing a certain work effectively, regardless of cost or time (Campbell and Neill, 1997) then there should be good reasons for this physical and ethical effort; one of these reasons is a school’s vision. Vision, as defined by Goldring and Pasternack (1994, p.251): “is the policy or philosophy of the school principal”. It is the leader’s task then, to promote teachers’ commitment to the school’s policy. Some considerable input has to be internalized in the
teachers’ feelings in order to produce commitment. Those factors that relate commitment to school improvement include a cohesive culture which involves collaboration and in some cases collegiality, shared beliefs, values, assumptions and agreed patterns of behaviour, active involvement of the teachers in every aspect of school life, committed leadership, shared decisions, a learning school (if possible) and in-service training. Commitment and motivation are crucial elements in the move towards school improvement.

**Motivation, commitment, culture and school improvement are key issues in this research.**

Changing the motivation and commitment of teachers in Arab schools in Israel cannot be taken for granted. It can be envisaged as a long process based on scientific methods. In the first place, it is essential to explore the level of motivation of the teachers in Arab schools in Israel, what levels of commitment they have to their schools, and then how to introduce the change. The theories of motivation of Maslow, Herzberg, McGregor, McClelland and others; the research on school culture, such that of Hargreaves (1997), Cheng (1993), Deal (1988), Sergiovanni (1984) Hopkins (1987) and others, underpin this thesis.

Moreover, without the contribution of research on school improvement and school effectiveness such as that of Hopkins (1991, 1997), Stoll (1994), Reynolds (1997) and others; and without the strong linkage of motivation, commitment, culture and school improvement, it would not have been possible to conduct this project, either by setting its purposes or by organizing its methods of research, or by concluding its findings and recommendations. In addition, the reading of various sources on ‘commitment’ and its linkage to motivation, culture and school improvement, afforded the main rationale of the title of this thesis.
6. **Methodology**

The aims of this research are:

1. To examine the perception of motivation and commitment of teachers in Arab schools by teachers and head teachers in Israel.

2. To examine how senior managers in schools could best change teachers’ motivation and commitment.

3. To recommend ways to change motivation and commitment in teachers.

The overall purpose is to promote school improvement in the Arab education sector.

The related research questions are:

1. What are the perceptions of teachers and head teachers of the factors associated with the culture of their school that affect motivation and performance of teachers? Such factors would include: vision, involvement of teachers in decision-making, policy, collaboration, values, beliefs and satisfaction or dissatisfaction with their work. What are the strategies
being adopted by principals in trying to change the motivation and commitment of Arab
teachers?

2. What are the perceptions of teachers and head teachers of the factors derived from
motivation theories are likely to produce commitment and motivation amongst teachers
in Arab schools in Israel? These would include performance related pay, job satisfaction,
estime and self-actualization, working conditions, security, growth, affiliation to one’s
school, national cause, managers’ strategies, the school’s, the teachers’ and the
community’s culture, the level of education at home and the teacher’s self-image in his or
her community.

3. What are the perceptions of teachers and head teachers of the political contextual factors
related to motivation and performance of Arab teachers in Israel?

4. What appear to be the differences in motivation, commitment and cultural factors
between LEA school and private church (PC) school teachers in the Arab educational
sector?

The research population sample includes 499 teachers from 10 schools and 10 head teachers
from the same schools. The research tools used are a questionnaire for the teacher population
and a semi-structured interview for the head teachers and 10 teachers, one from each school.

6.1 Research Paradigm

This research is based on documents about the culture of each school and interviews with
teachers and head teachers focusing on school culture, motivation and commitment of teachers in
10 Arab schools in Israel. In addition, a questionnaire was distributed among 499 teachers to
examine their motivation, culture and commitment. The use of these tools does not fit neatly into
a single research paradigm. The positivist paradigm, represented in this research by a questionnaire, is linked to objectivity (Johnson, 1994, p.7), its focus is on gathering facts, concepts are measurable and the core of it is a large sample, (Easterby-Smith, 1994, p. 80). The total number of teachers in the research area, that is, in the Northern district of Israel and in the Haifa district, is about 3850 and the number of teachers in the research sample is 499. This is a relatively large number if compared with the total number of Arab secondary school teachers in Israel, which was 4673 in the year 1999/2000 (Central Bureau of Statistics, 2000, No.51, 22.8).

An important characteristic of the positivist approach is the possibility of ‘generalization’ from the specific (Cohen and Manion, 1994, p.39).

The interpretive paradigm, represented in this research by interviewing one sample of teachers and another sample of head teachers, is used where there is an interaction of many factors, such as cultural, political, economic and national, that intervene and affect roles and attitudes. Teachers and head teachers in Arab schools in Israel are subject to such factors, due to the different religious affiliations of the pupils and the teachers which cause some cultural sensitivity, in addition to inter-family conflicts, especially in villages, and the conflict between traditionalism and modernism.

Other factors to be taken into account are the economic discrimination against Arab schools and the conflict between national affiliation and the loyalty to the employer- the government of Israel. The interview method of research is judged as appropriate as the interpretive paradigm is intended:

“to appreciate the different constructions and meanings that people place upon their experience.” (Easterby-Smith, 1994, p.78)
In this paradigm all human behaviours are meaningful and stem from their experiences, therefore, they have:

“to be interpreted and understood within the context of social practices.” (Usher, 1996, p.18)

One of the characteristics in considering paradigms is ‘objectivity’. Complete objectivity in interpretation of research data is impossible, since it is a result of the intervention of the interpreter in the process. Considering the interpretive paradigm, both the interviewer and the interviewee may have different social practices. Miles and Huberman (1994, p.5) point to the difficulty of having a researcher in a fixed (neutral) position, since the researcher’s views might not be in the centre as they suggest, but might also be at either extreme of the spectrum. The focus of the interpretive paradigm is on ‘meanings’, ‘subjectivity’, and ‘interpretation’ of the specific (Easterby-Smith, 1994, p.80 and Cohen and Manion, 1994, p.39). Therefore, in this research, an attempt to be careful when interpreting the words of the interviewee, an attempt to be in the position of a ‘neutral point’ and to be aware of possible bias will be ensured.

‘Subjectivity’ and ‘meanings’ are the hallmark of the interpretive paradigm and are sometimes identified with the feminist approach, which emphasizes the importance of the individual’s view. Strachan’s research (1993) on women in educational leadership reported that it was “full of the ‘personal’ and the ‘subjective’” (p.76). ‘Truth’, however, is asserted by the interpretive paradigm through critical discussion (Usher, 1996, p. 23). This research draws from both paradigms, a combination of the positivist and the interpretive; the questionnaire provides a relatively objective means of investigation and allows for some generalization, while the interviews provide a deeper insight into the views of a range of individuals in the schools, both head teachers and teachers.

The questionnaire used in this research might represent the positivist paradigm, is anonymous
and is expected to reflect objectivity, which has its focus on reasonable facts, free from social or political bias. However, subjectivity cannot always be excluded from a questionnaire, since individual feelings are affected by former or future interests. Nevertheless, these qualities, objectivity and subjectivity, are supposed to measure the ‘truth’ about the feeling of teachers in the Arab schools in Israel regarding what seems to be the most important basis of their jobs as teachers: ‘motivation and commitment’.

**Planning the research**

In this research, a closed Likert type questionnaire with a five point scale, ranging from (1) strongly dissatisfied to (5) strongly satisfied was used (a positivist method) and distributed among teachers in ten secondary schools (N~499) and a semi-structured interview was administered with the head teachers of the ten schools and with one teacher from each school. Both the questionnaire and the semi-structured interview included the same areas of questioning, relating to motivation and commitment, culture and job satisfaction, while a third section dealt with segregation and discrimination against Arab schools in Israel and the relative impact on motivation and commitment. Both paradigms complement each other and the combination of instruments from both paradigms (but not necessarily from two different paradigms) should lead to ‘triangulation’; which is defined as:

> “The use of two or more methods of data collection in the study of some aspects of known behaviour.” (Cohen and Manion, 1994, p.233)

The critical theory which might be relevant to this research and which aims at changing situations, stresses that there can be no ‘objective’ knowledge since every individual’s view is influenced by interest and both the positivist and the interpretive traditions are linked with social
interest (Habermas, 1972).

Teachers’ interests might be pro or against the head teachers, the curriculum, some school decisions, certain aspects of the organizational culture of the school, some coordinators’ attitudes, the policy of the head teachers, some beliefs (such as the involvement in certain co-existence programmes) and national projects. These feelings are pro and con and the questionnaire cannot ensure their neutrality, that is, if the ‘pros’ are equivalent to the ‘cons’, it does not mean that objectivity is attained and that the outcome represents the ‘truth’ for any particular individual. Therefore the utmost care has to be taken when interpreting and analysing the findings of the research.

Interviewing teachers and head teachers by means of a semi-structured interview ensures that individual ‘truths’ can be presented. Semi-structured interviews also represent one aspect of the interpretive paradigm, this being based on the idea that there is no objective truth, and that:

“All human life is experienced and constructed from a subjective point of view and that social research should seek to elicit the ‘meaning’ of events and phenomena from the point of view of the participants.”

(Johnson, 1994, p7)

Since the basic aim of any research is to find reliable solutions to existing problems, the use of one method could be criticized. Triangulation can avoid such criticism and provide the possibility of both cross-checking data and ensuring that the solution becomes more reliable. Adopting the combination of both measuring tools, the positivist and the interpretive, may provide the research with more valid results. As Shutt (1999, p.396) states:
“The ability to apply diverse techniques to address different aspects of a complex research problem is one mark of sophisticated social research.”

6.2 **Research Approach – A Survey**

The purpose of this work is to examine motivation and commitment among teachers in Arab schools in Israel. Since the research population is large, 4673 teachers in the Arab secondary schools in the scholastic year 1999/2000 (Central Bureau of Statistics, 2000, No, 51, 22.8) and the number of Arab secondary schools, namely 129, is also large, (CBS, 2000, No 51, 22.7) then a survey approach might be suitable. Survey as defined by Johnson (1994, p.13) is:

> “Eliciting equivalent information from an identified population.”

The survey approach is also suitable for this research for the following reasons:

1. This research work focuses on educational enquiry, which analyses the motivation and commitment of teachers in Arab schools in Israel.

This enquiry:

(a) examines motivation and commitment of teachers in Arab schools in Israel;

(b) examines aspects of how senior managers in schools could best change the motivation and commitment of teachers;

(c) recommends ways of changing motivation and commitment in teachers, with a view to school improvement.

The population on which it focuses comprises teachers and head teachers of Arab schools in the Northern and Haifa districts of Israel.

2. ‘Generalization’ is an important aim of this research work. A ‘survey approach’ can afford
‘generalization’ if the sample used represents the whole population of the Northern and Haifa districts of Israel and does not cause ‘bias’. Sampling of the population will be discussed later in this chapter.

3. The survey approach is chosen in order to obtain wider information related to the purpose of the research from a broad-based sample including more experienced and less experienced teachers, between men and women teachers, between respondents with different academic backgrounds, between teachers in the LEA and those in the private Church Schools, between schools with a strong and those with a weak cultural background and between teachers’ and head teachers attitudes.

A second tool used in the survey approach is the interview. Since on one hand, the purpose of the research is to examine ‘motivation and commitment’ among teachers in Arab secondary schools in Israel, it is necessary to involve the head teachers in gathering the data, and since it is only a sample of secondary schools, it is feasible to use the ‘interview’ technique. In order to deepen the research, a teacher from each of the same schools was also interviewed. The technique used is the semi-structured interview, for the following reasons:

1. Since the aim of any research work is to find the ‘truth’, so it is important to prepare a relaxed atmosphere for the interviewee to feel at ease and report all her/his feelings (Johnson, 1994, p.45). Every interviewee has his/her own ‘truth’. In a relaxed and easy atmosphere, there is a possibility to collect the parts of the whole ‘truth’.

2. Like the structured interview, the semi-structured gathers equivalent information, that is the same kind of information from interviewees (Johnson, 1994, p.45).

3. It can be adapted to the situation and to the personality of the interviewee, that is a flexible approach can be used (Johnson, 1994, p.45).
On the other hand, interviewing head teachers provides the research with rich description by means of cross-tabulating (Johnson, 1994, p.8) and, thereby, a chance to correlate the findings from the questionnaire to the teachers with the information gathered from the interviews of the teachers and the head teachers, which helps in examining the purpose of the research. The semi-structured interview is a tool that allows ‘probing’ (Hoinville and Jowell, 1978). The relaxed atmosphere of the interview and the flexibility of the dialogue give the interviewer the opportunity to explore and interpret aspects of the dialogue and body language, but at the same time there is a probability of ‘bias’, therefore, all probes used by the interviewer should be as neutral as possible (Hoinville and Jowell, 1978).

In this research, a particular intervention by the interviewer opened a certain area where bias was likely to emerge. One of the questions examined in this research is related to discrimination and segregation against Arab schools by the government. Since this is a sensitive question, it is not expected that head teachers will answer it freely and objectively, since they are employees of the government on one hand, but on the other, they are Arabs who suffer from discrimination and segregation. Hence the problem of ‘probing’ will be difficult, since their answers will reflect this conflict. Moreover, the interpretation of the utterances or muttered sounds will also be difficult, but may give a clue to the underlying attitudes of the interviewees. The use of a structured interview would afford neither the flexibility nor the relaxed atmosphere which are important variables in gathering information from people, such as the semi-structured interview provides. Secondly, although an unstructured interview will afford more freedom, more flexibility and a more relaxed atmosphere, a deviation from the focus of the interview might occur and the emphasis on research questions may be weakened. The information expected to be transferred from the interview will not be pure (Kitwood, 1977). Also the ‘bias’ in the unstructured
interview will be less controlled than in a semi-structured interview. In the case of this research
the validity was increased by attempting to reduce the bias. Cohen and Manion (1994) suggest
ways of reducing the bias:

“Careful formation of the questions so that the meaning is crystal clear, through training
procedures so that an interviewer is more aware of the possible problems; probability
sampling of the respondents, and sometimes by matching interviewer characteristics
with those of the sample being interviewed.” (p.282)

When interviewing the head teachers of the Arab schools, the above precautions described by
Cohen and Manion (1994) were taken into consideration as will be shown in a later section of
this chapter. Regarding the reliability and validity of the interview, Kitwood (1977) explains that
as reliability is enhanced through ‘rationalization’, ‘validity’ would decrease, this is because
‘rationalization’ leads people to hide aspects of themselves, the more rational the interview
becomes, the less relaxed, flexible and free it will be. Validity needs a human element in the
interview. As such, a semi-structured interview might be a ‘judicious compromise’ in order to
solve the problem of validity and reliability (Kitwood,1977), since it provides a relaxed
atmosphere, flexibility and freedom on the one hand and on the other hand there is consistency in
the questions asked of the respondents. To sum up this section, Cohen and Manion (1994, p.283)
assert that both the interview and the questionnaire have some common elements, but each has
advantages and disadvantages. The questionnaire is more reliable since it is usually anonymous
and less expensive in terms of time and money, but tends to have a low percentage of returns.
The advantages of an interview are that any misunderstanding can be solved on the spot, because
it may happen that the same question has different meaning for different people. Moreover, the interview can be conducted at an appropriate speed, whereas questionnaires may be filled in hurriedly. Another advantage of the interview is that every word and every sound can be recorded, thereby making it more reliable, since it provides some control of the elements of the interview (Cohen and Manion, 1994, p.282).

The ‘case study’ approach might also have been appropriate as a description of this research. Head teachers of secondary Arab schools in Israel are interviewed in this work and an Arab teacher from each school is also interviewed. In addition, a documentary study of the culture of each school is administered. Multiple case studies have the advantage of replication; Yin (1994, p.149) stresses that: “The evidence is often considered more compelling”. Nisbet and Watt (1984) consider the ‘interview’ as the ‘basic research instrument’ in case study research. Adelman et al (1984, p.94) and Bassey (1999, p.81) consider that: “asking questions; observing events and reading documents” are the members of a ‘family of research methods’ in case study research. The importance of considering this research, in Arab secondary schools in Israel, as multiple ‘case studies’, is the possibility of replication, in addition to the survey approach which is administered too.

6.3 A rationale for sampling of the research population

The following table illustrates the distribution of the research population and the sample in the secondary schools in the Arab sector in Israel.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 6.1 Distribution of the research population and sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Population of Arab schools</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEA schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haifa district</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Northern district  64  14  6  1
Central district  10 __ __ __
Tel-Aviv district  3  3 __ __
Southern district  4  2 __ __
Totals             96  33  7  3

As could be seen from the above table, there are 129 Arab secondary schools in Israel, 96 of them belong to a Local Education Authority and 33 are private schools belonging to different churches. Not all the teachers or the pupils in the private schools are Christians, there are about 30–50 percent Moslem pupils and about 10–20 percent Moslem teachers in these schools also (see table 6.1).

Approximately the same proportion of private and LEA schools exist in the sample as in the whole population of the LEA schools and the private schools. The sample can be analyzed on the basis of four typologies of sampling (Cohen and Manion 1994, p. 88-89): stratified, quota, purposive and convenience. The strata sampled included two homogeneous groups of schools, one being the LEA, and the other the private church schools. The purposive sampling, which is non-probability, is underpinned by the assumption that LEA schools are one type and the private church schools are the other type of Arab schools. The convenience sampling, which is also a non-probability sample, included both types of schools, the LEA and the private church schools, in the Northern and the Haifa districts of Israel, chosen on the basis of easy access.

Although there is a strong non-probability element in the sampling, approximately the same proportion of LEA and private schools in the whole population is represented in the sample, 96 LEA schools and 33 private church schools being the whole population, while in the sample, these numbers are: 7 LEA schools and 3 private church schools. The proportion in the first is 0.34 and in the second 0.42, which is a similar proportion. The final element of sampling technique used is a quota type, which is a non-probability sample.
The two groups, the LEA and the private schools, each has its own characteristics. The most important of these are:

1. The registration of pupils in the private schools is in the hands of the head teachers, while in the LEA schools, the registration is done through the LEA managers and according to the geographical location.

2. Acceptance and dismissal of teachers in the private schools is by the head teachers, while the LEA appoints teachers in LEA schools.

3. After three years of service in the LEA schools, the teacher holds a permanent job and cannot be dismissed except by a decision of a tripartite committee (one representative from each of: the Teachers’ union, the Ministry of Education and the LEA); while in the PC schools, the head teacher can terminate any teacher’s job any time, (no contract binds the teacher with the PC school).

4. The drop-out of pupils in the private schools is very minimal, not more than 1 percent while in the LEA schools the average drop out is about 30 percent (The Central Bureau of Statistics, 1997, p.37).

5. The average results for the Bagrut exams in the private schools is about 75 percent passing the exams, while in the LEA schools, it is about 30 percent (Central Bureau of Statistics, 1997, p.40).

These five characteristics demonstrate the two strata from which the samples were taken. Three private schools were chosen for the sample on the basis of ‘quota sampling’, because each one represents a different church: The PC2 school in Haifa is the only secondary school that is affiliated with the Greek Orthodox Church; the PC1 School in Haifa is affiliated with the Roman Catholic Church; the PC3 School in Nazareth represents the schools affiliated with the Protestant Churches; these may
therefore be considered as a representative sample. The three PC schools are considered as a control group because of their high academic achievements in the Matriculation exams versus the LEA schools which achieved the lowest results in the Matriculation exams among all schools in Israel. A Bedouin school was also chosen to represent the Bedouin schools in the Northern district of the country only. (Since the Bedouin schools in the South have their own unique problems, such as: lack of qualified teachers, lack of buildings and lack of any development). The LEA7 secondary vocational school was chosen to represent other ‘Nimat’ schools, (three of them are in the Arab sector).

The sample was also chosen according to convenience and access (Cohen and Manion, 1994). The LEA schools in the sample were chosen on the basis of easier access than others, either through contact with teachers teaching in those schools, or through the inspector, or through personal knowledge of the head teacher, as in the case of LEA1 Comprehensive School or LEA3 school. Without such access neither interviews with head teachers nor administering the questionnaires could be assured. Collecting in the completed questionnaires was not easy as the teachers showed no interest in participating in research work, if the questionnaire had been distributed by mail, the probability of them being returned would have been minimal.

The following is a description of the schools in the sample:

### Haifa Schools

**The Private Church School 1 (PC1)**

The school was founded in the year 1914, with about 100 pupils. It was a girls’ school and French Sisters were the only teachers. Today the school has 1485 children from kindergarten to the twelfth class. It is coeducational, the children being about 70 per cent Christians, and the rest Moslems. The school’s culture meets the community’s needs (their written report), but at the same time it preserves the basic values of
the church, also according to their report (but no more details were given). Buber et al (1967, vol. 1, p. 472) in the Educational Encyclopedia, says that the Christian schools were established in order to give education to the children of the respective church community according to the community’s culture or according to the beliefs and culture of the Church. Mari’, (1978 p.62) argues:

“Christian schools transmitted a foreign set of values and patterns of behavior to the local culture to which communities objected. Although the Arab minority in Israel has no direct political dealings with the Arab countries, it is also true that Israeli Arabs are directly influenced by Arab nationalistic movements and want the education of their children to reflect common Arab history and culture and to transmit its values. The Christian schools in Israel have been a target for criticism by the communities they serve, regardless of the kind of religion these communities adopt. In an interview a priest serving as a director of a Christian school describes the situation: “As far as popularity and status are concerned, our main objective is to maintain a status quo. Even that, I am afraid, we cannot achieve.....we are under fire from both the communities and the authorities... even our own countries and organizations do not support us as strongly as they used to.””

2. The Private Church School 2 (PC2):

The school was established in the year 1952 by the Greek Orthodox Church, when only 14 pupils were registered, taught by three teachers. Nowadays, it includes 617 pupils, both boys and girls, of whom 29 percent are Christians, 59 percent Moslems and 12 percent Druze, all come from Haifa and the surrounding villages. The number of teachers today is 35. In the year1999, the number of students in the graduating class was 157. 97 percent of whom passed the Bagrut exams. In brief, the culture of the
school, as reported by the head teacher, represents that of the Arab community in Israel and reflects the changes that take place in the outer Arab community. The school inculcates basic values and norms to the pupils, maintains a culture of debate or discussion and speech, and rejects any kind of violence. The school also prepares the pupils in the different trends for the Matriculation exams.

**Nazareth Schools**

**The Private Church School 3 (PC3)**

Established in the year 1947, it included 117 pupils, 64 boys and 53 girls; there were seven teachers and a principal. The number of students nowadays is 1046, Christians and Moslems, boys and girls, the majority being Christians, while the number of teachers, including two counselors, is 66. The school teaches from kindergarten up to the twelfth class. The PC3 school has a written manifesto, which deals with, for example:

**The spiritual level:** the school considers its religious and spiritual program a basic part of its school curriculum, for all the pupils. Through this program, which is based on the New and the Old Testament, the school works to bind the relationship of the individual boy and girl with God and with fellow brothers and sisters.

**The moral and social level:** the school is concerned that the pupils internalize social and moral values such as: love, religious tolerance, cooperation, respect for others, responsibility and respect for the law. Such values underpin the personality maturation. The school is also concerned that the pupils behave well inside and outside the school, to create a good learning atmosphere.

**The psychological level:** the school is concerned to qualify the pupils for a successful adjustment to future life and to face challenges optimistically, positively and with trust.

**The educational level:** the school is concerned to teach the pupils according to the national
curriculum set by the Ministry of Education. In addition, the school initiates curricular and extra-curricular activities to improve achievements.

The Local Education Authority School 7 (LEA7)

This school belongs to a net of schools called ‘Nimat’. ‘Nimat’ is an Israeli women’s organization whose main objective is: volunteering and working women. One of its activities is to open schools to qualify girls who drop out from the ordinary educational system for professions such as: hair-dressing, nursery, sewing, and secretarial work. This school was established in the year 1985, when it included 60 girls and six teachers, today it has 16 classes of 300 girls and 40 teachers and is considered as a secondary school since the girls are aged 16 to 18. The graduating class sits for the ‘Bagrut’ exams in different technological subjects, in addition to other basic studies such as: Arabic Language, Hebrew, English, Mathematics, Civics and History of the Arabs. The main and most important cultural education given to these girls, according to the summary given in the report by the head teacher, is to internalize in them the spirit of volunteering, as they graduate, they challenge life by having a profession. Practically, the girls, during the regular curriculum hours, go to an asylum for old women and dress their hair. They also go to an orphanage school for girls near Nazareth and help the girls there in many aspects of their life. Since these girls have dropped out from regular education, one of the goals of the school is to educate them in health values, to maintain good relations with their families, to demonstrate acceptable general behavior and moral and social values, this is all according to the head teacher’s report.

The Local Education Authority School 1 (LEA1)

When it was founded in the year 1961, 41 pupils, both boys and girls, and seven teachers were in the school. Nowadays, there are 800 pupils and 80 teachers, the pupils being both Moslems and Christians. In class twelve, there are 171 students and all sat for the Bagrut exams. In the report forms given to the
head teachers, in order to give essential information about their schools, there is a space on which the head
teacher was supposed to write the number of students who passed the exam in the year 1999!, this space
was left empty. The school’s culture is composed as follows:

1. **Educational goals:**

To educate according to the changes taking place in the environment, for a better future.

To develop the vision of the school.

To take into consideration the changing cultures of the teachers, the students and the other staff.

To give freedom to teachers and to students in relation to independent decision taking.

To develop different scientific departments to meet the needs of the school’s community.

To develop local and regional student groups to be an example to other national and religious
groups.

To develop students’ self-awareness of their Israeli, Palestinian and Arab identity.

2. **Management structure**

The school’s principal and his deputy form the highest authority of the school, controlling the
pedagogical and educational work. Heads of departments and classes’ sponsors are responsible for
the detailed subject matter and students’ problems. Teachers, students and parents are represented by
committees. A students’ council represents the students. The educational council is composed of the
teachers, the head teacher and his deputy, while the counseling department is composed of the
counsellor and the psychologist.

3. **Behavioural standards:**

These include times of attendance in the school, awareness of the general cleanliness of the school,
taking care of the school’s equipment, mutual respect between teachers and students and between
students themselves and the proper performance of school duties.
4. Prohibited behaviours:

Speech, corporal, psychological and sexual aggression, exaggerated appearance, robbery, carrying of prohibited tools, smoking, drinking of alcohol, even on trips, bringing cars to the school, the use of poisonous substances, the use of cellular phones, and all forms of cheating.

5. Action taken in cases of disorder:

Oral warning, written warning, oral scolding, written scolding, detention for one period or more or for a day, transfer to another class or to another school. Actions such as corporal punishment, or deduction of marks or reporting the action in the class diary are prohibited. The disorder has to be reported to the parents before taking any action against him/her.

The Local Education Authority School 6 (LEA6)

Founded in the year 1988, 253 students were enrolled in the school at that time, twenty teachers were employed. This year there are 545 students and 54 teachers, all students are Moslems. The school extends from class nine to class twelve. In the year 1999 there were 148 students in class twelve, 67 of them sat the Bagrut exams and 49 students, that is 33.1 percent passed the exam. The principal of the school is of a Bedouin origin and has a Ph.D. from the University of Manchester. The teachers of the school are men and women, almost 50 per cent of each sex, most of them from outside the village. The school has a written culture, a summary of which is: The students have to take care of the property of the school and participate in maintaining it. Students should collaborate in implementing projects of the school as an extra curricular activity in order to internalize in them the feeling of ownership of the school. The relationship between the students and the teachers has to be underpinned by mutual respect, as such also between the students themselves. If any problem occurs, it has to be reported to the class sponsor, then to the counsellor, then to the deputy head teacher and finally to the head teacher. Violence and
aggression in all its forms, is absolutely prohibited, whether it is physical or oral. Collaboration among the students is recommended, as well as between the students and the Students’ Council. One of the main goals of the school is to achieve good results in the Bagrut exams in order to enable the students to enroll in the universities.

Therefore, a full effort has to be made to reach this goal. Promotion from one class to another is according to the rules of the Ministry of Education. Punishment, as a result of any disorder, is also according to the rules of the Ministry of Education. In the written culture of the school, no reference was made to other aspects of school life.

**The Local Education Authority School 2 (LEA2)**

This school was established in the year 1992, 100 pupils were registered, boys and girls, a few of whom were Christians, and 8 teachers were employed. Now, there are 323 pupils distributed in 11 classes from grade ten to grade twelve, with 30 teachers, men and women. The school is a village school, about 40 kilometers to the north east of Nazareth. The principal of the school is a graduate of the University of Haifa in Education and Arabic and has been head teacher for 8 years. There is no written prospectus for the school but all regulations were decided in the teachers’ meetings. There are three twelfth grade classes in the school. Last year only one class sat for the ‘Bagrut’ exams but their results were not made available.

**The Local Education Authority School 3 (LEA3)**

This school is situated at the foot of Mount Tabor in lower Galilee. It was founded in the year 1972, and now has 434 students and 52 teachers, of whom 11 are women. The culture of the school was summarized by the head teacher as follows: It is based on community values, community norms, human relationship between teachers and students and between teachers and the head teacher, mutual
respect among all, the development of thinking and the stimulation of learning.

The Local Education Authority School 4 (LEA4)

This school is situated about 30 kms. to the South of Nazareth, it includes today about 874 students and about 65 teachers. There was no ‘culture’ available, either written or oral, the school belongs to Haifa district.

The Local Education Authority School 5 (LEA5).

This school is situated 45 kms. to the South-West of Nazareth and includes 1245 students and 110 teachers. The school has a written culture, the most important element of which is the school is an integral system of human relationships, mutual respect and respect for the rights of others, students, teachers and other personnel. Teachers’ behaviour should be a good example to students. The pamphlet consists of 33 pages, most of it deals with violence and aggression in the school or outside it. (A map is attached showing the towns and villages where the schools involved in the research are situated)

In the event, the total number of teachers in Arab secondary schools in Israel is 4673 in the year 1999/2000 (Central Bureau of Statistics, 2000, No.51, 22.8), and the number of teachers in the sample is 499, which represents about 13 percent of the total. The total number of pupils in the Arab secondary schools in Israel is 43395, the number of pupils in secondary schools in the sample is 4071, comprising 9.4 percent of the total. The carefully chosen sample is as representative as possible, including approximately 10 percent of all Arab secondary schools, 10 percent of the number of teachers in the Arab secondary schools and 10 percent of the pupils in the Arab secondary schools. The LEA schools in the research, whilst not a representative sample, do exemplify a range of schools that can be regarded as typical of the whole population of the Arab schools belonging to the Local Authorities. The three
private church schools represent the types of the private church schools in the Arab sector in Israel. Hence, it can be claimed that there is a basis for cautious generalization of the results of the research over the whole population of the Arab secondary schools in the **Northern and Haifa** districts of Israel.

### 6.4 The research method

**A questionnaire.**

As stated on page 130 above, the number of Arab secondary schools in Israel is 129 (CBS, 2000, No.51, 22.7), the number of teachers in these schools being 4673 (CBS, 2000, No.51, 22.8). To gather information from a large sample of teachers (about 500) a suitable research tool is the questionnaire. While the research tools available are questionnaires, interviews, documents, diaries and observation, only the questionnaire can be effectively used for a large number of participants. Secondly, the information to be gathered is specific and equivalent, focusing on teaching motivation, commitment, job satisfaction and school culture. Therefore, questions relating to these variables can provide equivalent answers from all teachers in the Arab secondary schools in Israel. The major problem of the use of the questionnaire as a research tool is the expected low percentage of returned questionnaires, Hoinville and Jowell, (1978, in Johnson, 1994, p. 138) argue this point:

“But no matter how much effort is made to encourage response, the likelihood of more resistance (in postal and indeed in interview survey) from most of the types of people….is very great indeed.”

In the case of this work, two, three or more visits to the schools and many phone calls had to be made in order to urge and encourage teachers to return the questionnaire. All questionnaires were
distributed by hand to the principal of each school, and each principal was asked about the number of questionnaires that could be completed and returned. In the event, only about 40 per cent were returned. One principal sent them by mail but they were never delivered to the researcher. In that school only, another distribution was made in the teachers’ room, and still some were not returned, even on the spot. At the time when the questionnaire was piloted, not one teacher complained about the length or the ambiguity of the questions (Johnson, 1994, p.43) and suggestions only led to the development of slight linguistic alternatives. (The lack of any response does not mean that there is a lack of piloting).

A second problem was the omission of some details of the respondents in two schools, such as gender, the number of years of experience or the teacher’s degree; when a second attempt had to be made, with the aid of the head teachers. They made a list of the teachers who returned the questionnaires and asked them to recognize their questionnaire and fill in the missing details, thereby solving the problem.

In order to minimize the extent of poor response one way is to motivate the respondents by explaining the purpose of the research, which was done directly or by the principal of the school (at his/her request). The anonymity of the questionnaire reinforced motivation, as it enabled the respondent to feel free and answer the questions more objectively. The principals of the schools were interviewed on the same topics of the questionnaire and some principals promised to explain the purpose of the research to the teachers, which also increased motivation to return the completed questionnaire. However, the percentage of unreturned questionnaires was high (more than 50%). This high percentage could be linked to the research question of the teachers’ general motivation in this work, and their low motivation for the teaching job. A first indication of this assumption is that some of them omitted to provide important data while filling in the easier part
of the questionnaire such as their gender, their academic degree and their years of experience.

**Interviews**

Interviewing the ten head teachers of Arab schools in Israel and a teacher from each school had two purposes: the first was to explore their attitude and perception of motivation and commitment of their teachers in the educational and teaching-learning process, the second was to compare the attitudes of both teachers and head teachers towards the same variables. A semi-structured interview was administered in order to create a more free and relaxed atmosphere (Johnson, 1994) and to ensure a more reliable response. The semi-structured interview weakens biases because the interviewer is tied to the scheduled questions, that is, to preserve the neutrality of the interviewer’s attitudes and opinions and to avoid seeking answers that support the hypothesis of the research. If bias becomes strong the positivist framework is almost destroyed and the comparison with the questionnaire becomes unrealistic. This does not mean that the interpretive paradigm is unreliable. If issues of validity are in question, more bias weakens the validity (Cohen and Manion, 1994, p.281). Johnson (1994) also argued this point:

“Semi-structured interviewing is the style most likely to be followed in small scale research, when it is of greater importance to gain the cooperation of a limited number of interviewees than it is to ensure that the information they give is supplied in a standardized and readily collatable form.” (p. 51)

In the case of this research, the interview also paved the way for the cooperation of the principals when running the questionnaire among the teachers.
Piloting the interviews

Three head teachers were interviewed in the pilot phase of the research: one head teacher in Nazareth, the head teacher of LEA2 secondary school and one woman head teacher of a school in Nazareth, with about a month’s interval between one interview and the next, due to head teacher’s scheduling difficulties. The interviews took place in the head teachers’ office, and were formal but relaxed, except for the opening conversation, which ended by explaining the aim of the interview. No previous contact or relationship had been made with one of the head teachers, while with the head teacher of the school in Nazareth there was and still is a close relationship, but the interview as explained, was almost formal. With the woman head teacher of the third school, the relationship was rather weak. The interview is semi-structured, all the questions were asked, but in order to have a relaxed atmosphere, there had to be some flexibility, (Powney and Watts, 1987, p.171) while avoiding a wide range of dissimilarity in the interviews. The time-limit of the interview was an important factor, as this was informally requested by the interviewees; its consequences were that short answers, and in some cases one word answers were given by the interviewee. However, the interviews are to be considered as exploratory and a supplementary device to the other research tool, the questionnaire to the teachers. It was made clear and explicit to the interviewees that the contents of the interview, which was recorded on a tape recorder, would be confidential, since some hesitation was felt when the interview focused on the question of segregation and discrimination against Arab schools in Israel. The hesitation demonstrated by the head teachers has its origin in the conflict felt by the head teachers being employees of the government of Israel and thereby supposed to show loyalty to their employer, and their nationalist feeling as Arabs. The semi-structured interview was chosen in order not to have a fixed schedule and a fixed wording or order; the aim of which was to help in creating a
relaxed atmosphere, (Burns, 2000, p.424).

The rationale behind the interview was to try to explore and verify the assumptions of the research, and to explore more about how ‘motivation and commitment’ of teachers in Arab schools in Israel can be changed in order to improve school outcomes. Further, to try to explore head teachers’ attitudes to the suggestion of ‘Nationalizing Education’ (Mazzawi, 1997), which is assumed by Mazzawi (1997), to serve the goal of improving Arab school outcomes. Some reservation was noticed in the answers of the head teachers about ‘nationalizing the concept of education’, which led to omitting the suggestion from the questionnaire, but there was no denial or objection to the problem of segregation and discrimination against Arab schools in Israel and to the factors affecting school improvement linked to motivation, commitment, culture or job satisfaction.

Contents of the Interviews and the questionnaire

To explore the attitudes of teachers in Arab schools in Israel regarding their motivation and commitment and ways of changing them, the head teachers of these schools were interviewed. The interview and the questionnaire were divided into three sections:

Section A related to the impact of cultural components on motivation and commitment of teachers, such as, the school’s vision, the collaboration of teachers, involvement of teachers in decision-making and in the school’s policy, shared values and beliefs and behavioral regularities of both pupils and teachers.

Section B included factors relating to the motivation theories of Maslow, McGregor, Herzberg and McClelland, such as, job satisfaction, esteem, self actualization, achievement, working conditions, security, growth and commitment.
**Section C** This section focused on political issues relating to the Arab education system in Israel; the segregation of the Arab education system from the Jewish education system which might lead to discrimination in many aspects of education and its link to motivation and commitment.

(See Appendices 1 and 2)

**Piloting the questionnaire**

Piloting the questionnaire is a prerequisite before it is run in full, the rationale being amendment and improvement.

“A pilot study tries out the research tool on respondents who would be eligible to take part in the main study, that is, they have the same characteristics as the population to be approached.” (Johnson, 1994, p.39)

Even with eligible respondents, the probability of their returning the completed questionnaire was difficult as in the whole population, two of the seven teachers who participated in the pilot did not return the questionnaire except after being reminded two or three times. Also the extent of the commitment to complete the pilot questionnaire with the required accuracy seemed similar to that of the whole population. Therefore, in order to avoid unreturned questionnaires and to secure commitment and accuracy, it was considered advisable to run the pilot among eligible respondents known to and trusted by the researcher.

As such, the questionnaire was piloted by five teachers; one of them is an Arabic language teacher, another is a deputy head teacher, a third teacher is a school counselor and the other two teachers are English language teachers, each of the five has a teaching experience of between eight and twenty years. The amendments made were mostly linguistic, as follows:
The original version of: “The questionnaire deals with absolute research purposes” was amended to:

“The questionnaire deals with pure research purposes.”

The original version of: “If your answer is ‘yes’ what is your feeling……” was amended to: “If your answer is ‘yes’ what is your opinion……… “

Or “If your answer is ‘yes’ how do you see…..”

The explanation for the amendments as suggested by the teachers was that, in Arabic, the meaning is clearer.

In group ‘B’ questions: instead of asking, ‘what is your feeling’, was amended to: ‘what is your opinion’. Besides these amendments, there were also some grammatical and semantic changes, but there was no suggestion or objection to the context. The purpose of the amendments was to simplify the language (Moser and Kalton, 1977) and to avoid ambiguity (Evans, 1984). The substitution of ‘feeling’ by ‘opinion’ conveys a clearer meaning in Arabic.

Piloting the questionnaire among trusted respondents gives the chance for oral discussion besides the suggested written amendments. The oral discussion with the respondents made it clear that there was no superfluity, (Bell, 1987) or ‘long and boring questions’.

6.5 Research instruments

“As the interview has some thing in common with the self-administered questionnaire, it is frequently compared with it.”

(Cohen and Manion, 1994, p. 283)

So, the two research instruments used are: the interview and the questionnaire. The aim of using
both of them is, first, to compare the attitudes of the head teachers with the attitudes of the teachers, secondly, to use them in conjunction with each other for the purpose of validation and triangulation, (Kerlinger, 1970).

Both the interview and the questionnaire were designed to include the same contents, that is:

1. motivation
2. culture
3. segregation and discrimination against Arab schools in Israel, and the effect on motivation and commitment.

**Designing the questionnaire**

The questions were divided into three groups:

**Group A:** Included the components of culture, vision, teachers’ involvement in school activities, collaboration, values, beliefs, school policy and commitment within the context of school improvement.

**Group B:** Included factors affecting the motivation of teachers, job satisfaction, esteem and self satisfaction, (Maslow and McGregor); achievement (McClelland); working conditions (Herzberg); security (Maslow and Herzberg); teachers’ strategies (Herzberg); growth (Herzberg and McClelland); affiliation (McClelland and McGregor) and commitment.

**Group C:** Included questions about ‘segregation and discrimination’ against the Arab schools in Israel and the effect of motivation and commitment.

**Designing the interview**

The interview was designed in a semi-structured typology that included the following contents:

(see Appendix 1)

**Questions 1,2,3 and 4:** focus on school improvement and culture and factors affecting them;
clear vision; collaboration of teachers; involving teachers in decision-making and in setting certain policies of the school; commitment; beliefs; behavioral regularities of pupils and teachers; these match with group A of the questionnaire.

**Question No. 5**: relating to changing the motivation of teachers to their jobs, contains the following factors: convenient time table, academic growth, giving responsibilities to teachers such as social coordinators, subject coordinators or coordinators of a set of classes, and praising teachers following high student achievements. These match with group B of the questionnaire.

**Question No. 6**: the focus here is on the political problem of segregation and discrimination against Arab schools in Israel by consecutive governments and the relationship to motivation and commitment. This question matches group C of the questionnaire.

### 6.6 Reliability, validity and triangulation:

**Of the interview**

Although the validity of the interview can be checked by the outcomes of the questionnaire (Cohen and Manion, 1994, p.281), it can be considered a valid instrument due to the:

> “Direct contact at the point of the interview which means that the data can be checked for accuracy and relevance as they are collected.” (Denscombe, 1998, p.136)

At the same time, there is a need to highlight the source of the invalidity, that is, the bias. Some of the interviewees tended to show themselves as advocates of the questions raised, in which case it might be that the results of the questionnaire will contradict their attitudes. For some questions, such as that of ‘nationalizing the concept of education’, some interviewees avoided answering it due to the feeling of uneasiness, this feeling is caused by the political
nature of the topic and the head teachers’ conflicting roles. Cicourel (1964) listed five features of the interview which are regarded as problems, of which:

“The respondent may well feel uneasy and adopt avoidance tactics if the questioning is too deep.” (in Cohen and Manion, 1994, p.275)

The interview is a semi-structured type, which means that the questions put to the interviewees were all the same, but were asked in a relaxed atmosphere adapted to the personality and characteristics of the head teacher (Johnson, 1994, p.45). This should reduce the bias, as should the fact that the questions were as clear as possible (Cohen and Manion, 1994, p. 282), they were the same for each head teacher, but not always asked in the same order. What Cicourel (1964) suggested, in order to reduce the bias, was adopted in interviewing the head teachers; for example, an attempt to create trust, to eliminate differences between the interviewer and the interviewee through a starting conversation about daily life or by means of controlling the interview by following the assigned schedule.

There is a considerable probability that the semi-structured interview administered might be considered as a reliable or ‘standardized’ instrument (Denscombe, 1998, p. 112-113), for the following reasons:

1. Keeping the same meaning and clarity of the wording of the questions.
2. The open and relaxed atmosphere of the interview which produce an equivalent type of interaction.
3. The equivalent physical conditions of the interview: in the head teacher’s office and made through a previous appointment.
4. The interview was not imposed upon any of the head teachers, on
the contrary, there was a warm welcome; the head teacher’s mood appeared natural.

5. No holding-back was felt during the interview, which might have caused a change in the respondent’s attitude.”

A similar argument is brought by Pole and Lampard (2001) who stress that: “interviewing is a well established and tested research tool” (p.126). They assume that interviews include a common feature of imparting verbal information through a form of conversation or questioning which is composed of the following factors: the time available for the interview; the pace of the interview, that is, the pattern of the dialogue; the types of the questions which will yield different types of data; the location of the interview, that is, the physical conditions of the interview; listening, that is, to be alert to every verbal or body response and recording the interview. Otherwise, any conversation “may be seen to convey information which is as reliable as that conveyed in the interview” (Pole and Lampard, 2001, p.147).

**The Questionnaire itself**

If it is ‘face’ or ‘content’ validity that is in question, then the questionnaire in this research is valid, since every question is built to reflect a concept of the school culture, such as vision (question no.1), involvement of teachers in school life (questions no.2,4&7), school policy (question no.3), collaboration (question no.5), values (question no.6), shared beliefs (question no.9), head teacher’s culture (questions no.7&8) and commitment of teachers and the head teacher (questions no.10a&10b). Or according to a theory of motivation such as that of Maslow
(Questions no.1,4&11), McGregor (questions no.1,11&12), Herzberg (questions no.2-10) and McClelland (Questions no.2,8,9,10&12) concerning job satisfaction, esteem, self-actualization, achievement, working conditions, security and affiliation.

As far as triangulation is concerned, interviews with the teachers and the head teachers are compared with the results of the questionnaire for the teachers. This is shown by comparing the results of the interview with the results of the questionnaires, after interpreting the statistical results. This comparison is expected to show how much concurrent validity exists.

In the piloting process of the questionnaire, not one of the five eligible teachers objected to or commented on the contents of the questionnaire except for linguistic structure. Their reaction was that all questions are clear enough for the purpose. As for the reliability of the questionnaire, triangulation is still intended to show how reliable it is, through comparing the results of the interviews with that of the teachers’ attitudes to the questionnaire.

6.7 Ethics and access

Access

The research was conducted among teachers in Arab schools in Israel, in the Northern and Haifa districts of the country, and among head teachers of ten secondary schools, most of which belong to the LEA, with three belonging to private church communities. There was no previous acquaintance with three of the head teachers of the LEA; another four were previous acquaintances, one head teacher of a private church schools was not previously known, while with the other two there was a previous acquaintance. Whatever the case was, most of the interviews were arranged by personal calls. The purpose of the research was explained to the
heads. Their approval for the interviews and for running the questionnaire was then obtained, except for two LEA schools, where consent was given through the school inspector. In only one school was admittance to the teachers’ room permitted when the questionnaire was distributed. In this case, an explanation of the research took place in the teachers’ room, motivating teachers to take part in filling in the questionnaire and returning it. The head teachers of all the other schools took responsibility for the explanation and the motivation for running and returning the questionnaire. It should be noted that there is a general tendency of teachers and the head teachers not to participate in research work, especially when they are asked to fill in a questionnaire or to be interviewed. Many reminders and phone calls were made in order to secure the return of the questionnaires, but less than 40 per cent of them were returned. The reason is likely to be linked to their poor motivation for their job, which is related to the aim of this research. This difficulty, which faces the researcher, can be partly overcome by personal contacts and suitable communications. Negotiating personal access was crucial to the success of this research but mitigated against the use of a wider range of schools.

Ethics

A convincing motive for teachers and head teachers to participate in this research is the desire to know why there is a high drop-out rate among pupils in Arab schools in Israel and why there is a low percentage passing the Bagrut (Matriculation) exams. An informed consent was obtained from every head teacher through a personal approach, when the purpose of the research was explained to them. All head teachers took responsibility to run the questionnaire among the teachers after the purpose was explained. There is some scepticism (from the researcher) about the process of the heads informing the teachers about the purpose of the research, since in one school it was claimed that the research was returned by mail but was never received. This
situation led to running the questionnaire again among the teachers of that same school who did not complain that it was the second time that they filled it in; in the teachers’ room they received full information about the research project. There is some scepticism (on the part of the researcher) that the four components of Diener and Crandall’s (1978) ‘informed consent’, that is to say: competence, voluntarism, full information and comprehension, were, in fact, applied to teachers (by the heads). This might explain the low percentage of returned questionnaires, since it may be that there was a strictly unethical approach to the teachers, just asking them to fill in the questionnaire without any explanation, instead of motivating them to do so. Hence, the access to the schools was relatively easy because it involved only the head teachers, who appeared to be advocating the project. It would not be ethical just to ask teachers to fill in a certain questionnaire without giving full information and ensuring comprehension of the project. Not one head teacher suggested that the process of giving information and ensuring comprehension be done in the teachers’ room, perhaps, because they perceive their job as being solely responsible for external relations. This behaviour (of the heads) implies disrespect to the teachers and casts doubt on their ‘competence’. In order to have a reliable completion of the questionnaire, and to secure its return, there is a need for preserving the respect and dignity of the respondents, Cohen and Manion, (1994, p. 359) defend this attitude:

“Whatever the specific nature of their work, social researchers must take into account the effects of the research on participants, and act in such a way as to preserve their dignity as human beings. Such is ethical behaviour.”

In some schools it took one month and, in some cases, more than one month for the return of the
questionnaires. It was through recurring requests and even by exerting moral pressure, that
the filling of the questionnaire and its return was accomplished. This behaviour reduces the
reliability and the validity of the measuring instrument, since it might be the low motivation of
the teachers which conditioned their behaviour in returning the filled questionnaire. However,
conflict can be seen as a ratio of: costs /benefits. On one hand it is the aim of the project to
collect reliable facts and options but on the other hand it may be at the expense of ethical
behaviour, that is, at the expense of the privacy of the participants, their self-determination and
dignity, as Frankfort-Nachmias and Nachmias (1992) put it.

One of the research questions deals with a sensitive topic, the segregation and the discrimination
against Arab schools in Israel, this may violate easily the ‘right to privacy’ of the teacher. From
one aspect, it is the teacher’s national feeling and on the other side it is ‘security’ reasons, as
Mari’ (1978) put it. This conflict between the ‘nationalist feeling’ and ‘security reasons’ of the
teacher affects his ‘right to privacy’.

“In the context of research, therefore, ‘right to privacy’ may be easily
violated during the course of investigation or denied after it has been
completed.” (Cohen and Manion, 1994, p. 365)

Since the questionnaire is anonymous, the respondent cannot be identified, but there was some
anxiety about the possibility of being identified (since the school is identified and in some cases
the head teacher made a list of the teachers who received the questionnaire, not for the sake of
knowing who they were, but for the sake of ensuring the return) and this might be reflected in the
accuracy and/or veracity of the answers.
‘The essence of anonymity is that information provided by participants should in no way reveal their identity.” (Cohen and Manion, 1994, p. 366)

However, if the research is published, it is intended that the schools participating in the research would be codified in such a way that they could not be identified and confidentiality preserved.

7.0 Findings of the research

7.1 Introduction

The research findings are gathered by two methods; the interview and the questionnaire.

The findings of the interviews with the head teachers and with the teachers in LEA schools and in PC schools are presented in a composite summary and then summarized in Tables 7.1, 7.2, 7.3 and 7.4. The findings of the questionnaire are refined by means of the SPSS programme. Also, the different comparisons of gender, years of experience and
degrees of the respondents in both kinds of schools, the LEA and the PC, separately and together appear in tables and in graphs at the end of this chapter.

7.2 Composite summary of head teachers’ interviews

Ten head teachers of Arab schools in Israel were interviewed for the purpose of exploring their role in school improvement. Seven of them were head teachers of public secondary schools belonging to the LEA and three were head teachers of private church schools. The interviews encompassed the following aspects of school improvement:

A- Culture

B- Motivation

C- Political and contextual issues, more specifically, ‘segregation and Discrimination’ against Arab schools in Israel.

It is almost impossible to avoid searching for ways that might lead to Arab school improvement in Israel, due to the low percentage of those passing the Bagrut exams (Matriculation) and to the high percentage of drop-out of pupils from elementary and secondary education. Head teachers are one source for exploring factors for school improvement. As a result of the interviews with the head teachers, the following summary appeared to offer important issues for school improvement.

1. What are the factors that might help in improving Arab schools?

The layout of these factors follows the order of their appearance in the interviews.

Convenient or comfortable timetable: (means, that it is comfortable for the teacher, from the point of view of the number of the teaching hours, the level of the
grades, the subject taught and the time of ending the school day.) A convenient or comfortable timetable has two facets; one, that it motivates teachers to be loyal and hard working, the other that it promotes ambition to have work in other schools, but in the same time, it produces, instead, a snobbish image of the teacher (reflecting a feeling that he/she is in great demand and that he/she is professionally superior to others). All the head teachers noted that facilitating further studies for teachers is likely to help in improving school performances. One LEA school head-teacher said: “Sometimes it has a negative connotation, when teachers use the free hours to teach in another school or do another kind of work. This paves the way to employ part-time teachers, which is a burden on the time-table and which might produce negative outcomes”. But if higher qualifications is the case, most of the head teachers agreed that a teaching certificate or higher academic degrees are needed for school improvement. So, head teachers are meeting this need for further study by providing their staff with a comfortable or convenient time-table, giving the time needed for further study, while preserving their appointment and their working hours in the school. At the same time, the head teachers did not neglect in-service training: head teachers asserted that INSET is important for exploring alternative teaching-learning perspectives that might help low achiever students, such as the individualistic method (which puts the individual in the centre of the learning-teaching process). INSET is supposed to enhance school improvement projects as it is a medium for strengthening teachers’ motivation. In Israel, it is also a way for increasing the teacher’s salary, because, according to the rules of the Ministry of Education, a teacher’s salary is increased by 1.2% for every 112 hours of INSET he or she attends.
One of the infrastructures of school improvement is building facilities. Many of the Arab school buildings are rented, and many others, which were old dwelling houses, are not suitable for a school (Hawkins, 1993). The head teacher of a private school (PC3) said: “Enough rooms to make the learning atmosphere more comfortable and encouraging, will help in producing teaching motivation and commitment.”

Another factor raised by one head teacher was good relationship with the teachers: Improving this relationship produces a feeling of ‘ownership’ amongst the teachers. The head teacher of PC2 commented on this factor as follows: “I think one important factor, is their feeling of belonging to the school, when at the end they say ‘this is my school’. This is not easy; I think every piece of work with the teachers might help to internalize this feeling.”

The LEA2 school head teacher stressed that unqualified or weak teachers are a source of disorder. The students, especially in the upper classes, feel their teachers’ weaknesses in subject matter; whereby, supporting teachers can be a factor leading to school improvement, since what is needed in this case is qualified and experienced teachers.

Another factor raised by the LEA6 school head teachers is that of: Mapping the class weaknesses and a follow-up process of all decisions taken. The same head teacher pointed to the need for: integrated institutional culture particularly among the teachers, since there are teachers from different cultures in his school (with different religious affiliations), also he mentioned the need for: a growth plan to be prepared by the beginning of every school year. The head teacher of a private school (PC1) said that, for school improvement to occur, it is not only the involvement of the teachers which is required but all the people in the school, even the gate keeper (he gave an example of the
awareness of the gate keeper to possible interaction of the students with strange people coming to the school). He also added that an appropriate professional, educational and social relationship between the head teacher and the teachers, between the teachers and the pupils and between the teachers and the parents is a factor for school improvement. The same head teacher asserted that educational climate is another factor. When he was asked what he meant by an educational climate, he said: “For example, if a teacher is absent for the slightest reason, this is not an educational climate”.

2. Who is the committed teacher? (In the view of the head teachers)
The head teacher of a private school (PC3) said: “The committed teacher is the one who produces an effective performance of duties, has a feeling of belonging to the school, is committed to school goals rather than to the owners of the school; and is involved in all aspects of school life but, not to impose on him/her too much from above”. Two head teachers focused on punctuality as a clue to being a committed teacher but many head teachers did not answer that question.

3. How is commitment managed?
The head teacher of a private school (PC3) said: “Winning, but not buying a teacher; giving rights according to available possibilities; giving chances for promotion; developing friendship and mutual understanding through personal relationships; having an open door policy; building trust between the teachers and the head teacher and showing appreciation of good performance. Moreover, a teacher should like his/her job; and should be accountable to colleagues, through team work even though it conveys formality; feeling like a member of a family and being involved in decision making”. Another head teacher of a private school (PC1) insisted that to internalize
commitment in teachers; **the head teacher himself has to be committed** to induce a sense of **belonging to the school** and **a feeling of ownership**, whereby every piece of work with the teacher helps in promoting commitment and involvement in social activities.

4. **What are the factors that are likely to help in internalizing commitment in teachers?**

**Clear vision:** The head teacher’s vision of the LEA3 school was to increase the number of school graduates joining the universities, as well the number of those passing the ‘Bagrut’ exams. The teachers in that school, he said, collaborated in achieving this goal. Some head teachers said that they did not have a vision for their school. One head teacher, LEA5, practiced a daily life policy because, he said: “it is difficult to challenge the quick change and development in the outer community”.

**Collaboration:** In LEA3 school, collaboration was exercised in subject teachers’ meetings (the meetings were held from time to time and not on a regular weekly basis, for example, which is not enough); in another school, collaboration appeared through team work and in the third school it appeared in the form of “family relationship” (PC3), that is, as in social activities. Most of the head teachers, when asked, agreed that ‘collaboration’ is a factor that might internalize commitment of teachers, but the head teachers themselves did not raise it.

**Decision-making:** Three head teachers agreed that the teachers should be, and are, involved in decision-making. The head teacher of a private school (PC 3) said: “If the decisions are one sided, the general feeling will be that of imposition, teachers feel as if it is against their will. If the suggestions come from the teachers and are adopted
unanimously, it is accepted by the head teacher and the teachers feel committed to it.”. An LEA school head teacher tells the teachers: “You are partners to the decision”. The other head teachers just agreed that their teachers are involved in the process of decision-making. Teachers in the other schools are not involved in the process of decision-making.

**Shared beliefs**: In one private school (PC3), the spiritual culture helped teachers, to some extent, to have a feeling of belonging to the school and a feeling of commitment. The other head teachers did not relate to this question.

5. **What are the factors that might change the motivation of teachers to their jobs?**

“**Social activities**, on one hand, can be a factor that produces motivation and commitment, on the other hand, there are teachers who create reasons not to participate, so it is not always a promising factor”, a private school head teacher (PC3) said. Another head teacher explained that commitment is internalized and teachers’ motivation might be improved if they feel they are one family (PC1); since social activities create a kind of affiliation to the school. The other head teachers just agreed that social activities might improve teachers’ motivation.

**Giving responsibilities**: The policy of one private school head teacher (PC3): “is not to close the doors of promotion to any post”. The head teacher of another school, LEA2, did not approve any promotion for any teacher as a deputy head teacher, or as a coordinator, for financial reasons: “This policy produces a feeling of frustration instead of stimulating motivation to school improvement”.

**Appreciating effective performance** is likely to improve teachers’ motivation because they feel that their hard work is not lost; their evaluation is not carried out only by the
head teacher, they are accountable to all and as such their work is of value. “To be proud of one’s school is a result of one’s hard work”, this is what a private school head teacher said (PC3). “To be proud of one’s school improves motivation and commitment”. The process of evaluating teachers’ work is not done by all other head teachers, however.

6. The problem of ‘segregation and discrimination’ against Arab schools.

The head teachers were asked how to fill the gap between the Jewish educational system and the Arab educational system as a result of the segregation and discrimination against Arab schools in Israel, and how it would impact on the motivation of Arab teachers.

All head teachers tried not to answer this question clearly, but all of them agreed that it is a political problem which the Arab political leaders and the Arab Local Authorities have to discuss and find relevant and adequate solutions to. One of the head teachers (LEA2) admitted that there is discrimination against Arab schools and gave an example: “A neighbouring Bedouin school belonging to a Jewish Local Authority was supplied with about twenty musical instruments, which they did not need. The deputy head of that school offered the instruments to our school, without payment”. This is an example of how the Jewish Educational Sector is supplied with what it needs, or even more, while the Arab Educational Sector suffers from under-funding. The head teacher of a private school (PC3) was aware of what the results might be if decisions turned out to be extreme; that is, if the understanding of the teachers and the head teachers and other responsible people, of the decisions, is extreme nationalism, rather than a search for school improvement. He added, also, that a process of awareness, persuasion and information, for all the parties concerned, should be initiated. A woman head teacher
(LEA7) equated the solution to the problem with the loyalty of teachers and their commitment. She said: “Factors such as collaboration, hard work, responsibility, not to be absent for trivial reasons, and the involvement of parents and Arab intellectuals and political leaders, might be combined to find a solution to the problem”.

7.3 Data collected from head teachers’ interviews

The data gathered in the following tables (7.1 and 7.2) depend upon the data in the composite summary of the interviews, and in some cases upon the original recorded interviews themselves, but not in the same order of the variables appearing in the composite summary. For the purpose of comparing the findings of the interviews of the head teachers in LEA and PC schools, the variables in the first left hand column of table 7.1 match with the same order of variables that appear in the table of the gathered data from interviewing the head teachers of PC schools, that is, table 7.2. Also, the same order of the variables is kept in tables 7.3 and 7.4, in the left hand column, of interviews with teachers in these schools. For the purpose of making the process of comparison easy, this order of the same variables also appears in sections A, B and C of the questionnaire.

Data collected from the interviews of the head teachers in the LEA and the PC schools.

Table 7.1 shows the attitudes of the head teachers of the LEA schools in relation to the factors of school improvement, culture, motivation and the political context.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>HT of LEA1</th>
<th>HT of LEA2</th>
<th>HT of LEA3</th>
<th>HT of LEA4</th>
<th>HT of LEA5</th>
<th>HT of LEA6</th>
<th>HT of LEA7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Factors suggested by HT for school improvement</td>
<td>-Physical facilities</td>
<td>-experienced teachers</td>
<td>-interest in pupils</td>
<td>Creation of new learning options</td>
<td>Teachers approach to their pupils</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factors leading to teacher commitment</td>
<td>No reaction</td>
<td>No reaction</td>
<td>No reaction</td>
<td>No reaction</td>
<td>Punctuality</td>
<td>No reaction</td>
<td>Teachers’ collaboration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural factors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clear vision</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers’ collaboration</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Trusting teachers by the head</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers’ involvement in decision making</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Yes, reluctantly</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes, they are partners</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes, but not all the teachers are involved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers’ involvement in setting the policy of school</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Values and beliefs</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Integration, “leaving the personal identity outside.”</td>
<td>Mutual respect among all</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Integration, co-existence among all</td>
<td>Working and volunteering women</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>HT of LEA1</th>
<th>HT of LEA2</th>
<th>HT of LEA3</th>
<th>HT of LEA4</th>
<th>HT of LEA5</th>
<th>HT of LEA6</th>
<th>HT of LEA7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Motivation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>satisfaction, esteem</td>
<td>No reaction</td>
<td>Almost negative</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>The LEA is a political barrier</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>There is a deputy HT and there is a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 7.2 shows the attitudes of the head teachers in the PC schools in relation to the factors of school improvement, culture, motivation and the political context.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>HT of PC1</th>
<th>HT of PC2</th>
<th>HT of PC3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Factors suggested by HT for school improvement</td>
<td>There is little to improve since the achievements are high</td>
<td>- Involvement of all people in the school even the gate keeper</td>
<td>- Academically qualified teachers. -Ownership. - Comfortable atmosphere increases teachers’ motivation. - Teacher’s commitment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Promptness of the teachers. - Enriching the graduating class without pay. Value added</td>
<td>- Promptness. - Who is not absent for the slightest reason.</td>
<td>-Performs duties effectively. -Collaborates always. - Feeling of ownership. - Works for achieving goals by means of internal feeling. - Winning vs buying the teacher. - A chance for promotion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Belonging to the school. - A sense of ownership. -Every piece of work with the teachers</td>
<td>-Involvement. - Interrelationship with all people in the school. - Educational climate.</td>
<td>- Personal relationship with the head teachers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>HT of PC1</th>
<th>HT of PC2</th>
<th>HT of PC3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social activities</td>
<td>Does not motivate new teachers</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Yes, it helps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes, it helps in motivating teachers</td>
<td>Yes, but to keep distance between HT and teachers!</td>
<td>Yes, it promotes motivation and commitment to school work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes, may it fosters a sense of social interaction</td>
<td>Teachers are given what they need in order to grow academically for the purpose of improving their motivation and commitment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working conditions: comfortable time table, discipline and educational climate</td>
<td>The school was closed for one week because of violence among the pupils</td>
<td>Comfortable time table has a positive and a negative impact on commitment and motivation</td>
<td>Teachers are given what they need in order to grow academically for the purpose of improving their motivation and commitment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No reaction was given</td>
<td>No reaction</td>
<td>Teachers are given what they need in order to grow academically for the purpose of improving their motivation and commitment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teachers do not have this feeling</td>
<td>Teachers do not have this feeling</td>
<td>Teachers do not have this feeling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teachers do not have this feeling</td>
<td>Teachers do not have this feeling</td>
<td>Teachers do not have this feeling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teachers do not have this feeling</td>
<td>Teachers do not have this feeling</td>
<td>Teachers do not have this feeling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teachers do not have this feeling</td>
<td>Teachers do not have this feeling</td>
<td>Teachers do not have this feeling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teachers do not have this feeling</td>
<td>Teachers do not have this feeling</td>
<td>Teachers do not have this feeling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teachers do not have this feeling</td>
<td>Teachers do not have this feeling</td>
<td>Teachers do not have this feeling</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Segregation and discrimination’ | This is a political question beyond the role of the HT as "security is the worry of the Israeli Jews, education should be the first worry of the Israeli Arabs” | This is a political question. If solved, school will improve. | To day, education is the main source of living. The Arab authorities should find the solution. |
| | It is a political question. If solved, school will improve. | The majority of the teachers do not react, some of them will if the problem is activated. | “We are not segregated and we are not discriminated against.” Sometimes our budget is greater than any other ‘Nimat’ school. |
| | The committed teacher | - Interrelationship of HT and teachers and pupils - Educational climate | |
### Cultural factors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clear vision</th>
<th>Internalizing commitment might be a school vision in the future, besides internalizing community values and church values. (See please p.133)</th>
<th>There is a clear written culture for the school in which there is a clear vision. (See please, p.134)</th>
<th>There is a written culture for the school in which the school’s vision is clearly established. (See p.134-135)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teachers’ collaboration</td>
<td>Exists</td>
<td>Exists</td>
<td>Exists</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers’ involvement in decision making</td>
<td>Decisions are taken collectively.</td>
<td>Teachers are involved in decision making.</td>
<td>Yes, if not, a feeling of imposition is produced. If the suggestions come from the teachers, a feeling of commitment is produced.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers’ involvement in setting the policy of the school</td>
<td>Those holding posts</td>
<td>Only the administration of the school</td>
<td>Only the teachers holding posts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Values and beliefs</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Democracy</td>
<td>Religious beliefs only helps to a certain extent, the feeling of belonging.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Motivation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Satisfaction, esteem and self actualization as in: promotion in responsibilities or praise or support</th>
<th>It is needed, but for the other teachers it gave a negative feedback</th>
<th>Not raised by the HT</th>
<th>Yes, but also from parents and colleagues. The teacher is accountable to all; this leads to commitment. To avoid promoting the teacher to become self-important.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Growth in academic degrees</td>
<td>HT encourages teachers</td>
<td>HT encourages teachers</td>
<td>HT encourages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social activities</td>
<td>Yes, it also produces commitment.</td>
<td>Yes, it adds to teachers motivation</td>
<td>Commitment is internalized when the teachers feel they are one family, it creates a kind of affiliation to the school.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working conditions: comfortable time table, discipline and an educational climate</td>
<td>If the teacher is to continue for higher degrees, he is given a comfortable time table. Discipline is important.</td>
<td>Yes, a comfortable time table can be afforded. The educational climate is important; if a teacher is absent for slight reasons, this is a bad educational climate.</td>
<td>If any teacher wants to study for higher degrees, a comfortable time table is prepared for her/him.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ownership</td>
<td>Some are proud of being teachers in our school.</td>
<td>Most teachers feel this is their school.</td>
<td>Many teachers have this feeling.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Segregation and discrimination</td>
<td>This problem is linked to the general political situation.</td>
<td>There is a need to integrate all efforts to face this problem. School improvement is then ensured.</td>
<td>There is no doubt that schools improve greatly if this problem is solved.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 7.4 Composite summary of teachers’ interviews.

In order to explore in depth the problems of motivation and commitment of teachers in Arab schools in Israel, ten teachers were scheduled to be interviewed, one each from the ten schools in the research sample. However, it was impossible for one interview to take
place, as the head teacher was not in favour of it. Many attempts were made to arrange an interview with any one of the teachers in that school, with the agreement of the head teacher, but none of the attempts succeeded. The interviews with the other nine teachers included the same topics as the interviews with the head teachers, that is:

1. Culture.
3. A political contextual problem, more specifically, the problem of segregation and discrimination against Arab schools in Israel.

The interviews were designed according to the semi-structured paradigm, in order to provide a relaxed atmosphere and the possibility of more objective answers (Johnson, 1994, p. 45). All the teachers interviewed had approximately the same experience in teaching, namely, more than six years, and had the same academic qualifications, a university degree and a teaching certificate. All the interviews were held in one of the rooms of the school as agreed with the head teacher and the teacher himself or herself, and each lasted about one hour. The following summary is categorized for the purpose of comparing and analyzing the data gathered from the interviews, on the following basis:

“Systematically arranging and presenting the information. It has to be organized so that comparisons, contrasts, and insights can be made and demonstrated. But the data are categorized not just to count occurrences. Instead, they are categorized to permit analysis and comparison of meanings within a category.” (Burns, 2000, p.430)
Factors affecting school improvement related to every school in the sample

The following factors were raised by the teachers in the Private Church Schools, (PC):

The teacher in PC1 school raised many factors, as follows: The awareness of the teachers and the head teachers of the changes taking place in the outer community. She added: “I think there is a blackout policy for Arab education, especially in ‘History’ and the ‘Arabic language’. The head teacher-teacher relationship should be built on collaboration. Another important factor of school improvement is the expertise of teachers. The same teacher asserted that: “a convenient time-table is necessary so that the teacher can perform his or her job without stress”. The teacher in PC2 school pointed to the factor of job satisfaction, she said: “I am a teacher not because I did not find any other job, but because I like teaching”. She also said: “I do not see myself only as a teacher, but I do feel some responsibilities for the future of my students, this is how the feeling of belonging to the school is produced.” The same teacher raised the factor of commitment of teachers to school decisions.

The teacher in PC3 started by saying: “Search for the head, school improvement passes through the vision of the head teacher”. She continued: “he has the authority to embark the school and lead it by means of a work plan.

All the teachers in PC schools put a stress on teachers’ involvement in the process of decision-making.

In the LEA schools, the factors emerging from the interviews were:

The teacher in LEA7 (A girls school) stressed the following factors:

Teachers’ qualifications, not only academically, but also socially, that is, to have an
adequate interaction with the students; for example, how to behave with adolescent girls. Teachers’ collaboration. “it helps a lot when there is collaboration among the teachers, not only those who teach the same subject, but all the teachers”.

Building trust between the teachers and the head teacher; and the feeling of belonging to the school. The same teacher in LEA7 school added: “What we all feel here, is that the school does not belong only to the head teacher, we all feel it is ours”.

Other factors which emerged from the interviews with other teachers from LEA schools were:

Teachers’ qualification.

Eliminating violence and aggression in order to have a good educational climate.

The vision of the school, the teacher in LEA3 explained their vision as follows: “to build an independent personality of the student for national understanding and an academic career”.

The teacher in LEA6 emphasized the importance of the financial issue, he said: “without sources of finance, school improvement will be difficult to produce”. He also stressed the factor of teachers’ commitment, “to strive to internalize it in teachers”.

Other LEA teachers raised the following factors: teachers’ collaboration; to build a feeling of belonging to the school and the type of school management, which was stressed by the teacher in LEA1, who said: “In case the school management has the authority and the power”- (he hinted at the power granted by the Local Authority). Other factors raised by LEA school teachers were: Teachers’ absenteeism, a good relationship between the teachers and the head teacher, general discipline, (especially of the pupils) and conflict of cultures on an inter-family basis (as expressed by the
How do you see the committed teacher?

Teachers in PC1, 2 and 3 gave a definition as follows:

**Needs no control, likes his/her job, the one who does not neglect his/her duties, the one who prepares his/her students to achieve higher results in the matriculation exams. “if I decide on something I should be committed to it”,** this is what the teacher in PC3 school said.

The teacher in LEA7 responded as follows: **“The one who likes her job and works voluntarily”**.

The responses of teachers in other LEA schools were:

**“The one who likes his/her job”**. Another response was: **“if there is a feeling of belonging to the school.”**

The reaction of the teacher in LEA1 was: “most of the teachers work on the basis of related-pay”.

**“Teachers’ commitment is a personal trait”**. This is how the teacher in LEA6 expressed himself.

(One teacher did not give an answer)

The factors that might produce commitment

Responses of teachers in PC1, 2 and 3 schools were:

**Working conditions, salaries, involvement of teachers in the process of decision-making**. “Decisions should not be one sided”. **A convenient time-table**, especially when he or she stays till 1530. **The involvement of teachers in setting the vision of the school**, to be happy in the school and to have a good relationship with the administration
of the school”. This response was given by the teacher in PC3 school.

The response of the teacher in the girls’ school LEA7 was: Appreciation of the teacher’s work. Support of the head teacher, parents and students for the teacher’s work. Responses of other teachers of LEA schools are:

Job satisfaction, democratic life in the school, teachers’ involvement in the process of decision-making, setting the vision and the policy of the school, the feeling of belonging to the school and the concern for the students. “Commitment is an internal feeling which the organization can produce and also through raising a child at home”.

This is the response of the teacher in LEA 6 school.

“Social activities might produce commitment but related-pay is still the dominant factor”. This is the response of the teacher in LEA1 school. (One teacher did not react).

The factors affecting the motivation of teachers

The teacher in PC1 gave the following factors affecting teacher’s motivation:

“Promotion is not a motive, teachers seek promotion for financial purposes; but ownership, appraisal and appreciation by the students and the parents rather than by the head teacher, and collaboration, discipline and academic growth are motives”

The teacher in PC2 school responded as follows:

“In our school we are all involved in setting the vision and the policy of the school. Shared values and beliefs are important motives because it relieves the teacher and motivates teaching, a sense of ownership; trust and mutual respect coalesce among the teachers, promotion is open to all, discipline is an important factor, as is a convenient time-table. What motivates teachers more than everything else is the related-pay”.
The teacher in PC3 reacted as such:

“Social activities produce a family feeling among the teachers in our school, promotion is linked to the relationship with the head teacher and not on qualification, academic growth is open to all. The head teacher affords a convenient time-table. The need for praise and appreciation of my work is satisfied by the parents, the students and the head teacher”.

The reaction of the teacher of the girls’ school LEA7 was as follows:

“Good working conditions stimulate motivation. Comfortable time-table motivates teacher’s work. The related-pay is also a motivating factor but it differs from one teacher to another since it depends on the whole income of the family; whether it is the only income or a subsidiary income. The chance for promotion is a motive. Social activities are another motive but are not the most important; in our school we believe in voluntary work, this is beneficial”. She added another factor: the educational climate.

The response of the teacher in LEA5 was:

“In our school, there is no vision or policy, we have a written culture but it was never implemented. Salaries are not important since he/she who had chosen the teaching profession knew that the salary would be as such. If teachers want to continue their studies then the head teacher facilitates it through a convenient time-table.”

The teacher in LEA3 school responded as follows:

“Our vision is that no student shall graduate from the school without passing the Matriculation exams, but this does not mean that it is fulfilled. The teachers are involved in the process of decision-making, but only in the discipline of teaching their subjects. Teacher’s promotion is linked to the policy of the head teacher; he always urges
teachers to participate in INSET programmes. The salaries are de-motivating.”

The teacher in LEA5 school responded as follows:

“The feeling of belonging to the school is a good motive for the teacher. This feeling is produced by his/her chances of promotion, by getting his/her salary on time and by being respected by the head teacher and the students. The teachers are sometimes involved in setting the policy of the school. The vision of the school is restricted to ‘passing the Matriculation exams’. Social activities are very rare. Collaboration amongst teachers is not ideal. Teachers’ salaries are de-motivating”.

The factors mentioned by the teacher in the LEA1 school were:

“The educational climate: this does not exist due to the violence among the students. Related-pay is another factor which de-motivates teachers. In our school, no social activity helps, because what worries the teachers is their salaries, even their contribution to the process of decision-making is linked to their salaries. Proper appraisal of the teachers’ work does not exist”.

The reaction of the teacher in school LEA2 to the factors that affect the motivations of teachers were:

“Low salaries of the teachers de-motivates them. If a healthy educational climate does not exist, the teachers’ performance is not satisfactory. The process of decision-making should be collegial and not only by the majority, since the roots of this assumption lie in inter-family conflicts in the village; therefore, if the decisions are not taken on a collegial basis, they will not be effective. Social activities are missing in the school and this does not help the process of raising teachers’ motivation. Factors affecting teachers’ motivation, such as: promotion, convenient time-table, appreciation of teachers’
work, work conditions, discipline and the teacher’s feeling of ‘ownership’ partly exist. For example, the head teacher facilitates further studies for the teacher by means of convenient time-table. The LEA interferes politically in the school work, an example of which is teachers’ promotion.

The ‘segregation and discrimination’ against Arab schools in Israel. Is there any role for the teacher to fill the gap between Arab and Jewish schools?

The reaction of the PC teachers were as follows: It is their commitment to their school, job and students. To try and help the students as much as possible. To give their full potential in order to help the students.

The reaction of the LEA teachers were as follows:

The teacher in LEA7 school said:

“The teacher cannot solve the problems, but she can help her students through maximizing her effort”.

The teacher in LEA5 school reacted as follows:

“Through becoming a committed teacher, the gap can be partly closed”.

The responses of the teachers in the other LEA schools were:

The teacher in LEA3 school: “No, there is no role for the teacher in this respect.”

The teacher in LEA6 school: “No, since it needs a budget, which is missing.”

The teacher in the school of LEA1: “Only if teachers become committed to their job.”

The teacher in the school of LEA2: “Teachers blame others for the discrimination.”

7.5 Data collected from the teachers interviews

The following tables show the data gathered from the teachers’ interviews. It depended
upon the composite summary of these interviews and in some cases upon the original text of the interview itself. The order of the variables that appear in the first left hand column of tables 7.3 and 7.4 is the same and matches the same order of variables in tables 7.1 and 7.2, interviewing the head teachers; it also matches the order of the same variables appearing in sections A, B and C of the questionnaire.

**Data collected from the interviews of the teachers in the LEA and the PC schools**

Table 7.3 shows the attitudes of the teachers in the LEA schools in relation to the factors of school improvement, culture, motivation and the political context.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>LEA1</th>
<th>LEA2</th>
<th>LEA3</th>
<th>LEA4</th>
<th>LEA5</th>
<th>LEA6</th>
<th>LEA7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Factors suggested by teachers for school improvement</strong></td>
<td>- The type of school management.</td>
<td>- Adequate relationship between the teachers and the head teacher</td>
<td>- Educational climate.</td>
<td>No interviewee from this school.</td>
<td>- Teachers’ qualification, e.g. INSET</td>
<td>financial sources.</td>
<td>- Teacher’s qualification, e.g. INSET</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Teachers’ absenteeism</td>
<td></td>
<td>- Absence of violence in the school.</td>
<td></td>
<td>- Teacher’s commitment, Teacher’s collaboration.</td>
<td>- Teacher’s commitment, Teacher’s collaboration.</td>
<td>- The feeling of belonging to the school.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Discipline</td>
<td></td>
<td>- Independent student for national understanding.</td>
<td></td>
<td>- The feeling of belonging to the school.</td>
<td>- The feeling of belonging to the school.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Conflict of cultures</td>
<td></td>
<td>- Partial teachers’ involvement.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The committed teacher</strong></td>
<td>- Related pay</td>
<td>No answer.</td>
<td>The feeling of belonging to the school..</td>
<td></td>
<td>Liking one’s job.</td>
<td>Liking one’s job.</td>
<td>- Raising a child at home.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Personal trait.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Factors leading to teachers’ commitment</strong></td>
<td>Involvement of teachers in decision making, school policy and vision.</td>
<td>No answer.</td>
<td>- The feeling of belonging to the school.</td>
<td></td>
<td>- Job satisfaction</td>
<td>- Job satisfaction</td>
<td>- The feeling of belonging to the school.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Related pay</td>
<td></td>
<td>- Concern for the students.</td>
<td></td>
<td>- Teachers’ involvement in school policy, decision-making and vision.</td>
<td>- Through the organization.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cultural factors</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Clear vision</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Passing the Matriculation exams.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Teachers’ collaboration</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Teachers’ involvement in decision-</strong></td>
<td>Is linked to the teacher’s salary.</td>
<td>Should be collegial because of family conflicts.</td>
<td>Yes, but in discipline of subjects.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Table 7.4 shows the attitudes of the teachers in the PC schools in relation to factors of school improvement, culture, motivation and the political context.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>PC1</th>
<th>PC2</th>
<th>PC3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Factors suggested by teachers for school improvement                      | -The awareness of the teachers and the head teachers of the changes taking place in the outer community.  
-Collaboration among the teachers and between the teachers and the HT.  
-Qualified teachers  
-Comfortable time-table  
-Good educational climate  
-Changes in the teaching methods. | -Teacher’s expertise  
-Satisfaction with the job  
-Teacher’s involvement in school life  
-The feeling of belonging to the school  
-Adequate relationship between the teachers and the HT  
-Commitment of teachers to school decisions. | -A vision of the head teacher  
-A work plan |
| The committed teacher                                                     | -Needs no control  
-Likes his/her job. | -Does not neglect his/her duties  
-Preparing his/her students to achieve high results in the Matriculation exams | If I decide on something, I should be committed to it. |
| Factors leading to teachers’ commitment                                  | - Good working conditions  
-Related-pay  
-Involvement of teachers in decision-making and to be one-sided  
-Comfortable time-table  
Teachers’ involvement in setting the vision and the policy of the school. | The involvement of teachers in the process of decision-making. | -To be happy in the school.  
To have a good relationship with the administration of the school. |
| Cultural factors                                                          |                                                                     |                                                                     |                                                                     |
| Clear vision                                                             | Necessary                                                           | Yes                                                                 | Important |
| Teacher’s collaboration                                                   | Necessary                                                           | Yes                                                                 | Yes         |
| Teachers’ involvement in decision-making                                  | Necessary                                                           | Important                                                           | Yes         |
| Teachers’ involvement in setting the policy of the school                | Necessary                                                           | Yes                                                                 | Yes         |
| Values and beliefs                                                       | No reaction                                                         | Should be shared                                                    | A family life |
| Motivation                                                               | -Teachers seek promotion for financial purposes.                    | -Promotion is open to all.                                         | -Promotion is linked to the relationship with the HT. |
| Job satisfaction, esteem and self actualization as in:                   | -Appraisal and appreciation by                                       |                                                                     | -I feel support from the head |
| promotion, praise or support                                             |                                                                     |                                                                     |                                                                     |
7.6 Findings of the questionnaire

The questionnaire to the teachers included three sections: Section A on the culture of the school and the commitment of the teachers included 11 questions coded A1, A2,……..A101, A102. Section B included 13 questions coded B1, B2, B3,………..B13 concerning the motivation of the teachers. Section C included 4 questions about the segregation and discrimination against Arab schools in Israel coded C1, C2, C3 and C4.

The answers were measured on an attitude scale, ranging from 1 to 5; scale of 1 meant ‘mostly dissatisfied’ and scale 5 meant ‘mostly satisfied’. The teachers were asked to give the following information about themselves: Gender, years of experience (coded 1 to mean that the years of experience of the teacher are between 0 to 5 years and 2 to mean 6 or more years of experience), academic degree (coded 1 to mean a qualified teacher, 2 to mean a B.A. degree, and 3 to mean an M.A. degree). The schools which belonged
to the Local Education Authority were coded LEA1, LEA2,…to…..LEA7; while the schools which belonged to the Private Churches were coded PC1, PC2 and PC3.

The data collected from the questionnaires were entered into the SPSS programme. The tables extracted from the programme were to give answers to the research questions:

1. **What is the perception of the teachers of the factors associated with the culture of the school, such as: vision, involvement of teachers in the process of decision-making, collaboration and values and beliefs?**

2. **What is the perception of the teachers of the factors affecting their motivation as related to the different motivation theories?**

3. **What is the perception of the teachers of the political contextual factors related to the motivation and commitment of the teachers?**

4. **What are the differences between the attitudes of the teachers in LEA and PC schools in motivation, commitment and cultural factors?**

7.7 **Data collected from the questionnaire**

The number of the returned questionnaires was 170 which is about 34 per cent of the total sample. This percentage indicates that the sample might not be a representative one.

The questionnaire was anonymous, in an attempt to avoid any bias, whereas the sample was ‘self selected’ and thus potentially biased.

The following table (7.5) shows the mean attitudes of the group of teachers in the LEA schools and the mean attitudes of the group of teachers in the PC schools towards every question in sections A, B and C; at the same time it gives the standard deviation of the means in every group and about every question.
Data collected from sections A, B and C of the questionnaire in relation to the attitudes of the teachers in LEA and PC schools

Table 7.5 pp.177-179 shows the mean attitudes of the teachers in LEA and PC schools towards the factors of school improvement, culture, motivation and the political context as refined by SPSS programme.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group Statistics</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Std. Error Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[LEA1 to LEA7] Group</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>3.7500</td>
<td>.84699</td>
<td>.17289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[PC1 to PC3] Group</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>3.4189</td>
<td>.92168</td>
<td>.10714</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[LEA1 to LEA7] Group</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>3.3600</td>
<td>.95219</td>
<td>.19044</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[PC1 to PC3] Group</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>3.7067</td>
<td>.95540</td>
<td>.11032</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[LEA1 to LEA7] Group</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>3.9259</td>
<td>.61556</td>
<td>.11847</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[PC1 to PC3] Group</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>3.6000</td>
<td>1.11524</td>
<td>.13833</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[LEA1 to LEA7] Group</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>3.8750</td>
<td>.67967</td>
<td>.13874</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[PC1 to PC3] Group</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>3.8600</td>
<td>1.03494</td>
<td>.10349</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[LEA1 to LEA7] Group</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>4.0833</td>
<td>.76997</td>
<td>.12833</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[PC1 to PC3] Group</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>3.6593</td>
<td>1.02437</td>
<td>.10738</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[LEA1 to LEA7] Group</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>3.5789</td>
<td>.85840</td>
<td>.13925</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[PC1 to PC3] Group</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>4.0700</td>
<td>3.08222</td>
<td>.30822</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[LEA1 to LEA7] Group</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>3.9697</td>
<td>.80951</td>
<td>.14092</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Group [LEA1 to LEA7]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A8</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>4.0316</td>
<td>.97252</td>
<td>.09978</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>38</td>
<td>4.0526</td>
<td>.73328</td>
<td>.11895</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A9</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>3.7979</td>
<td>.93418</td>
<td>.09635</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>37</td>
<td>3.9730</td>
<td>.83288</td>
<td>.13693</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A101</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>3.3909</td>
<td>1.14215</td>
<td>.10890</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>38</td>
<td>3.6579</td>
<td>.99394</td>
<td>.16124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A102</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>3.3596</td>
<td>.98778</td>
<td>.09251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>40</td>
<td>3.4000</td>
<td>.92819</td>
<td>.14676</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>3.7581</td>
<td>1.03885</td>
<td>.09329</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>41</td>
<td>4.0000</td>
<td>.80623</td>
<td>.12591</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B2</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>3.5285</td>
<td>1.08888</td>
<td>.09818</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>40</td>
<td>3.7250</td>
<td>.93336</td>
<td>.14758</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B3</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>2.5000</td>
<td>1.10815</td>
<td>.09872</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>43</td>
<td>2.4186</td>
<td>1.02893</td>
<td>.15691</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B4</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>3.0080</td>
<td>1.20814</td>
<td>.10806</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>41</td>
<td>3.0488</td>
<td>1.20315</td>
<td>.18790</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B5</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>3.4921</td>
<td>.98587</td>
<td>.08783</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>43</td>
<td>3.6279</td>
<td>1.15518</td>
<td>.17616</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B6</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>3.7520</td>
<td>.99722</td>
<td>.08919</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group</td>
<td>[PC1 to PC3]</td>
<td>[LEA1 to LEA7]</td>
<td>[PC1 to PC3]</td>
<td>[LEA1 to LEA7]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B7</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>4.1628</td>
<td>.89789</td>
<td>.13693</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>124</td>
<td>3.3387</td>
<td>1.04288</td>
<td>.09365</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B8</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>3.3810</td>
<td>1.01097</td>
<td>.15600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>119</td>
<td>3.8655</td>
<td>1.08084</td>
<td>.09908</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B9</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>3.9750</td>
<td>1.04973</td>
<td>.16598</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>126</td>
<td>3.3730</td>
<td>1.04103</td>
<td>.09274</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B10</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>3.2326</td>
<td>1.19198</td>
<td>.18178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>126</td>
<td>3.6508</td>
<td>1.13361</td>
<td>.10099</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B11</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>2.8417</td>
<td>1.04516</td>
<td>.09541</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>120</td>
<td>2.7619</td>
<td>1.12205</td>
<td>.17314</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B12</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>3.8760</td>
<td>1.03739</td>
<td>.09431</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>121</td>
<td>4.3571</td>
<td>.65598</td>
<td>.10122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B13</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>3.7213</td>
<td>1.03861</td>
<td>.09403</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>122</td>
<td>3.8750</td>
<td>.88252</td>
<td>.13954</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C1</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>3.2459</td>
<td>1.10828</td>
<td>.10034</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>122</td>
<td>3.6190</td>
<td>1.05812</td>
<td>.16327</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C2</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>3.0902</td>
<td>1.13548</td>
<td>.10280</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The following tables pp. 180-185 show the results of the questionnaire, sections A, B and C in terms of the means of every section as a function of the years of experience of the teachers in both kinds of schools, the LEA and the PC.

**Table 7.6**
Case Processing Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cases</th>
<th>Included</th>
<th>Excluded</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>124</td>
<td>72.9%</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>27.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>170</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Report Means A *
- Years of experience - LEA Schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.5944</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>.78203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5551</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>.94058</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>.89943</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Years of Experience LEA

![Bar chart showing the distribution of years of experience among teachers.](chart)

Years of Experience - Lea Schools

**Table 7.7**

Case Processing Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cases</th>
<th>Included</th>
<th>Excluded</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>up to 5 years of exp</td>
<td>74.1%</td>
<td>25.9%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Means B *

Years of experience - LEA Schools

Report

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years of experience - LEA Schools</th>
<th>Mean (N)</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>up to 5 years of experience</td>
<td>3.4469 (32)</td>
<td>.64252</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 years of experience and more</td>
<td>3.4341 (94)</td>
<td>.66132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3.4373 (126)</td>
<td>.65406</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Years of Experience – LEA Schools
Table 7.8
Case Processing Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cases</th>
<th>Included</th>
<th>Excluded</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Means C *</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years of experience - LEA Schools</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>71.8%</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Report Means C
Years of experience - LEA Schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years of experience</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>up to 5 years of experience</td>
<td>3.1875</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>.95038</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 years of experience and more</td>
<td>3.3287</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>.92707</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3.2917</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>.93137</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Years of Experience – LEA Schools

Table 7.9
Case Processing Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cases</th>
<th>Included</th>
<th>Excluded</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Means All Questions * Years of experience - LEA Schools</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>74.1%</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Report
Means All Ques
Years of experience - PC Schools
up to 5 years of experience
3.4613
32
.61884
6 years of experience and more
3.4665
94
.64715
Total
3.4652
126
.63763
Years of Experience - PC Schools

Table 7.10
Case Processing Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cases</th>
<th>Included</th>
<th></th>
<th>Excluded</th>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Means B *</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years of experience - PC Schools</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>up to 5 years of experience</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>25.3%</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>74.7%</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Report

Means B

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years of experience - PC Schools</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>up to 5 years of experience</td>
<td>3.5502</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.31603</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 years of experience and more</td>
<td>3.5272</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>.67842</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3.5304</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>.63754</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Years of Experience - PC Schools

Table 7.11
Case Processing Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cases</th>
<th>Included</th>
<th>Excluded</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Means C * Years of experience - PC Schools</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>42</td>
<td>24.7%</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Report Means C

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years of experience - PC Schools</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>up to 5 years of experience</td>
<td>2.9167</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.15830</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 years of experience and more</td>
<td>3.7639</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>.78136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3.6429</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>.88024</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The following tables pp. 186-191 indicate the relation between the means of the attitudes of the teachers towards sections A, B and C of the questionnaire, in both kinds of schools, the LEA and the PC as a function of their academic degree.

**Table 7.12**

Case Processing Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cases Included</th>
<th>Excluded</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Means A</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree of LEA</td>
<td>72.9%</td>
<td>27.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Report Means A Degree of LEA Schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Qualified</td>
<td>3.3471</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BA</td>
<td>3.5764</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MA</td>
<td>3.6466</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3.5652</td>
<td>124</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 7.13

Case Processing Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cases</th>
<th>Included</th>
<th>Excluded</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Means B</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>74.1%</td>
<td>25.9%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Degree of LEA Schools

Report

Means B

Degree of Mean N Std. Deviation
LEA
Schools
Qualified 3.2758 14 .99681
BA 3.4209 86 .60199
MA 3.5786 26 .59486
Total 3.4373 126 .65406
### Table 7.14

**Case Processing Summary**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cases</th>
<th>Included</th>
<th>Excluded</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Means C 122</td>
<td>71.8%</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>28.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Degree of LEA Schools*

### Report

Means C

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree of Mean</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LEA Schools</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualified</td>
<td>2.9615</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BA</td>
<td>3.2781</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MA</td>
<td>3.5000</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3.2917</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 7.15

**Case Processing Summary**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cases</th>
<th>Included</th>
<th>Excluded</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Means A</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree of PC Schools</td>
<td>25.3%</td>
<td>74.7%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Report**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Means A</th>
<th>Degree of Mean</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PC Schools</td>
<td>Qualified</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.6878</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BA</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>3.7473</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3.6780</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>3.7419</td>
<td>.47829</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 7.16
Case Processing Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cases</th>
<th>Included</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Excluded</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Means B *</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>25.3%</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>74.7%</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree of PC Schools</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Report</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Means B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PC Schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 7.17
Case Processing Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cases</th>
<th>Included</th>
<th>Excluded</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Means C</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>24.7%</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree of PC Schools</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Report
Means C
Degree of Mean N Std. Deviation
PC Schools
Qualified 3.7500 3 1.29904
BA 3.5463 27 .82636
MA 3.8636 11 .98972
Total 3.6429 42 .88024
The following tables 7.18-7.23, pp. 192-197 show the relation between the gender of the respondents in both kinds of schools, the LEA and the PC, and their attitudes to sections A, B and C of the questionnaire.

### Table 7.18

#### Case Processing Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cases</th>
<th>Included</th>
<th>Excluded</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Means A *</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender of respond.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEA Schools</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Report</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Means A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender of respond.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEA Schools</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Report

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender of respond.</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>3.4951</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>.99507</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>3.6504</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>.76777</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3.5652</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>.89943</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Table 7.19

**Case Processing Summary**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Cases Included</th>
<th>Excluded</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Means B</td>
<td>* *126</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>170</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Gender of respond. LEA Schools

### Gender of respond. LEA Schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender of respond. LEA Schools</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>3.4098</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>.70440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>3.4707</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>.59188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3.4373</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>.65406</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 7.20
Case Processing Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cases</th>
<th>Included</th>
<th>Excluded</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Means C Gender of Respond. LEA Schools</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>71.8%</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>170</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Report Means C Gender of respond. LEA Schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>3.3485</td>
<td>.90817</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>3.2247</td>
<td>.96189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3.2917</td>
<td>.93137</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 7.21
Case Processing Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cases</th>
<th>Included</th>
<th>Excluded</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Means A *</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender of respond. PC Schools</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Std. Deviation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>male</td>
<td>3.7254</td>
<td>.52598</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>female</td>
<td>3.7550</td>
<td>.44813</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3.7419</td>
<td>.47829</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 7.22
Case Processing Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cases</th>
<th>Included</th>
<th>Excluded</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Means B</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender of respond.</td>
<td>25.3%</td>
<td>74.7%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PC Schools</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Report
Means B
Gender of respond. PC Schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender of respond.</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>male</td>
<td>3.4944</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>.73467</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>female</td>
<td>3.5589</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>.56382</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3.5304</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>.63754</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 7.23  
Case Processing Summary  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cases</th>
<th>Included</th>
<th>Excluded</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Means C</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>24.7%</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender of respond. PC Schools</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>170</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Report Means C  
Gender of respond. PC Schools  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>3.7237</td>
<td>.73548</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>3.5761</td>
<td>.99554</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3.6429</td>
<td>.88024</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The following T-tests show that there are no differences between the male and the female teachers in relation to their perception of the factors associated with the culture of their schools, their motivation and commitment and their perception of the political contextual factors related to motivation and performance of the teachers in Arab schools in Israel.

**Group Statistics**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RESPOND</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Std. Error Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Means A</td>
<td>male</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>3.5454</td>
<td>.9157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>female</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>3.6818</td>
<td>.6864</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Means B</td>
<td>male</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>3.4281</td>
<td>.7076</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>female</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>3.4968</td>
<td>.5816</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Means C</td>
<td>male</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>3.4324</td>
<td>.8825</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>female</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>3.3270</td>
<td>.9787</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Independent Samples Test**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Levene's Test for Equality of Variances</th>
<th>t-test for Equality of Means</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Sig.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Means A</td>
<td>Equal variances assumed 1.813</td>
<td>.180</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Gender Respond PC Schools
The attitudes of the teachers in the separate schools of LEA and PC, tables 7.24-7.26

Table 7.24 Case Processing Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cases</th>
<th>Included</th>
<th>Excluded</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A1</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>69.4%</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Report

A1 SCHOOL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LEA School (1)</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LEA School (2)</td>
<td>3.500</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1.00000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEA School (3)</td>
<td>3.5625</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>.51235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEA School (4)</td>
<td>2.8000</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1.22927</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEA School (5)</td>
<td>4.1818</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>.60302</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEA School (6)</td>
<td>3.8000</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>.76777</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nimat girls’3.3333</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1.29099</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School</td>
<td>PC</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Mean A1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PC school (1)</td>
<td>3.5000</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.57735</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PC school (2)</td>
<td>3.5714</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.27242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PC school (3)</td>
<td>3.9231</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>.64051</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3.5932</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>.95396</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 7.25**
Case Processing Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Included</th>
<th>Excluded</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>58.2%</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Report**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Report</th>
<th>A2</th>
<th>SCHOOL</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LEA</td>
<td>3.4000</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>.96609</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School (1)</td>
<td>LEA</td>
<td>3.1000</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>.56765</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School (2)</td>
<td>LEA</td>
<td>3.0000</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>.89443</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 7.26
Case Processing Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCHOOL</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Excluded</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LEA</td>
<td>3.6154</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1.12090</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nimat girls'</td>
<td>3.5000</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.97183</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3.4040</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>0.92493</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Report

A4 SCHOOL

Mean N Std. Deviation
LEA 3.6154 13 1.12090
School (1)
LEA school(2) 3.4000 5 .89443
LEA school(3) 3.5000 10 1.17851
LEA school (4) 2.8000 5 1.64317
LEA school (5) 3.7273 11 1.00905
LEA school (6) 3.9286 14 .82874
Nimat girls’ school 7 1.51186
PC school(1) 4.2000 5 .44721
PC school(2) 3.4000 5 .54772
PC school(3) 3.9286 14 .73005
Total 3.6742 89 1.01997

Tables 7.27-7.35 show the relation between the gender, academic degree and the years of experience and the attitudes of the respondents towards sections A, B and C of the questionnaire in both schools LEA and PC.

Table 7.27
Case Processing Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cases Included</th>
<th>Excluded</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Means A</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>98.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Report

N

GENDER Means A
Male LEA 68
Female 56
LEA
Male PC 19
Female 24
PC
Total 167
Table 7.28
Case Processing Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cases</th>
<th>Included</th>
<th>Excluded</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Means B</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>99.4%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GENDER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Report
N
GENDER  Means B
Male LEA  69
Female  57
LEA
Male PC  19
Female  24
PC
Total  169
Table 7.29
Case Processing Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cases Included</th>
<th>Cases Excluded</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Means C</td>
<td>*164</td>
<td>96.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GENDER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Report

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N</th>
<th>GENDER</th>
<th>Means C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male LEA</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEA</td>
<td>Male PC</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PC</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>164</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7.30
### Case Processing Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cases</th>
<th>Included</th>
<th></th>
<th>Excluded</th>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Means A</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>98.2%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Report

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N</th>
<th>DEGREE_</th>
<th>Means A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>qualified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>LEA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>BA LEA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MA LEA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>qualified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>BA PC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MA PC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

![Bar Chart]

DEGREE_4
### Table 7.31
Case Processing Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cases</th>
<th>Included</th>
<th>Excluded</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Means B</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEGREE_4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Report

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N</th>
<th>DEGREE_ Means B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>qualified</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BA LEA</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MA LEA</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>qualified</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BA PC</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MA PC</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>169</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 7.32
Case Processing Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cases Included</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Excluded</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Means C</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>96.5%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Report

N

DEGREE_4 Means C

4 qualified 13 LEA
BA LEA 83 MA LEA 26 qualified 4 PC
BA PC 27 MA PC 11 Total 164
Table 7.33
Case Processing Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Included</th>
<th>Excluded</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Means A</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>98.2%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Report
Means A
YEARS_4 Mean N Std. Deviation
up to 5 years of experience
LEA
3.5944 32 .7820
6 years of experience and more
LEA
3.5551 92 .9406
up to 5 years of experience
PC
3.7429 6 .3224
6 years of experience and more
PC
3.7417 37 .5025
Total 3.6107 167 .8144
### Table 7.34

#### Case Processing Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cases</th>
<th>Included</th>
<th>Excluded</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Means B</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>99.4%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>YEARS_4</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>170</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Report

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Means B</th>
<th><strong>YEARS_4</strong></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>up to 5</td>
<td>LEA</td>
<td>3.4469</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>.6425</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>years of</td>
<td>PC</td>
<td>3.5502</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.3160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>experience</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 years of</td>
<td>LEA</td>
<td>3.4341</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>.6613</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>experience</td>
<td>PC</td>
<td>3.5272</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>.6784</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and more</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 7.35
Case Processing Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cases</th>
<th>Included</th>
<th>Excluded</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Means C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YEARS_4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*164</td>
<td>96.5%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Report Means C
YEARS_4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>up to 5 years of exp</td>
<td>3.1875</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>.9504</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 years of exp</td>
<td>3.3287</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>.9271</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>up to 5 years of exp</td>
<td>2.9167</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.1583</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
8. Analysis of the findings

8.1 Introduction

The two main groups in this research are, on one hand, the LEA schools and on the other hand, the PC schools. In these two groups there are sub groups: women teachers and men teachers; teachers of more, or less experience and teachers of higher qualifications versus those with lower qualification. This analysis focuses on the comparison of the two main groups as an answer to one of the purposes of this research and, at a minor level, the comparison between the different sub groups. The analysis is also divided, into two parts: One part deals with the analysis of the interviews, on one hand, with the head teachers of
the LEA schools in comparison with the interviews with the head teachers of the PC schools; on the other hand it analyses the interviews with the teachers of the LEA schools compared with the interviews with the teachers of the PC schools. The other part deals with the analysis of the questionnaire to the teachers in both kinds of schools.

8.2 Analysis of the head teachers’ interviews

The findings of the interviews of the head teachers in LEA schools and in PC schools showed very clearly that there are significant differences in their perception and implementation of school improvement factors, of commitment and the committed teacher; and of cultural factors that are linked to school improvement. The following analysis describes these differences.

8.2.1 Head teachers’ perception of the factors leading to school improvement.

School improvement will not occur if the head teacher is not aware of the factors leading to it. Neither will school improvement occur if the policy for implementing these factors is not designed with the involvement and collaboration of the teachers.

Table 7.1 shows that the factors perceived by the head teachers of LEA schools correlate partly with the factors in the literature about school improvement, such as: teachers’ involvement in the process of decision-making, which is stressed by Stoll and Mortimore (1995); collaboration amongst teachers on one hand and between the teachers and the head teacher on the other, as emphasized by Hopkins (1997); INSET (Hopkins, 1994) and developing a growth plan (Hargreaves and Hopkins, 1991). The head teachers are not aware of many other factors which affect school improvement, such as affecting school culture (Hargreaves and Hopkins, 1991), the focus on the teaching-learning process (Hopkins, 1996), clear vision (Stoll and Fink, 1996), commitment to external change
(Hopkins, 1997) and professional leadership (Reynolds, 1997 and Mortimore, 1989). It can be seen, also, that only one of the seven head teachers, namely, the head teacher of the LEA6 school, indicated the importance of this factor of ‘professionalism’, besides other factors for school improvement, the most prominent of which is ‘leadership’. Head teachers are the ‘agents of change’ as described by Glatter (1989, p.129); the head teacher of the LEA6 school is carrying out a change by means of a ‘growth plan’ and of strategies such as ‘mapping weaknesses’. Other head teachers of the LEA schools did not show this quality of ‘leadership’.

Table 7.2 shows that the awareness of the head teachers of PC schools is greater than that of the head teachers of the LEA schools. They stressed, for example, factors such as:

- involvement of all the people, even the gate-keeper, in the school life, as emphasized by Stoll and Mortimore(1995),
- ownership, as indicated by Brown (1997),
- educational climate as part of the school culture (Hargreaves and Hopkins, 1991) and changing motivation and commitment of teachers as pointed-out by Stoll (1994).

**Head teachers’ perception of ‘who is the committed teacher’ and of commitment.**

In every aspect of school improvement, without the commitment of the teachers and the head teacher to the change linked to that aspect, school improvement will not occur. Commitment of all the school personnel is prerequisite for any change. Most of the head teachers of LEA schools are not aware of the concept of ‘teacher commitment’ nor of the factors that might internalize commitment in teachers, while the head teachers of the PC schools are aware of these concepts and of the factors that might lead to ‘organizational commitment’ (Sergiovanni, 1990), [please see Table 7.2]. Some of the definitions of
commitment given by the head teachers of the PC schools are:

“Enriching pupils without pay”, “promptness, and not to be absent for the slightest reason”, “performs duties effectively, collaborates, has a feeling of ‘ownership’ and works for achieving goals by means of internal feeling”. These definitions correlate closely with the definition given by O’Neill (1994, p.5). The factors leading to commitment as brought by the head teachers of the PC schools were: belonging to the school, a feeling of ‘ownership’, involvement, educational climate, trust and equity of rights and inter-relationship with all the people in the school. These factors correlate with those of Hopkins (1996, p. 34) or with those of Torrington and Weightman (1989, p. 48). The factors reported by the head teachers of the PC schools are part of the school culture which inspires ‘commitment’, (Deal, 1988, p. 248). The prominent differences between the head teachers of the LEA schools and the PC schools are not confined only to school improvement factors, or to commitment and the committed teacher, but also to cultural factors such as: clear vision, involvement of the teachers in the process of decision-making, collaboration, and the values and beliefs that the school adopts.

8-2-3 Cultural factors affecting school improvement as perceived by the head teachers.

‘A clear vision’ of the school is a prerequisite for school improvement, which is emphasized by many writers such as: Stoll (1994, p. 133): “A clear vision for a better future for the school”, or Horne and Brown (1997, p.14-15): “Build a vision of what you are trying to achieve”, or Stoll and Fink (1996, p.31): “Shared vision and goals”, and others. This component of school culture is prominent and operative in LEA7, while in the other LEA schools either it is not built or it is not operative, such as: “Democratizing
school life” which needs so many preparatory steps to achieve. In PC schools, clear vision is built on many levels: educational, moral, social, spiritual and psychological (please see p.133-135). It has to be noted that not all of the PC schools have the same vision.

One of the key factors for school improvement is ‘collaboration’ between teachers and head teachers (Stoll, 1994, p.131). Improvement projects will be marginal if they do not include collaboration of teachers and head teachers and their commitment (Hopkins 1997, p.266). ‘Collaboration’ does not exist in LEA schools and where it exists it is not effective as seen in table 7.1, but head teachers of PC schools assert that collaboration of teachers and head teachers does exist in their schools.

The involvement of teachers in the process of decision-making is essential for school improvement and the commitment of the teachers to the change (Reynolds, 1993, p.13). Their involvement is also essential to internalize their feeling of commitment and ‘ownership’ to innovation (Brown et al, 1997, p. 141). If teachers are involved in the process of decision-making, their commitment is guaranteed (Cheng, 1993, p.103). All head teachers in LEA schools admitted that the involvement of the teachers in the process of decision-making is partial, it is either occasional or it is limited to teachers who hold managerial posts (see table 7.1). In PC schools the situation is different, the head teachers of these schools emphasize the importance of involving teachers in the process of decision-making. The head teacher of PC3 explained: “Yes, if not, a feeling of imposition is produced. If the suggestions come from the teachers, their commitment is produced.”

In order to improve the culture of the school, it is necessary to have a clear vision, shared beliefs, values, agreed policy and assumptions by all teachers (Hopkins et al, 1996, p.28). Teachers’ involvement in every aspect of school life is a prerequisite for school
improvement (Hopkins et al, 1997, p.267; Brown et al, 1997, p.141; Torrington and Weightman, 1989, p.48 and others). As shown in table 7.1, all head teachers of LEA schools admit that the teachers in their schools are not involved in setting the policy of the school, while head teachers of PC schools claim that only those who hold positions of responsibility are involved in setting the policy of the school. Cheng, 1993, p.87) concluded that:

“Schools with a strong culture achieved not only high teacher satisfaction and commitment but also high academic achievements in public examinations.”

Beliefs and values are part of the culture of the school as argued by Deal (1988, p.204); Dalin et al (1993, p. 97); Bush (1995, p.130); Schein (1985, p.6); Schwarts and Davis(1981) in Cheng (1993, p.86) and others.

Some of the head teachers of LEA schools claim that they have values and beliefs that might help them in school improvement, but most important is their implementation. PC schools also have similar values and beliefs, but at least one of them (PC3) has a syllabus for their implementation. (See please tables 7.1, 7.2 and p. 162-164)

8-2-4 Motivation

Also in the field of motivation there are prominent differences between LEA and PC school head teachers. School improvement is directly linked to teacher motivation; if these are satisfied, then school improvement might occur. It might be that Vroom and Deci (1997, p.
(237) gave a more operative definition of motivation:

“...Incentives for effective performance are in the task or job itself or in the individual relationships with members of the working team.”

This definition correlates with Herzberg’s two-factor theory (1959): satisfaction, which has its roots in the work itself, achievements, responsibilities, recognition, advancement and personal growth. Dissatisfaction, which is affected by what he termed ‘hygiene’, such as: organizational policies and administration management, working conditions, inter-personal relationships, money, status and security. Also, McGregor’s Y theory included factors such as: affiliation, self-esteem and self satisfaction, and McClelland (1961) stressed the need for achievement. The factors of Herzberg’s theory of motivation, as of McGregor’s and of McClelland’s, are those in which the head teachers were asked about their effectiveness in their schools. It can be seen from Table 7.1 that there is good reason for the teachers’ dissatisfaction with their jobs, since the chance of promotion to posts of responsibility is rather weak because it depends upon the relationship of the teacher with the LEA or with the head teacher. Also, their self-actualization and esteem are not satisfied because of the lack of support and praise of their work by the head teacher. The head teacher of the LEA school argued that the LEA is a political barrier against the promotion of teachers.

Evans (1998, p.12) underpins Herzberg’s theory of ‘satisfaction and dissatisfaction’ at work; she argues that recognition, responsibility, advancement and the work itself are motives that may lead to commitment. Satisfaction is also considered to be an intrinsic motive (Nias, 1981); but Cheng 1993, p.103) considers it as extrinsic, since it is produced by the school’s organizational culture. As such, teachers’ motivation in LEA schools is not
satisfied by means of promotion, support or praise. In the PC schools the situation is different; it is possible to say that job satisfaction through support or praise is partially satisfied. Although promotion is needed, it may however, produce a negative feedback for other teachers with the same qualifications (Adams, 1965 – the Equity theory).

“As a result, the way that management treats one employee influences not only that particular employee, but all other employees in the organization who come in contact with that person.” (Fieldman and Arnold, 1983, p.64)

Therefore, it does seem that it is not an easy job for the head teachers to afford satisfaction for this kind of motivation. Job support might be sought through support and praise that come from the parents and the students, since the teacher is also accountable to them. (See table 7.2 and HT of PC 3)

Another level of motivation is ‘growth’, meaning academic growth for the sake of school improvement (Herzberg, 1959 and McClelland, 1961). LEA head teachers see that academic growth is used only for personal reasons such as more income and not for the sake of school improvement. Head teachers of PC schools encourage growth via academic degrees because they believe it can help school improvement. Maslow (1946) adapted a hierarchy of man’s needs; at the top of his hierarchy are the needs of esteem, self-actualization and the feeling of belonging to a social group. The aim of social activities in schools is to try to satisfy the motive of the feeling of belonging to the organization. On one hand, some head teachers of LEA schools see that these activities do not help in motivating teachers, while others see that it fosters social relationships and might motivate teachers to perform effectively (Vroom and Deci, 1997) and might promote commitment.
On the other hand, all three head teachers of PC schools agree that social activities promote commitment and motivation. The head teacher of the PC3 school argues that “commitment is internalized when the teachers feel they are one family, it creates a kind of affiliation to the school”.

Working conditions, such as comfortable time-table, discipline and educational climate are motives that belong to Herzberg’s dissatisfaction factor, or ‘hygiene’, that is, which causes dissatisfaction of teachers with their jobs. Imant and Zoelen (1995, p.80) speak of ‘open’ and ‘closed’ climates; an ‘open’ climate is marked by a high degree of trust and esprit, it paves the way for the involvement of teachers in the process of decision-making and in designing the policy and vision of the school, which lead to school improvement. Four head teachers out of seven LEA schools did not argue these factors in the interview because discipline, educational climate and other beneficial working conditions do not exist in their schools where teachers suffer from their absence. Two other head teachers of LEA schools explained that such working conditions promote motivation and commitment in teachers, which are necessary for school improvement. The seventh head teacher of an LEA school argued that a comfortable time-table may have a positive as well as a negative impact on commitment and motivation. The negative impact is that the teacher seeks another work place because of the free time in the time-table, which lowers his affiliation to the school and the feeling of belonging, this does not help to improve the school. The head teachers of the PC schools indicated that if the teacher is aiming to continue with higher studies, he/she is afforded a more comfortable time-table. It was also pointed out that discipline and the educational climate are important for school improvement. Table 7.1 shows that the perception of the head teachers in the LEA schools about the sense of ‘ownership’ of the
teachers of their schools is almost negative, while the perception of the head teachers in the
PC schools is, to the contrary, positive. Teachers in PC schools are proud of their schools.
The importance of this factor in school improvement is asserted by many writers, such as
Stoll and Mortimore (1995) who argue that the teachers are the mesh for school
improvement, whether through the development of teachers’ skills, or through strategies, or
through ‘ownership’. Staessons, (1993, p.127) asserts that:

“Unless every one in the school has a shared appreciation of a common
problem to be resolved, and a sense of ‘ownership’ of the strategies to
be used in passing the resolution, teachers will not be convinced that
effort should be expended to bring about change.”

In relation to the problem of segregation and discrimination against Arab schools in Israel,
the attitudes of the head teachers in the LEA and PC schools are almost similar, but, with
slight differences in the awareness of the reflection to suggested solutions, such as that of
Mazzawi (1997).

8-2-5 The perception of the head teachers of the issue of ‘segregation
and discrimination’ against Arab schools in Israel.

This is a political question and it should find its solution politically. One head teacher
argued: ‘as security is the worry of the Israeli Jews, education should be the worry of the
Israeli Arabs’. This argument correlates with the suggestion of Mazzawi (1997) about
‘nationalizing the concept of education’ for the Israeli Arabs. The head teacher of LEA7
school asserted that there is no segregation or discrimination in her school, this is due to the
fact that her school belongs to the net of the organization ‘Nimat’, which is the
organization of ‘volunteering and working women in Israel’ and not to the Ministry of
Education, as such, the school’s budget is independent. Another head teacher (LEA4) noted that if this problem is solved, there will be no doubt that school improvement will occur. Head teachers of PC schools also explained that it is a political problem and if solved it will lead to the improvement of Arab schools in Israel. The head teacher of the PC2 school explained that there is a need to integrate all efforts to face the problem.

8.2.6 Summary of this section

It might be concluded at this level of analysis of the findings of the interviews, that there is a difference in the awareness of the factors for school improvement between head teachers of LEA schools and head teachers of PC schools. This difference might be due to the professionalism of the head teachers (Sergiovanni, 1984, p.107) as could be interpreted from the answers of the head teachers of the PC schools and that of the head teacher of LEA 6 school, regarding the factors for school improvement or the factors leading to the commitment of teachers or of their awareness of what is commitment in teachers or in head teachers. (See tables 7.1 and 7.2)

The organizational culture is another area of difference between the conception of the head teachers of LEA schools and PC schools. Table 7.1 shows that factors of organizational culture in LEA schools barely exist, such as: clear vision of the head teachers, teachers’ collaboration, teachers’ involvement in the process of decision-making, teachers’ involvement in designing the policy of the school and values and beliefs that partially exist. These organizational factors do exist in PC schools, as can be seen from table 7.2 and from the summary of the documented culture on p.134-135. School improvement will not occur unless a deep application of the factors of the organizational culture takes place (Joyce, 1991, p. 59).
Motivation of teachers is another aspect of school improvement; it is poorly managed in LEA schools. Probing into tables 7.1 and 7.2 shows that head teachers of LEA schools are not aware of the concept of motivation and of the factors promoting it. Even when a convenient time-table is used, it does not affect school improvement. In PC schools, however, head teachers are aware of the concept and of the factors that promote it, and are aware of the negative consequences if any behaviour is misused, such as a convenient time-table (some teachers make use of this convenience to be engaged in other work places). They are aware of how factors such as social activities might internalize commitment or produce affiliation to the school and a sense of belonging to it. At the same time, there are no differences and conflict between the head teachers of the LEA schools and the head teachers of the PC schools about the issue of segregation and discrimination against Arab schools in Israel. They agree, almost unanimously, that it is a political problem and if solved will surely yield improvement in schools. Some bias is probably unavoidable in qualitative research, especially when the researcher’s expectations and values affect his perceptions of the data, as the case might be in this research.

8.3 Analysis of teachers’ interviews

The differences between LEA and PC school teachers are also as prominent as those of the head teachers of those schools; whether in relation to school improvement factors, in relation to ‘commitment’ and the ‘committed teacher’, in relation to the culture of their schools, or in relation to the problem of segregation and discrimination against Arab schools in Israel.

8-3-1 Teachers’ perception and attitudes of the factors that lead to school
improvement.

Referring to tables 7.3 and 7.4, it can be seen that the teachers in LEA schools are aware of some of the factors leading to school improvement, such as educational climate, as pointed-out by Joyce, (1991) and by Hopkins and Hargreaves (1991), teachers collaboration, the feeling of belonging to the school, teachers qualifications, trust, discipline and teachers’ involvement, as stressed by many writers such as Hopkins (1997) or Stoll and Mortimore (1995) and others. One of the teachers in an LEA school, stressed that teachers’ involvement has to be partial due to the difficulty of taking decisions collegially or even by the majority, referring to the conflict between groups of teachers which has its roots in family conflicts. Also, the head teacher of that school, (LEA3) asserted: “I want all the teachers to leave their identities with the door keeper, we need an integrated staff”.

In PC schools, as table 7.4 shows, teachers’ awareness of the factors of school improvement is deeper than that of LEA school teachers. They indicated factors such as vision of the head teacher, a work plan, teachers’ expertise, satisfaction with the job, involvement in school life, the feeling of belonging to the school, commitment of teachers to school decisions, the awareness of the teachers and the head teacher of the change taking place in the outer community. It is similar to the factors that Hopkins (1997) found for school improvement to occur: collaboration amongst teachers and between teachers and head teachers, educational climate and changes in the process of teaching-learning. It might be that this difference is due to the difference in the organizational culture between these schools, through which the teachers became aware of the factors for school improvement.

8-3-2 The committed teacher and the factors leading to commitment.
Again referring to table 7.3, teachers of LEA schools could not define, ‘who is the committed teacher?’ One of them (LEA1) indicated personal traits of the committed teacher. Instead of identifying the committed teacher, they indicated the factors that might lead to commitment such as the feeling of belonging, liking one’s job, or working voluntarily (LEA7). This last linkage between the committed teacher and voluntary work was argued by Campbell and Neill (1997, p.193):

“Feeling of professional obligation to complete work regardless of the hours required or personal cost.”

The clue to the committed teacher given by two LEA school teachers, ‘the feeling to belong’, is also argued by O’Neill (1994, p.5):

“Wanting to do well, to feel a sense of belonging to a group or team of people working to the same goals and being determined to achieve those goals or targets, are natural aspirations for staff in any organization.”

But ‘the feeling of belonging’ alone is not enough, without working with determination to achieve the goals. However, it is possible to conclude that there are teachers who at least feel what a committed teacher should be.

It emerged that teachers of PC schools were closer to the definition of Campbell and Neill (1997). One teacher in a PC school said: “the committed teacher is the one who needs no control”, another said: “does not neglect his/her duties”, while a third teacher said: “if I decide on something I should be committed to it.”

Teachers in LEA schools and in PC schools pointed almost to the same factors that might
internalize the feeling of ‘commitment’ in teachers: their involvement in the process of decision-making, in designing the policy and vision of the school, the feeling of belonging, job satisfaction while raising a child at home, being part of an organizational culture, sensing appreciation of their work, and of being happy in the school. These factors correlate with most of the factors in the literature. For example, Brown et al, (1997, p.143) suggest that: “a shared common problem to be resolved is a tool for commitment”, Hopkins et al, (1996, p.14) argue that: “involving teachers in development planning is likely to create their feelings of motivation and commitment” and Levacic et al, (1999, p.20) refer to the organizational culture in order to secure organizational commitment through the involvement of teachers in all aspects of school life.

8-3-3 Cultural Factors

Referring to Table 7.3, it can be seen that cultural factors are missing in LEA schools. When the teachers of those schools were asked about how they see the effectiveness of factors in internalizing commitment in teachers, like clear vision, collaboration, involvement of teachers in designing the policy of the school, values and beliefs and the involvement of teachers in the process of decision-making, there was no reaction. On the other hand, in PC schools, teachers gave very brief answers such as, yes, it is important, it is necessary that values and beliefs should be shared. It can be concluded, at this stage, that Arab schools are in need of an organizational culture, such as clear vision, involvement of teachers in the process of decision-making or in designing the policy of the school and the collaboration amongst the teachers on one hand and between the teachers and the head teacher on the other hand. All the literature reviews assert the importance of these cultural factors in internalizing the commitment of teachers and in school improvement. Hargreaves
(1997, p.248) finds it essential to look beneath the cultural factors, such as collaborative attitudes and a shared vision, in order to provide teachers with strong morale and commitment. Deal (1988, p.248) asserts that a strong performance depends upon a set of shared beliefs and values that motivate behaviour and inspire commitment. Hopkins et al (1996, p. 28) stress that:

“The methods through which the vision is developed seems to be as important as vision itself in generating staff commitment.”

Similarly, Cheng (1993, p.87) found a strong link between strong culture and school improvement:

“Schools with strong culture achieved not only high teacher satisfaction and commitment, but also high academic achievement in public examinations.”

Not only is there a clear difference between the head teachers of LEA and PC schools regarding their perception of school improvement factors or commitment of teachers or of cultural factors, but the difference is prominent regarding their levels of motivation, such as related pay, job satisfaction, esteem and self actualization, promotion, the feeling of belonging or the educational climate.

The levels of motivation between the LEA and PC school teachers also differ prominently in relation to job satisfaction, esteem, self actualization, work-conditions or related-pay.

8-3-4 Motivation

There is almost a consensus among teachers of LEA schools that teachers’ salaries are
de-motivating; only one teacher, that of LEA5, opposed the idea that teachers’ salaries are de-motivating. He explained: ‘every teacher knows before joining the profession, what his/her salary would be’ (See Table 7.3). Teachers in PC schools hinted at the problem of salaries in the way that teachers seek promotion for financial purposes. The teacher from school LEA 1 built all his reaction in the interview on related pay. He asserted that teachers’ involvement in any activity is measured by what he/she gets. It is to be noted that all teachers in Israel have the same scale of salaries whether in LEA schools or in PC schools.

However, it seems that at on an international level, salaries are also a factor affecting teachers’ motivation, Evans (1998, p.42) here again, underpins this argument:

“In relation to teachers in the UK, for example, the media and the teachers’ unions have promulgated the notion that pay is an important determinant of three aspects of motivation: recruitment, retention and improvement.”

Also, in the United States of America, the problem of the related pay of teachers is fierce and likely to grow fiercer. The Washington Post, p. A30, August 25, 2000 published an article, “Dollars for Teachers” after the proposal of a research group, ‘The Century Fund’, an extract of which is:

“Teachers should be paid more, and there is surely a role for the federal government in helping guarantee a qualified teacher for every classroom. But exactly what role the feds should pay, how to tie higher salaries to improved performance, how to equalize salaries
across districts without penalizing localities that choose to spend
more on education – these are far from solved problems.”

Other aspects of teachers’ motivation are: job satisfaction, esteem and self-actualization, through promotion in responsibilities, support or praise (Maslow, 1946 and Mc Gregor’s Y theory, 1970). With reference to Table 7.3, teachers in LEA schools have rare chances of promotion because this is linked politically to the LEA, (LEA6), or to the policy of the head teacher, and most important of all, they have no esteem or support or praise from those who hold the key posts. The respect paid to teachers by the community is still low due to the stigma attached to them since the establishment of the State of Israel (Educational Encyclopedia, Vol.3, p.1175). In PC schools, appraisal and esteem of teachers by the parents is noticeable and differs greatly from the situation in LEA schools. (See table 7.4). Also, PC school teachers get support from the head teacher, whereas in LEA schools they do not get it, as table 7.3 shows. Dissatisfaction with these factors lowers the performance of teachers and consequently students’ achievements. Satisfaction is caused by the work itself, according to Herzberg’s theory of satisfaction and dissatisfaction (1959). Personal growth is one of the motivators of satisfaction, if it is not satisfied, dissatisfaction will occur (Maslow, 1946). Some of the teachers in LEA schools claim that there is a chance for academic growth and the head teacher’s role is affording it through a comfortable time-table; others claim that it does not exist. On the other hand, the teachers in PC schools are aware that academic growth is important for school improvement and as such it is open for all. Again, referring to Tables 7.3 and 7.4, teachers in both LEA and PC schools did not react seriously to the factor of ‘social activities’. Some of the teachers in
LEA schools said that social activities help to produce teacher motivation, others said it does not help, and in other schools it does not exist. In PC schools, the reaction is weak, but in PC3 school, the teacher said that social activities produce family feeling. Maslow (1946) placed the need to belong to a social group high in his hierarchy, a motive which, if not satisfied, would produce frustration. This is why social activities in schools and the production of family feeling is important and might motivate teachers to improve their school achievements. A convenient time-table, good discipline and a benign educational climate are part of the optimum working conditions in a school. Teachers in some LEA schools are afforded a convenient time-table, if they plan to continue their further studies. In PC schools, teachers claimed that a convenient time-table is essential as a general working condition and not only for those who intend to continue their further studies. Caldwell and Spinks (1992, p.49) assert the same perception as the teachers of PC schools:

“…..from the leader, an agreement to ensure good working conditions or, in some other way, satisfy the needs of the follower.”

Not only is a convenient time-table a working condition, but also discipline and the educational climate of the school are necessary conditions. The teachers in LEA schools did not react to the factors of ‘educational climate’ and ‘discipline’, except the teacher in LEA1 school, who complained of the violence that exists in the school, which led him to say, ‘there is no educational climate in our school’. ‘Educational climate’ as described by Imant and Zoelen (1995, p. 80) is about an ‘open’ or a ‘closed’ climate; the first paves the way for the involvement of teachers in school life, while the second closes the way to such involvement. Discipline can be regarded as a ‘hygiene’ factor of Herzberg’s theory (1959)
of satisfaction and dissatisfaction, which de-motivates teachers. Teachers of PC schools raised the question of related-pay, which they perceive as a de-motivator in their work, but also asserted that good discipline and a good educational climate are important motives. Referring once again to Tables 7.3 and 7.4 it can be seen clearly that the factor of ‘ownership’ in LEA schools does not exist, while in PC schools, the teachers perceived it as a better motive because they feel a sense of ‘ownership’ of their schools. Stoll and Mortimore (1995) and Staesson (1993) asserted the importance of this factor as a motivator for teachers’ work.

Even in relation to the problem of segregation and discrimination against Arab schools in Israel, the difference between the attitudes of the LEA and PC school teachers is strong, stressing the importance of the committed teacher in partially solving this problem.

8-3-5 The problem of ‘segregation and discrimination’ against Arab schools in Israel. The question put to the teachers in both LEA and PC schools, was: ‘What is the role of the teacher in closing the gap between the Arab and the Jewish schools as a result of segregation and discrimination against Arab schools in Israel?’

‘If teachers become committed’ then the gap can be partly closed. This is how most of the teachers in LEA schools reacted, but one of them said: ‘go and find them’ (he meant the committed teachers). The teacher in LEA7 school said: ‘the teacher cannot solve this problem, but she can maximize her effort to help her students’. In PC schools, teachers reacted almost as did the teacher in LEA7: ‘It is their commitment to their school and students’, another said: ‘to give the full potential in order to help the students’ and the third said: ‘to try and help the students as much as possible’.
To conclude the analysis of the interviews with the teachers of the LEA and PC schools, it is to be noted firstly, that the interview with a teacher from LEA4 school did not take place, although many contacts were made to arrange it. It might be assumed that the failure of the interview to take place is linked to the low achievements of the school in the Matriculation examinations, which was 14 per cent of the age group in that town, (Ben Artzi, 2001, p.2). It was made clear to the head teacher of that school that confidentiality would be preserved. Similarly, the same school did not send any information about its culture or discipline, and the teachers’ questionnaires were administered twice (see pp.140-141).

The awareness of the teachers in PC schools to factors of school improvement is deeper than the awareness of their colleagues in LEA schools. It could be assumed that the reason for this difference is due to the difference in awareness of the head teachers in the LEA and PC schools of school improvement factors. Head teachers are assumed to be professionals, as Stoll and Fink (1996, p.21), and Sergiovanni, (1984, p.107) emphasize. (see please sections 8-2-1 and 8-2-5)

Practicing the different factors of school improvement in school life, or the existence of an organizational culture in the school, internalizes the awareness of these factors in its teachers. This is reflected in the difference between the teachers of PC schools and LEA schools about ‘Who is the committed teacher?’ or, about the existence of organizational culture, such as clear vision, teachers’ collaboration, teachers’ involvement in the process of decision-making, teachers’ involvement in designing the policy of the school or the beliefs and values of the school. The assumed reason for such differences lies in the school’s leadership; Evans, (1998, p.17) states this clearly:
“My research findings revealed categorically, that the greatest influences on teacher’s morale, job satisfaction and motivation are school leadership and management.”

Or, what Silcock and Brundrett (2002) concluded:

“It is of little surprise that good schools have good leaders and that the staff of those schools work together.”

Also, McMahon, (2001, p.126) stressed the relationship between leadership and school culture:

“The early stage of leadership is a time when head teachers are socialized into the knowledge, values and behaviours that constitute the culture of a particular school.”

The existence of school culture is vitally important for school improvement projects:

“Interest in the study of organizational culture is prompted by the recognition that there is a link between the culture of an organization and its performance.” (Ibid, p.127)

The teacher in LEA1 school stressed throughout the interview that any performance of the teacher is linked to his or her related-pay; his view is underpinned by the Expectancy Theory of Motivation, which posits that individuals are more likely to put effort into their work if there is an anticipated reward they value. Almost all the teachers in the LEA
schools or in PC schools indicated that their salaries are de-motivators for their work. This is really what Herzberg (1959) asserted in his dissatisfaction factor. Job satisfaction as defined by Evans (1998, p.40) is:

“A state of mind encompassing all the feelings determined by the extent to which the individual perceives his/her job-related needs to be being met.”

Job satisfaction is linked to motivation (Evans, 1998, p.40-41). What motivates teachers practically is not the ‘need to achieve ideal oriented goals’ but is pay-related:

“Pay is also assumed to be an effective motivator in relation to improving job performance. Indeed, it is their assumption that underlies the practice of performance related-pay or merit pay.”

(Ibid, p. 42)

Other motivation factors such as promotion in responsibilities, support or praise, growth in academic degrees, social activities, discipline, educational climate and comfortable timetable are rarely satisfied in LEA schools. The feeling of ‘ownership’ of the school also, does not exist. Therefore, what motivates teachers in their schools is missing on a wide scale. Glatthorn et al, (1996, p.9-10) has a different argument:

“Even though some administrators mistakenly believe that teachers are motivated by higher salaries, the research presents a quite different picture. The factors that, according to the research, are likely to result in a higher level of motivation to teach are represented
in the following: A supportive environment for quality teaching, meaningful work, belief system, goals, rewards, feed-back, and autonomy and power.”

However, it can be seen that neither a related-pay factor nor other oriented factors are satisfied for teachers in the LEA schools. However, in PC schools, the situation is different, as can be observed in Table 7.4. The reason for the difference is assumed to reside in the culture of the school, or more accurately, the organizational culture of the school, which encompasses socialized values, knowledge and behaviour (Weindling, 1999, p.98), [see pp.134-136].

In this research, it can be seen that the committed teacher is the key for improving Arab schools in Israel. The segregation and discrimination against Arab schools in Israel can be partly neutralized by means of preparing teachers committed to their jobs, to their students and to their schools, (see Tables 7.3 and 7.4). Change is inevitable in order to improve Arab schools. The change is likely to be in internalizing commitment in teachers. This can be done by managing organizational commitment, which is typically thought to include a strong belief in the organization’s values, beliefs, set of behaviours and the willingness to give the teachers’ full potential to the school and a strong feeling of belonging to the school (Reyes, 1990). However, it should be stressed once again that there is place for bias from the side of the researcher due to his expectations and values that might have affected his perceptions of the data.

8. 4 **Comparing attitudes and perceptions of head teachers and teachers towards school improvement, culture, commitment, motivation and ‘segregation and**
discrimination’ against Arab schools in Israel.

Here again, the attitudes of the teachers and the head teachers of LEA schools in relation to school improvement factors, commitment and motivation of teachers, or school culture, indicate less awareness than their counterparts in the PC schools. While comparing the attitudes of the teachers and the head teachers of the LEA schools indicates slight differences in their awareness of these factors. Similarly, the attitudes of the teachers and the head teachers of PC schools were congruent.

8-4-1 Comparing head teachers and teachers in LEA schools, about:

8-4-1-1 Factors of school improvement.

It is only in LEA6 that there is a correlated awareness of some of the factors for school improvement between the teachers and the head teachers. This correlation partly exists in LEA7, while in other schools, teachers are more aware, but only partly, of these factors, than the head teachers. In most LEA schools teachers and head teachers are not aware of the factors leading to school improvement. One of these factors, which is most important of all, is ‘commitment’: commitment of head teachers, teachers, students and the outer community to ‘change’ (Brown, 1997 and Hopkins, 1997), commitment of the teachers and the head teachers to collaboration (Hopkins, 1997), clear vision and clear decisions (Stoll and Fink, 1997), a focus on the teaching-learning process (Hopkins, 1996), affecting the culture of the school (Hargreaves and Hopkins, 1991) and professional leadership (Reynolds, 1997 and Mortimore, 1989). It is reasonable to assume that this last factor is what is basically missing in most LEA schools. What underpins this assumption is the partial correlation of the awareness of these school improvement factors for the benefit of the teachers.
8-4-1-2 Commitment and the ‘committed teacher’

Seemingly, the awareness of the teachers of ‘who is the committed teacher’ and of ‘what is commitment’ is deeper than that of the head teachers, in LEA schools, although it is still partial. The above assumption for this difference still holds, that is, the lack of professional leadership (Reynolds 1997 and Mortimore, 1989). Only one teacher, in LEA1, related ‘commitment’ to ‘personal trait’ and to related-pay, thus contradicting Campbell and Deal (1997, p.193) but joining Evans (1998, p.42) who stresses that related-pay is linked to job performance; the head teacher of the same school did not give any reaction. Other teachers in LEA schools mentioned other factors leading to ‘commitment’ such as voluntary work, the feeling of belonging to the school or liking one’s job, while the head teachers did not give any comment. The awareness of the teachers of commitment is still far away from what has been explored in the literature: ‘Commitment’ is linked to ‘change’ (Leithwood, 1994), involvement in the ‘change’ produces ‘commitment’ (Hargreaves and Hopkins, 1991, p.119), a sense of ‘ownership’ internalizes ‘commitment’ (Brown et al, 1997, p.141). Inter-disciplinary meetings contribute to ‘commitment’ (Torrington and Weightman, 1989, p.48), sharing common norms, values and meanings secure organizational members’ ‘commitment’ (Levacic, 1999, p.20), and ‘internal job satisfaction’ which is gained by the job itself produces ‘commitment’ in (Evans, 1998), ‘transformational leadership’ produces ‘commitment (Coleman, 1994, p.69), while a difference in the strength of culture, produces a difference in ‘commitment’ (Cheng, 1993, p.87) and ‘vision’ generates ‘commitment’ (Hopkins et al, 1996, p.28). To conclude this section, it is clear that head teachers are not aware of the factors leading to ‘commitment’ and consequently, they lack some of the qualities of leadership.
8-4-1-3 Culture

Although some LEA schools have a written manifesto, which explain the factors constituting a school culture, probing into tables 7.1 and 7.3 shows that the factors which constitute the culture of the school are only on paper. Thus, the teacher in LEA5 said: “We speak of values, but they were never implemented’. Also, the teachers’ response about cultural factors: clear vision, teachers’ collaboration, teachers’ involvement in the process of decision-making, teachers’ involvement in designing the policy of the school, and their values and beliefs, revealed that their awareness in this area is very weak and they deny its existence in their schools. The head teachers, on the other hand, mentioned some cultural factors that do exist in their schools such as integrated staff, democratizing school life, voluntary work, teachers as partners (partially), mutual respect and co-existence.

However, school improvement will not occur without a clear vision and clear decisions (Stoll and Fink, 1996), an involvement of all the school community in the process of decision-making with its various levels as emphasized in Stoll and Mortimore (1995), decisions affecting the culture of the school (Hargreaves and Hopkins , 1991), involvement of teachers in designing the policy and the philosophy of the school (Schein, 1985, p.6), decisions affecting a set of norms and beliefs that influence behaviours (Bush, 1995, p.5) and, finally, affecting commitment of teachers and head teachers to collaboration (Hopkins, 1997).

This ‘without’ is the responsibility of the head teacher, because if school improvement is to occur, professional leadership is needed (Reynolds 1997 and Mortimore, 1989).

8-4-1-4 Motivation

Job satisfaction, esteem and self-actualization represented by the teacher’s need for
promotion or for holding responsibilities and posts, or the need for praise or support, are
not satisfied in LEA schools as reported by teachers and head teachers of these schools.
The teachers also reported that their salaries de-motivate their work (Evans, 1998, p.42).
According to Herzberg’s two-factor theory (1959), money is a hygiene factor, which leads
to dissatisfaction. However, it seems that this problem of salaries is an international issue,
as for example, in the UK (Evans, 1998, p.42) or in the USA (Washington Post, 2000,
August 25, p. a30), and is not confined to Arab teachers in Israel. It has to be noted in this
regard that the salaries of Arab teachers are according to the same scale of salaries for all
teachers in Israel.
‘Growth’ is a motivator, according to Herzberg’s theory. There is some difference in the
perception of this factor between teachers and head teachers. Some teachers in LEA
schools reported that there is a place for academic growth, while others say it does not exist
in their schools. Some head teachers confirm that teachers’ academic growth is aimed at
increasing their financial income by engaging themselves in part-time jobs in other schools
and not aimed at improving their own school. Social activities create an affiliation to the
organization. McGregor’s Y theory (1970) is based on the assumption that the motivation
of the individual occurs at the affiliation level. Most of the teachers in LEA schools agree
that social activities help in leading to school improvement, but they claim that it is missing
in their schools, except for LEA7.
Working conditions such as convenient time-table, discipline, or healthy educational
climate are hygiene factors, according to Herzberg’s two-factor theory (1959). These
might cause dissatisfaction at work. When a convenient time-table exists both teachers and
head teachers agree that it provides satisfaction which might improve the motivation and
commitment of teachers. Both teachers and head teachers did not react to the issue of educational climate or discipline, although both are important in both the teaching-learning process and corresponding school improvement.

‘Ownership’ as a factor for school improvement is asserted by Stoll and Mortimore (1995) and by Staesson (1993). Both teachers and head teachers of LEA schools confirm its non-existence in their schools.

8-4-1.5 ‘Segregation and discrimination’ against Arab schools in Israel

Referring to tables 7.1 and 7.3, head teachers are aware that this issue is political, but they explain that if a solution is found, schools will improve. One head teacher said: “The Arab authorities should find the solution, because today, education is the main source of living”.

The teachers explain that the issue can be partly solved by means of the ‘committed teachers’ who can maximize their efforts to help students in improving their achievements but, another teacher said: ‘go and find them’, that is, the committed teachers.

8-4-2 Comparing teachers and head teachers in PC schools in terms of:

8-4-2-1 Factors of school improvement.

Both teachers and head teachers in PC schools are aware of many of the factors for school improvement, such as those mentioned in the literature review on pp.77-81, for example, the need for commitment of the teachers, the head teacher, the students and the outer community to change as stressed by Brown (1997). This was raised by the teacher in PC1 school and by the head teacher of PC3 school. Commitment of the teachers and the head teacher to collaboration (Hopkins, 1997) was argued by the head teacher of PC2 school and by the teachers in PC1 and PC2 schools. The need for clear vision (Stoll and Fink, 1997), was mentioned by the teacher in PC3, while the focus on the teaching–learning process
(Hopkins, 1996) was stressed by the teacher in PC1 school. Greater involvement of the school community in the process of decision-making (Stoll and Mortimore, 1995) was asserted by the teacher and the head teacher of PC2 school. In addition to cultural factors, such as educational climate, inter-relationship of teachers and head teachers (Torrington and Weightman, 1989, p.48), a work plan (Hopkins et al 1996, p.34), ownership (Brown et al, 1997, p. 141), teachers’ commitment, job satisfaction (Evans, 1998), or, motivational factors such as convenient time-table (Herzberg, 1959) or the feeling of belonging (Maslow, 1946), were also emphasized as required factors in school improvement.

Once again, the teachers and the head teachers in PC schools were aware of ‘who is the committed teacher’. The head teacher of PC1 school defined the committed teacher as the one who ‘enriches the graduating class without pay’, which, in part, correlates with O’Neill’s definition (1994, p.5): “…Works for achieving goals by means of internal feeling”. The teacher of PC2 school gave a similar definition: ‘preparing his/her students to achieve high results in the Matriculation exams’. Also, teachers and head teachers are aware of exactly how to produce commitment in teachers. Almost the same factors are mentioned by teachers and head teachers in these schools, for example, involvement of teachers in school life, a sense of ‘ownership’, inter relationship with all the members of the school, and working conditions which correlate partly with the factors in the literature, involvement (Brown et al, 1997, p.141), a sense of ‘ownership’ (Brown et al, 1997, p.141), inter relationship (Torrington and Weightman, 1989, p.48) and working conditions (Caldwell and Spinks, 1992, p.49).

8-4-2-2 Culture
Teachers and head teachers in PC schools agree that a clear vision of the school is important and necessary. In two of the three schools there is a written manifesto, in which the vision of the school is clearly stated (see pp. 133-135), while the third PC school does not have a written manifesto but the head teacher explained that she is designing ‘commitment’ as her vision for the school.

Also, both teachers and head teachers claimed that ‘collaboration’ amongst the teachers, on one hand, and amongst the teachers and the head teacher, on the other hand, does exist and is necessary.

Teachers are involved in the process of decision-making, as asserted by both teachers and head teachers. The head teacher of PC3 school even explained that: ‘If the suggestions come from the teachers, a feeling of commitment is produced’. But involvement of teachers in designing the policy of the school is limited to those who hold certain posts, as the head teachers explained, while the staff say that all the teachers’ involvement in designing the policy of the school is necessary and important.

Although “Cultural models assume that beliefs, values and ideology are at the heart of the organization” (Bush, 1995, p.130), in PC schools, these are missing. The head teacher of PC2 school pointed to ‘democracy’ as a value, as stressed in the manifesto of the school, and the head teacher of PC3 school explained that religious beliefs help, to a certain extent, to create the feeling of belonging. The teachers assert that values and beliefs are necessary for the school, as components of its educational philosophy.

8-4-2-3 Motivation

The awareness of teachers and head teachers and their attitudes towards motivational factors are almost similar. Regarding ‘promotion’, there is an agreement that it is open to
all, but the incentives differ. In PC3 school, the support for the teachers’ work is satisfied but he or she is accountable to all, as a result, commitment is internalized. The head teachers assert that social activities produce ‘commitment’, while only one teacher said ‘it fosters family feeling’. There is full agreement between the teachers and the head teachers about ‘academic growth’, it is needed for school improvement. The head teachers provide a convenient time-table for the teachers if they decide to continue their studies for higher degrees. The teachers in PC schools stress that discipline and a healthy educational climate are necessary motivators, while only one head teacher agrees with this, the other two head teachers did not react to it. Teachers explained that their salaries de-motivate them. Tables 7.2 and 7.4 show that the teachers and the head teachers of the PC schools agree that there is a feeling of ownership in their schools.

8.4-2-4 ‘Segregation and discrimination’ against Arab schools in Israel

Teachers and head teachers of PC schools agree that if this issue is solved, the result will be school improvement for all. Teachers also agree that they can solve this problem partially through their commitment to their jobs, that is, to give their full potential to help their students, in order to achieve better results in the Matriculation exams.

8.5 Summary of the interviews

The awareness of the LEA school teachers and head teachers of the factors relating to school improvement such as commitment and the committed teacher, clear vision, clear decisions and professional leadership, is minimal. Similarly, their awareness of the factors composing the culture of the school such as the policy or philosophy of the school, teachers’ collaboration, teachers’ involvement in all aspects of school life, especially in the
process of decision-making and in the decisions affecting the norms and beliefs of the school, is also minimal. Moreover, the teachers’ motivation is not satisfied in terms of esteem and respect, related-pay (salaries), self-actualization as in promotion or career growth or the working conditions, for example, discipline, the educational climate and the feeling of affiliation or ‘ownership’.

Teachers and head teachers are aware of the problem of segregation and discrimination against Arab schools in Israel, but the solution is political, they say. The suggestion ‘to nationalize the concept of education’ (Mazzawi, 1997) causes a dilemma for the head teacher if it is to be adopted. On one hand, the head teacher is supposed to be loyal to his/her employer, the Ministry of Education, and on the other hand, he/she is an Arab who feels loyal to his/her culture. The awareness of the problem is clear and clearly identified (above pp.11-14); as such “the situation is conceptualized and defined and its elements and the values underlying it, are a sine qua non” (Dimmock, C., 1999, p.110); but, the solution is beyond the head teacher’s management. One teacher suggested that ‘committed teachers’ can solve partly the problem but, added ironically, “go and find them”. The teachers and head teachers of the PC schools are more aware of the factors leading to school improvement and school culture and their motivation is better than their counterparts in the LEA schools, except for a related-pay differential, where they are also not satisfied. The teachers in PC schools suggested that they could partly solve the problem of segregation and discrimination by employing their full potential in helping their students, which, in fact, they are doing. There is a need to clarify, that one’s expectations and values might affect the perceptions of the data. Interviewing teachers and head teachers from LEA and PC schools, is not totally pure from any bias.
8.6 Analysis of the Findings of the Questionnaire

The other part of this analysis is that of the questionnaire to which 170 secondary school teachers in the Arab educational sector in Israel responded, 127 of them are teachers in seven LEA schools and 43 are teachers in 3 PC schools. Their attitudes and perceptions of school improvement factors, school culture, commitment and motivation, and the problem of segregation and discrimination against Arab schools are of considerable importance, especially when comparing them with the results of the interviews with head teachers and teachers, which dealt with the same issues.

8-6-1 Culture

The present research examines factors of organizational culture such as school vision, involvement of teachers in all aspects of school life, in the process of decision-making, in designing the school policy and in setting its goals. Other factors, such as collaboration, values and beliefs were also examined.

School Vision (Question A1)

Setting long–term goals for a school is important as a factor in its improvement, but most important is the effectiveness of their implementation. The effectiveness of implementing goals set in LEA schools as measured by the teachers’ attitudes, Mean=3.55, (see pp.177-179 of Group Statistics) is not satisfactory. This effectiveness, as measured by the teachers in PC schools (Mean=3.75, see pp.177-179 of Group Statistics) is nearly satisfactory. The total number of respondents in LEA schools is 126, 94 responded to this question, indicating that they are aware of the importance of the existence of this factor, long-term goals in their schools. In PC schools 24 teachers expressed their views in this factor out of
a total number of 43. The result in both kinds of school indicates that there is no clear vision in Arab secondary schools in Israel. However, there is room to conclude, although on a small scale, that there is some difference between LEA and PC school teachers, in favour of the PC school teachers’ clarity of vision.

In LEA5 school, the average attitude of the teachers towards this factor of long-term goals, was more positive, Mean=4.18, (see p.198, table 7.24 of ‘Means - Case Processing Summary’). In this school, the long-term goal was to fight violence and aggression among the students both in the school and outside it, this disciplinary aim was stressed in their manifesto, these teachers are convinced that it would improve the school’s outcome. In PC3 school the average attitude of the teachers towards this factor was almost satisfactory (M=3.93, see p.199, table 7.24 of ‘Means – Case Processing Summary’); this means that the school’s vision of academic, psychological, social and religious goals as stated in their manifesto (pp. 134-135) is being implemented and is very nearly satisfactory. All other schools, whether in LEA or PC, have an average of about M=3.5, (see pp.177-179 of ‘Group Statistics’), which means that the teachers are hardly satisfied with their school’s vision.

The vision of the school guides staff and leaders to school improvement (Stoll and Fink, 1996); without setting long-term goals, that is, without a clear vision for the school, school improvement will not occur.

**Involvement of teachers (Questions A2 and A4)**

Another cultural factor which contributes to school improvement is the involvement of teachers in all aspects of school life, such as drawing-up and establishing a clear vision and policy for the school. The table on pp. (177-179) of ‘Group Statistics’ shows, on one hand,
that the average attitude of the teachers in the LEA schools towards this factor is $M=3.42$ of Question A2, which measures their involvement in designing and setting the vision of the school and on the other hand, $M=3.6$ in question A4, which measures their involvement in setting the policy of the school. In PC schools these averages are $M=3.36$ and $M=3.88$ respectively. These results indicate that the teachers in both kinds of schools are not satisfied with their involvement in the process of decision-making, bearing in mind that the head teacher is responsible for setting the vision of the school. Bolam et al (1993, p.44) indicate that there is little evidence that teachers play a significant role in shaping the school vision. This explains why the average attitude of the teachers in PC schools is not very satisfactory in terms of the vision factor. However, their involvement in setting the policy of the school is almost satisfactory ($M=3.88$) better, therefore, than the teachers’ involvement in setting the policy of the school in LEA schools. These results give a clue as to why there is weak commitment and motivation of the teachers towards their jobs. What underpins this explanation is that the number of respondents to questions A2 and A4 was only 65 out of 126 in LEA schools, while in PC schools it was 25 and 24 out of 43 respondents respectively. The low percentage of respondents to questions A2 and A4 also points to a deficiency in the involvement of teachers in the process of decision-making, regarding the setting and designing of school policy and school vision. Without full involvement of teachers in all aspects of school life, such commitment cannot be expected to be gained.

Referring to tables 7.25 and 7.26, pp.199-201, it can be seen that, relating to the same questions, A2 and A4, the attitude of the teachers in school LEA5 was measured to be $M=4.0$ and $M=3.72$ respectively, which is ‘satisfactory’ and ‘nearly satisfactory’. The
teachers in this school are involved in setting the policy of the school towards fighting student violence and aggression, both in the school and outside it. This behavioural aspect of school life, the prevalence of violence in the school, is critical since it does not help in creating a suitable educational climate. The manifesto of this school relates mostly to this aim (see p.139).

**Designing the School Policy (Question A3)**

Setting and designing the school policy for the different school activities are both part of its culture and factors for school improvement (Hopkins, 1984, p.16). 75 out of 126 teachers in LEA schools are aware that a school policy exists, but the implementation of such a policy is not effective (M=3.7 pp.177-179). In PC schools 27 out of 43 teachers affirmed the existence of a policy in their schools and claimed that they are closer to being satisfied with its effectiveness (M=3.93 pp.177-179). Here again, the effectiveness, the setting and designing of school policy in PC schools is more satisfactory than in LEA schools. The reason, as Tables 7.1 and 7.2 show, is because the head teachers in PC schools are more aware of this factor in school improvement than their colleagues in LEA schools. (See Table 7.2)

**Collaboration amongst teachers (Question A5)**

Collaboration is another factor relating to school improvement. Stoll (1994, p.131) asserts that collaboration is a key to school improvement:

“Culture that promotes collaboration, trust, the taking of risks and a focus on continuous learning for students and adults is a key for school improvement.”
The Table of ‘Group Statistics’ on pp.177-179 shows that teachers in PC schools are more than satisfied about collaboration among teachers in their schools (M=4.08), while the attitudes of teachers in LEA schools to this factor are less satisfactory (M=3.86). It is worthwhile noting that the interviews with the teachers and the head teachers in LEA schools (tables 7.1 and 7.3) did not underpin this result. Therefore, there is some skepticism about the reliability of this factor in LEA schools, while in the PC schools there is good correlation between the result of the questionnaire and that of the interviews, (tables 7.2 and 7.4).

The general culture of a school is shaped by its ethos, the values and beliefs it adopts, and its organizational culture. Bush (1995, p.130) asserts that: “values and beliefs are at the heart of the organization, which influence the behaviour of its members.”

Questions A6 and A9 relate to values and beliefs that the school adopts and to what extent the school (teachers and students) is committed to these values and beliefs. The table of ‘Group Statistics’ on pp.177-179 indicates that the teachers’ attitudes about adopting certain values (question A6) are less than satisfactory (M=3.66) for LEA school teachers and (M=3.58) for PC school teachers. While their attitudes about adopting certain beliefs (question A9) is very nearly satisfactory (such beliefs as coexistence between different groups), (M=3.8) for LEA school teachers and (M=3.97) for PC school teachers. It can be seen that this factor of school culture, values and beliefs, which is assumed to shape the general behaviour of both students and teachers, academically and ethically, is almost missing in Arab schools in Israel.

What underpins the above conclusion, about adopting beliefs and values, is the perception of the teachers about their commitment and the commitment of the head
teachers to these values and beliefs.

**Question A7** is related to this linkage, adapting values and beliefs and the commitment to them. The table of ‘Group Statistics’ on pp.177-179, shows that (M=4.07) for LEA school teachers and (M=3.97) for PC school teachers, which means that the teachers are satisfied about their commitment to the beliefs and values adopted by the school.

Without the full commitment of the teachers and the head teachers to any school project, school improvement will not occur; Brown (1997) and Hopkins (1997) emphasize the importance of the commitment of the teachers and the head teachers to the intended change, and the teachers to collaboration in the project.

**The results of Question A8** prove that the teachers are also satisfied with the commitment of the head teacher to their involvement in developing the policy of the school towards school improvement projects; (M=4.03) for LEA school teachers and (M=4.05) for PC school teachers. Once again, the degree of teacher satisfaction with their involvement in aspects of school life is not enough. The interviews with the teachers and with the head teachers emphasize that teachers’ involvement in aspects of school life is limited either to some teachers and not to all, or to only certain aspects of school life (see tables 7.1, 7.2, 7.3 and 7.4). Levacic et al (1999, p.20) assert that it is only through the involvement of the teachers actively in all aspects of school life, that it might be possible to secure their commitment. But, what is needed first, is the commitment of the head teacher himself/herself to the involvement of teachers in school life. Robinson (1982, p.141) explains that school principals’ commitment to school projects is not enough without the commitment of their entire staff.

**Beliefs and values, questions A101 and A102**
These questions are related to the implementation of adopting beliefs and values as factors for improving social or academic achievements. The results, as they appear in the Table of ‘Group Statistics’ pp.178-180 show that, for LEA school teachers, (M=3.39) and (M=3.36) to questions A101 and A102 respectively, and (M=3.66) and (M=3.4) respectively, to the same questions, for PC school teachers. These results indicate that it is not only values and beliefs that are missing, but also, that the commitment of teachers to existing values and beliefs does not help to improve either social or academic achievements. Values and beliefs, if shared by teachers and head teachers, ensure strong performance, (Deal, 1988, p.203). Therefore, beliefs and values should be shared in order to inspire commitment (Deal, 1988, p.203). The results of questions A101 and A102 reinforce the previous conclusion that without the commitment of teachers and head teachers to any school cultural project, school improvement will not occur. It can also be seen that there is a slight difference between the attitudes of the PC school teachers and the LEA school teachers, in favour of the PC school teachers. While this difference is not significant it throws some light on the differences relating to school culture between these two groups of schools.

8-6-2 Motivation

“School improvement is about raising student achievement through enhancing the teaching-learning process and the conditions which support it” (Hopkins, 1994, p.75)

Enhancing the teaching-learning process is linked to the performance of the teacher,
in turn, affecting and improving the performance of the teacher is linked to his/her level of motivation. Job satisfaction, achievements, working conditions, self-security, self-actualization, affiliation and related-pay are those factors which need to be examined and improved in Arab schools in order to raise the students’ achievements in the Matriculation examinations and to reduce the high drop-out rate of students. The following is an analysis of the motivation of teachers in Arab schools as resulted from the results of the questionnaire.

**Job satisfaction, esteem and self-actualization (Question B1)**

Question B1 deals with the appreciation of the teacher’s work. The table of Group Statistics on pp.177-179 shows that the teachers in the PC schools are satisfied with the appreciation of their work by the head teacher (M=4.0) where the number of respondents was 41 out of 45 teachers. The degree of satisfaction among the LEA school teachers was lower (M=3.76), that is, they are not satisfied with the appreciation of their work; 124 out of 126 teachers responded. These results indicate that the teachers in the PC schools are more highly esteemed and are more satisfied in their jobs (and their self-actualization is more satisfied) than their counterparts in the LEA schools. The assumed reason for this difference between the two groups of teachers is the level of the head teacher’s professionalism, as Tables 7.1 and 7.2 show. Satisfying the teacher’s personal and intellectual potential is a basic need for his/her job (Maslow, 1946), otherwise he or she works in a state of de-motivation and frustration.

**Job satisfaction and achievement (Question B2)**

Question B2 is about the achievement and the personal promotion of the teacher as
a result of being a committed professional, that is, to be ‘somebody’ in the community, which is a reward for his/her commitment to the job. Locke and Latham (1990, p.4), in their High Performance Cycle, assert that if the performance of the teacher is rewarded, commitment to the organization produces individual challenges, which motivate a new performance.

The number of respondents in both groups of teachers was high but their job-satisfaction was low, being only $M=3.725$ for the PC teachers and $M=3.53$ for the LEA teachers. These results indicate that if the teacher becomes committed to his/her job, it does not follow that he or she will be ‘somebody’ in the community. These findings reinforce the negative aspect of the teacher’s self-image and the feeling that the stigma which was attached to the teacher at the time of the establishment of the State of Israel still exists, at least partly. It is important to point to the difference in attitudes between the PC school teachers and the LEA school teachers. Although this difference is not great it still reflects some difference between the culture of the PC schools and that of the LEA schools. Referring to Tables 7.1 and 7.2 it can be seen that there is some measure of support or praise given to the teachers in the PC schools, while this does not happen in the LEA schools.

**Working conditions (Question B3)**

Question B3 deals with the related-pay of the teacher. It seems teachers’ salaries are low and that this is a central problem in teacher motivation. The findings related to this question indicate clearly, both for the PC and the LEA school teachers, that they are dissatisfied with their salaries; $(M=2.5)$ for LEA teachers and $(M=2.42)$ for PC teachers. This result does not support what Glatthorn and Fox (1996, p.9) state, namely that teachers are not
motivated by salary but by other factors, such as a supportive environment, a meaningful vocation, a belief system, shared goals, intrinsic rewards, feedback, autonomy and power. The result underpins what Evans (1998, p.42) claims, namely, that teachers’ salaries are considered a key motivator. However, if we compare the attitudes of women with men teachers in both groups of schools, women teachers in both PC and LEA schools are more satisfied with their salaries than the men. This may support the view that the teaching profession is becoming more a job for women. Moreover, the problem of salaries was considered by Herzberg (1959) as a hygiene factor which causes dissatisfaction and de-motivation at work.

**Security and working conditions (Question B4)**

Question B4 is also related to the working conditions of the teacher, focusing on pension schemes, sabbatical leave and other social benefits. The attitudes of teachers in both groups of schools, PC and LEA, are similar; (M=3.00) for LEA school teachers and (M=3.04) for PC school teachers (see Tables of Group Statistics on pp.177-179) and indicate that they are not satisfied with their social allowances. These working conditions and the corresponding allowances are linked directly to the problem of salaries, since they constitute a certain percentage of income; hence, the teachers are also dissatisfied with this facet of their working conditions. Another hygiene factor, which cause dissatisfaction among the teachers, is the number of the working hours and the timetable, is also added to those, which taken together lead to a state of de-motivation.

**Working hours and comfortable time-table (working conditions, Question B5)**
The number of working hours of the Israeli secondary school teacher with a full time job is 24 periods weekly (a period is 45 minutes). For a full time job, the time-table is considered to be comfortable if it contains 3 free periods and 2 more for parents’ meetings. The total number of free hours in the teacher’s time-table should correlate with the total number of working hours so that it could be said to be comfortable. In addition, if the teacher is given a time-table that enables him or her to continue higher studies at the university it may also constitute a comfortable time-table. Also, it is said to be a comfortable time-table for women teachers (mothers only) if their work at school ends by 13 30 p.m.

In both PC and LEA groups, the teachers are less than satisfied with their time-table; as can be seen from the tables on pp.177-179, of ‘Group Statistics, (M=3.49) for LEA school teachers and (M=3.63) for LEA school teachers. Referring to tables 7.1, 7.2, 7.3 and 7.4, both head teachers and teachers also confirm that a more convenient time-table is given to teachers who intend to continue their higher studies at a university. In the same tables the head teachers complain that some teachers, when given a comfortable time-table, try to find a part-time job in another school for the sake of earning more money, this, in turn, puts a burden on the time-table. These contradictory attitudes explain why the teachers are less than satisfied with their time-table. Once again, dissatisfaction at work (Herzberg, 1959) causes de-motivation.

**Social climate (Question B6)**

McGregor’s Y theory is based on the assumption that motivation occurs at the affiliation level of the individual (Riches, 1997). It is also assumed that the stronger the social relationships among teachers, the more they are motivated (Cheng, 1993, p.87). The findings on pp.177-179 show that the teachers in LEA schools are not
satisfied with their schools’ environment for promoting social relationships (M=3.75) which does not help in producing a feeling of affiliation and consequently does not motivate them to perform better. In the PC schools, the degree of teacher satisfaction is better; they are satisfied with the social relationships that the school’s environment provides (M=4.16). As a result, they feel more like a family, and, consequently perform better. Strong social relationships among the teachers in a school help to create better working conditions. If these do not exist, the result will be low teacher motivation (Herzberg, 1959).

**Head teacher’s strategies, or organizational policies and administration. (Question B7)**

Dissatisfaction among teachers might occur if a hygiene factor is mediating (Herzberg, 1959), one such factor is the organizational policy and administration of the head teacher; as for example, the effectiveness of staff meetings. Referring once again to ‘Group Statistics’ on pp.177-179, it can be seen that teachers in both LEA and the PC schools are not satisfied with the effectiveness of staff meetings, particularly the agenda set for the meetings, which is prepared by the head teacher. For the LEA school teachers this dissatisfaction is measured by M=3.34 and for the PC school teachers M=3.38. Both groups of teachers are dissatisfied with the organizational policy of the head teacher, relative to the situation in their schools, that is, to the existing level of organizational policy in their schools. This working condition, as it is now, does not help to improve teacher motivation.

**The possibility of growth in the academic hierarchy. (Question B8)**

McClelland (1961) identifies four needs, one of which is the individual’s need for achievement. What achievement is the teacher in need of? money, prestige or both?

It emerges that teachers in LEA schools and in PC schools are not satisfied on either
Regarding academic growth, it can be seen from the tables of ‘Group Statistics’ on pp. 177-179, that they are not satisfied with the possibility of growth in the academic hierarchy, (M=3.87) for LEA school teachers and (M=3.97) for PC school teachers. The head teachers are aware that, if teachers are given this opportunity, they might be deeply engaged in other schools, seeking extra income, and not working to improve their own schools. The teachers themselves, in LEA schools, claimed that they are not given this opportunity in any case, while the teachers in the PC schools claimed that the issue of academic growth is open to all, if it is not for personal interest. Herzberg (1959) explained that ‘personal growth’ as a motivator is needed for job satisfaction.

**INSET programmes for financial and academic growth (Questions B9 and B10)**

As explained earlier on pp. 118-119, teachers in Israel, get an allowance of 1.2 percent of their salaries if they participate actively in INSET programmes of 112 hours each. Even this financial and academic growth does not satisfy Arab teachers, either in LEA or PC schools. The average degree of satisfaction relating to financial growth, was M=3.4 for LEA school teachers and M=3.2 for PC school teachers. The average degree of satisfaction relating to academic growth was M=3.7 and M=3.5 for the LEA and the PC school teachers respectively. This result indicates that INSET programmes are not motivators that might lead to satisfaction, either according to Herzberg’s theory of satisfaction and dissatisfaction (1959); or as a need to achieve according to the theory of the self-motivated achiever of McClelland (1961).

**The teacher’s image in the eyes of the community (Question B11)**

Teachers in both LEA and PC schools are clearly dissatisfied with their image as seen in the eyes of the community; M=2.84 for LEA school teachers and M=2.76 for the PC
school teachers, as can be seen from the tables of ‘Group Statistics’ on pp.177-179. This result ensures that the ‘stigma’ which was attached to the teachers in the early years of the establishment of the State of Israel is still attached to them (see p.6). It has de-motivated teachers through the years and is still de-motivating them. It is a strong de-motivator. As such, their self-actualization is also dissatisfied, a motive which Maslow (1946) ranked high in his hierarchy and which McGregor (1970) assumed to occur at this high level.

**Affiliation: seeing the school as the teacher’s own school (Question B12)**

One of the four needs of McClelland’s theory of the self-motivated achiever (1961) is affiliation. McGregor’s Y theory (1970) is based on the assumption that motivation occurs with a high level motivator such as ‘affiliation’. Maslow (1946) ranks ‘affiliation’ high in his hierarchy. Again, LEA school teachers are dissatisfied with this motivator, their feeling of belonging to their schools is rather weak, M=3.88; while the PC school teachers are satisfied with their feeling of affiliation to their schools, M=4.36. This is due to the difference in the organizational culture of the schools, such as involvement of the teachers in school life, or in collaboration among the teachers, as can be seen from Tables 7.1, 7.2, 7.3 and 7.4. This is underpinned by Staesson’s argument (1993, p.127) who asserts that, without a sense of ‘ownership’ of the strategies to be used in any change, teachers will not be convinced to make any effort.

**Commitment, a personal trait (Question B13)**

The teachers in LEA and PC schools are not satisfied that ‘commitment’ is a personal trait, (M=3.72 and M=3.88 for LEA and PC school teachers respectively). This result
underpins most of the written literature, which asserts that the internalization of commitment in the members is the task of the organization. As an example, Hopkins et al (1996, p.26) point to the importance of ‘school vision’, ‘clear goals’ and ‘widespread involvement’ as the key to generate staff commitment. Torrington and Weightman (1989, p.47) indicate that ‘to the head’ is the most frequent response to any question about ‘commitment’. At the same time, it can be argued that ‘commitment’ or more accurately, ‘moral commitment’ is affected by the way such values were instilled in an individual teacher’s upbringing. Sergiovanni (1990, p.24) distinguishes between ‘organizational commitment’ and ‘moral commitment’ and asserts that they are conversely related to each other; that is, ‘organizational commitment’ produces ‘moral commitment’ and that ‘moral commitment’ may produce ‘organizational commitment’.

8-6-3 The problem of ‘segregation and discrimination’ against Arab schools in Israel

(Questions C1, C2, C3 and C4)

Teachers were asked if they see themselves as compensating for the segregation and discrimination against Arab schools in Israel or if they can be agents to help to decrease student drop-out and to increase the percentage of Matriculation passes. The results of these questions, as can be seen from the ‘Group Statistics’ on pp. 177-179 were: M=3.25, M=3.1, M=3.37 and M=3.48 for LEA school teachers for questions C1, C2, C3 and C4 respectively; while the respective results for the PC school teachers were: M=3.88, M=3.36, M=3.81 and M=3.78. These results indicate that the teachers
in both kinds of schools cannot see themselves as compensators or as agents. But PC school teachers feel that they can do more than their counterparts in improving the Arab schools. If the results of these questions are compared with the results from interviewing teachers, they are almost similar. The teachers in PC schools responded positively in the interviews; they claimed that they are giving their full potential in order to decrease the number of drop-outs and to increase the passes in the Matriculation examinations. The explanation of the high degree of dissatisfaction of both groups of teachers, resides in the fact that the solution of this problem of segregation and discrimination is political rather than educational.

8.7 The effect of the academic degree of the teachers, their gender and teaching experience on the results of the research.

Academic degrees

Referring to the tables of ‘Case Processing Summary’ on pp.186-191, it can be seen that there is an increasing awareness of the different factors affecting the culture of the school, of the factors affecting the motivation and commitment of the teachers or of the factors relating to the problem of segregation and discrimination against Arab schools in Israel. This awareness increases in the LEA schools only as the teachers grow in their academic hierarchy, in PC schools there is no such trend

Gender

Referring to the above tables, it can be seen that in both kinds of school there is no statistically significant difference between the awareness of the male teachers and the women teachers on the factors leading to the culture of the school. Also, there is no statistically significant difference between the two sexes on the factors affecting the
motivation and commitment of the teachers. The same is true regarding the problem of ‘segregation and discrimination’ against Arab schools in Israel.

**Years of experience**

The tables of ‘Case Processing Summary’ on pp.180-185 show that there is no significant difference in teachers’ attitudes as a function of their years of teaching experience, in relation to the awareness of the factors affecting the culture of the school, or the motivation and commitment of the teachers, or finally, in relation to the problem of segregation and discrimination. In PC schools the difference is prominent only between the less experienced and the more experienced teachers, in relation to the problem of segregation and discrimination. The explanation for this difference might be that teachers with less than five years experience are simply not aware of the organizational structure of the Ministry of Education.
8.8 Summary of the results of the questionnaire

The analysis of the findings of the questionnaire, regarding the attitudes of the teachers in the Arab schools in the Northern and the Haifa districts of Israel, in relation to the culture of their schools, to their motivation and commitment or to the problem of segregation and discrimination against Arab schools in Israel, shows a feeling of dissatisfaction, especially in the LEA schools. In PC schools a feeling of partial satisfaction prevails among the teachers and the head teachers. The explanation for this difference is due to the difference of the teachers’ and the head teacher’s awareness of the factors leading to school improvement, school culture and commitment and their implementation. (See please tables 7.27-7.35 on pp.201-209)

8.9 Comparing the results of the interviews with the results of the questionnaire.

Referring to the summary of the interviews on p.228 and to the summary of the results of the questionnaire, it can be seen that the results of one reinforce the results of the other. Thus, the awareness and the attitudes of the teachers in LEA Arab schools in Israel in relation to school improvement factors, to school culture and their motivation and commitment, reflect dissatisfaction. However, the awareness and the attitudes of their counterparts in the PC schools in relation to the same issues is nearly satisfactory. In relation to the political problem of segregation and discrimination against Arab schools in Israel, the attitude of the teachers and the head teachers in both kinds of schools were almost identical; it is a political problem whose solution is political. One important difference in this part of the research is that the teachers in the PC schools stressed that employing their full potential can partly solve the problem. These results are reflected,
directly, in their students’ achievements in the Matriculation examinations, which show that the in the year 2000 the percentage of those who passed the Matriculation examinations in PC schools was 59.5 percent of the students of the graduating class (Class 12), while among the other Arab students this percentage was 36.5. In the Jewish sector, the distribution was as follows: 54.7 percent among students of Israeli origin, 45.1 percent among students of Asian-African origin and 56.8 percent among students of European-American origin (The Statistical Abstract of Israel, 2000, 22.21).

The analysis of the findings, whether related to the culture of the Arab schools in Israel, or to the motivation and commitment of the teachers in those schools, or related to the political problem of segregation and discrimination against the Arab schools in Israel, should pave the way to some conclusions that might lead to improvement in those schools.
9. **Conclusion**

9.1 **Introduction**

The organizational culture of a school is reflected in the attitudinal level of the teachers in terms of their commitment to the organization and their job satisfaction (Cheng, 1993, p.103). The questionnaire, which is a part of this research, has focused on the degree of satisfaction or dissatisfaction of the teachers in Arab schools in Israel, in terms of the cultural aspects of school life, about their motivation and commitment and about the contextual political issue of segregation and discrimination against Arab schools in Israel. Their degree of satisfaction or dissatisfaction is linked to the level of their commitment. The level of the teacher’s commitment to all aspects of school life secures the level of school improvement to be achieved, since one of the factors affecting school improvement is the commitment of the teachers and the head teacher to the change which is intended to occur (Brown, 1997). Hence, the degree of satisfaction or dissatisfaction of the teachers in Arab schools in Israel, as measured by this research, is supposed to diagnose the problems facing school improvement, in relation to the culture of the school, or in relation to the teachers’ motivation, or in relation to the political contextual problem of segregation and discrimination against Arab schools in Israel.

9.2 **An overview of the findings of the research**

Referring to table 7.5 on p.177, it can be seen that the overall attitude of the teachers, in relation to all the issues concerning the culture of the school or the teachers’ motivation and commitment or the problem of segregation and discrimination against Arab schools in Israel, is ‘dissatisfaction’. At the same time, it can be seen that the attitudes of the teachers in the PC schools, in relation to the same issues connected with school culture,
motivation and commitment, and the political problem of segregation and discrimination, are more positive than those of their counterparts in LEA schools, that is, their degree of satisfaction is better.

1. The teachers in LEA schools showed an attitude of dissatisfaction in relation to: setting a vision for their schools; their involvement in the different aspects of school life, such as designing the policy of the school; adapting certain beliefs and values, such as coexistence and mutual respect between different groups, or in relation to the commitment of the head teachers and the teachers to the school policy or school decisions. However, the teachers in the PC schools showed better attitudes towards the same factors, but are still dissatisfied with some of them, namely their involvement in designing the school vision or in setting behavioral regularities. The attitudes of the head teachers of LEA schools towards the same cultural factors are almost congruent to those of the teachers in the same schools (see Table 7.1). Also, the attitudes of the head teachers in PC schools are congruent to those of the teachers in the same schools (Table 7.2).

2. In relation to the motivational factors of job satisfaction, whether it is the appreciation of the teacher’s work by the head teacher or in relation to the teacher’s salary; the working conditions, the pay related to the number of working hours, pension schemes, social relationships or the effectiveness of staff meetings; academic growth; the effectiveness of the INSET and the feeling of ownership, there is a feeling of dissatisfaction among teachers in LEA schools. A better attitude is reflected among the teachers of the PC schools except for the issue of ‘salaries’, where the teachers in both kinds of school are dissatisfied. The attitudes of the head teachers, in
relation to the same motivational issues, in both kinds of school, are similar to those of the teachers in their respective schools.

A significant result in both kinds of schools emerged from question B11: ‘The teacher’s image in the eyes of the community’; the average attitude was $M=2.84$ and $M=2.76$ in LEA and PC school teachers respectively, which means that the stigma which was attached to the teachers since the establishment of the State of Israel still holds (see p.6).

Teachers in both kinds of schools are not satisfied that ‘commitment’ is a result of the process of upbringing, which means that it can only be internalized by means of the organizational culture of the school.

3. In relation to the problem of ‘segregation and discrimination’ against Arab schools in Israel; there is a feeling of dissatisfaction that the teachers in LEA schools can compensate for it, or can even help in decreasing the percentage of drop-outs from schools, or increase the percentage passes of the matriculation examinations. However, in PC schools, the teachers expressed a more positive feeling. These results correlate with the attitudes of the head teachers in both kinds of schools, who asserted that it is a political problem which can find its solution only in the frame of politics.

9.3 Verifying the research questions

1. The perception of the teachers and the head teachers in LEA schools in relation to the factors associated with the culture of their schools that affect the motivation and performance of teachers, is unsatisfactory. Such factors would include, vision, teachers’ involvement in aspects of school life, collaboration, values and beliefs.

However, the perception of the teachers and head teachers in PC schools, in relation
to these factors, is nearly satisfactory.

2. The feeling of the teachers in LEA schools in relation to motivational factors which are derived from the motivation theories of Maslow, Herzberg, McGregor and McClelland is unsatisfactory. Such factors would include performance related-pay, job satisfaction, esteem and self actualization, working conditions, security, growth, affiliation to one’s school, the feeling of ‘ownership’ and the teacher’s self-image. The feeling of the teachers in PC schools, in relation to these factors, is nearly satisfactory, except for the related-pay and the teacher’s self-image which reflected unsatisfactory feelings. The head teachers’ attitudes to these motivational factors correlate with the attitudes of the teachers in the respective schools.

3. The perception of the teachers and the head teachers in both kinds of school in relation to the problem of ‘segregation and discrimination’ against Arab schools in Israel, is that it is a political problem, which has its solution politically. Teachers in PC schools asserted that, by employing their full potential, the gap between the Jewish and the Arab educational sectors can be partially closed.

4. The findings of this research indicate that there is a prominent difference between the teachers and head teachers in LEA schools on one hand, and the teachers and the head teachers of the PC schools on the other hand, in relation to their motivation, commitment and cultural factors. This is due to the difference in the level of awareness of these factors between the teachers and the head teachers of the PC schools and their counterparts in the LEA schools; and also, due to the difference in implementing these factors by the teachers and the head teachers of these schools.
9.4 Implications of the findings to the conceptual literature

The main purpose of this thesis is to improve the motivation and commitment of teachers in Arab schools in Israel within the context of improving these schools. School improvement is linked to motivational and cultural factors, such as clear vision and clear decisions (Stoll and Fink, 1996); involvement of teachers in the process of decision-making in all aspects of school life (Stoll and Mortimore, 1997); affecting the culture of the school by means of introducing ‘change’, such as a change in the system of values and beliefs or in behavioural regularities of all the members of the school (Hargreaves and Hopkins, 1991). This change should affect the Arab community culture in Israel from authoritarianism and traditionalism to liberalism and modernism which is expected to be a slow process and not simple. In addition, a deeper awareness of the political situation and its reflection on their situation. As such the change is transferred to schools.

Similarly, school improvement is linked to commitment of the teachers and the head teachers to change (Brown, 1997) and to organizational-motivational factors which are gained by the policy and culture of the school, such as job satisfaction, educational climate and staff development such as INSET or academic growth (Hopkins, 1987).

School improvement is also linked to school leadership (Reynolds, 1997), but needs the commitment of staff (Sergiovanni, 1990). This is one of the biggest problems in schools, namely to develop and sustain staff commitment (Robinson, 1982, p.141).

The findings of this research indicate clearly that the motivation and commitment of teachers in Arab schools in Israel is unsatisfactory, but it should be noted that this dissatisfaction is proportional to the status quo in these schools, that is to say, the teachers in PC schools are dissatisfied with their motivation and commitment in
relation to the status quo in their schools, and the same is true in relation to the teachers in LEA schools.

The results of the Matriculation examinations as published by the Statistical Abstract of Israel (2000, 22.21) showed that in the year 1998, 59.5 percent of the graduating class in PC schools passed the examinations (the highest of all Israeli schools), while only 36.5 percent passed the examination in LEA schools. These results underpin the findings of the research which indicate that the level of motivation and commitment of teachers in PC schools is better than that of the teachers in LEA schools. Therefore, there is a need to strengthen the motivation and commitment of teachers, especially in LEA schools, since without the commitment of all the staff to any change, school improvement will not occur (Leithwood, 1994).

In order to strengthen the motivation and commitment of the teachers, there is a need for change, the goal of which is school improvement. The proposed change would include internalizing commitment to a shared vision, providing teachers with clear purpose and direction (Hargreaves, 1997, p.248) and promoting a cohesive culture which would shape the behaviour of all members of the school (Deal, 1988, p.248) because schools with a strong organizational culture inspire more satisfied, more motivated and more committed teachers (Cheng, 1993,p.87).

A suggestion for improving Arab schools in Israel may include the following:

1. A process of increasing awareness of the teachers of the problem of segregation and discrimination against Arab schools in Israel, and of its consequences.

2. To design a clear vision of the school with the involvement of all the teachers, in order to secure their commitment as well as the commitment of the head teacher,
in order to minimize the effect of segregation and discrimination and to improve academic achievements.

3. To set a policy for the implementation of the school’s vision, involving all the teachers, in order to secure the commitment of all.

4. To monitor the progress of the school in every area in order to strengthen the motivation and commitment of the teachers, to improve their self-image and to motivate them to perform better.

5. It is the responsibility of the head teacher to ensure the commitment of the teachers to the change for the purpose of school improvement (Coleman, 1994, p.69).

9.5 The significance of this research

1. Due to the problem of ‘segregation and discrimination’ against Arab schools in Israel, which is a situation that is rarely found in other countries, there is a need “to employ the full potential” (stressed by one of the women teachers in PC3 school, see Table 7.4) of the teachers, in order to face the consequences of this situation. In order to ensure “employing the full potential” there is a need to secure the commitment of all the teachers in the school.

2. The teachers and the head teachers are in a dilemma. On one hand, they are employees of the Ministry of Education, to whom they are supposed to show loyalty while on the other hand, they are Arabs, to whom they are affiliated (see p.10). This dilemma is difficult to solve, since the teachers and head teachers have to play two conflicting roles: one is loyalty to the Ministry of Education and the other is their loyalty to their Arab culture and nationalism. Commitment of the teachers and the
head teachers to the vision of their schools and to the policy set by them to implement this vision, might be a solution to free them of the dilemma and to improve their schools’ achievements.

3. The stigma attached to the teachers since the establishment of the State of Israel (see p. 6) which is still attached to them, lowered the motivation of the teachers to a minimum. This situation requires a change in the educational culture of the school, that is, a culture which is underpinned by the involvement of teachers in all aspects of school life, especially in the process of decision-making; by collaboration among all the teachers on one hand and by the teachers and the head teacher on the other hand, and by creating an educational climate, the centre of which is ‘commitment’, the commitment of all personnel in the school to its culture, which should include a set of norms and regularities of behaviour that might motivate the teachers.

4. There is very little research on Arab schools in Israel, especially in the area of educational management. Most of the research done was linked to the problem of segregation and discrimination against Arab schools in Israel and in some cases comparative research between the Jewish and the Arab educational sectors. This is the only research that tackles the problem of motivation and commitment amongst teachers in Arab schools in Israel.

5. Private church (PC) schools achieved better results in the Matriculation examinations even amongst all schools in Israel. This might be due to better organizational culture, as this research showed, in comparison with the LEA schools in the Arab educational sector. Also, it might be due to the status quo of the teachers in PC
schools who are not bound by any kind of contract. They feel secure only if their performance is effective.
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Appendices

Appendix 1

Interviewing the head teachers

After a brief introduction about the intended research work, the focus of the interviews was on the following questions, head teachers were also asked about their years of experience as head teachers:

Group A

1. As an experienced principal what do you think are the factors that might help in school improvement?
2. From your experience as a principal, how do you see the ‘committed teacher’?
3. Also, from your experience, how do you manage to bring teachers to be ‘committed’?
4. How do you see the following factors as likely to help in internalizing ‘commitment’ in teachers?
Clear vision, collaboration of teachers, involving the teachers in decision making and in setting a certain policy of the school such as: finding ways of helping low achievers, or planning for extra activities, e.g. ‘value added’, shared beliefs, adopting certain types of behaviours of the pupils and the teachers.

**Group B**

5. How do you see the impact of the following on maximizing motivation of teachers to their jobs?

Encouraging social activities. Comfortable time-table. Facilitating growth in academic degrees through further studies. Giving chance to hold responsibilities as in social activities, or coordinator of a subject or coordinator of a set of classes. Praise due to high pupils’ achievements.

**Group C**

6. How do you see the problem of segregation and discrimination, as related to internalizing commitment of teachers and changing their motivation?
Appendix 2

Questionnaire

Group A (culture)

1. Are there long-termed goals set in your school related to school improvement?  
   Yes  No  
   such examples may be: minimizing the number of low-achievers, give one example: .................................................................  
   if yes, what is your feeling about the effectiveness of these goals to improve the school outcome?  1  2  3  4  5
   (vision)

2. Are you involved in setting these long-termed goals to improve school outcomes?  
   Yes  No  
   If yes, what is your feeling about the extent of your involvement in it?  1  2  3  4  5
   (involvement)

3. Are there any short-termed goals set by the school?  
   Yes  No  
   e.g. arranging an ‘English’ or an ‘Arabic’ language day in the school to highlight its importance as a school improvement project?. Give one example.................................  
   If yes what is your feeling about its effectiveness?  1  2  3  4  5
   (policy)

4. Are you involved in setting these short-termed goals?  
   Yes  No  
   If yes, what is your feeling about such involvement?  1  2  3  4  5
5. Is there any collaboration among the teachers? e.g. teachers of the same subject. Give one example. If yes, what is your feeling about such collaboration? 

Yes No

1 2 3 4 5

6. Are there any behavioral goals set by the school, that may help in school improvement, such examples as: mutual respect among the pupils and the teachers. If possible give an example. If yes, to what extent you feel these goals may help in improving pupils outcomes ethically?

Yes No

1 2 3 4 5

7. Do you think that the head teacher and the teachers are committed to these cultural goals and adapt them in their daily life in school and outside it?

Yes No

1 2 3 4 5

8. Do you think that the head teacher encourages teachers’ involvement in developing the policy of the school in relation to school improvement? such a policy as finding ways of helping low achievers or planning for extra curricular activities. Give one example. If yes, to what extent you feel he/she is committed to such involvement?

Yes No

1 2 3 4 5

9. Do you think that the school adapts certain beliefs, such as coexistence among different groups? Give an example. If yes, to what extent you feel the school is committed to these beliefs?

Yes No

1 2 3 4 5

10.(a) Do you think that the school adapts certain beliefs, such as co-existence among different groups? If yes, to what extent you feel the implementation of this policy helps in improving the social achievements of the school?
10.(b) Do you think that the school adapts certain beliefs, such as co-existence among different groups? If yes, to what extent you feel the implementation of this policy helps in improving the academic achievements of the school? 

(commitment)

---

**Group B (Motivation)**

What is your feeling about:

1. The appreciation of your work in the school by the head teacher?  
   (Job satisfaction, esteem and self actualization - Maslow and McGregor’s)

2. The chance to be ‘some body’ in the community because you are a committed teacher  
   (Job satisfaction and achievement - Herzberg and McClelland)

3. The pay you get for the number of hours you do?  
   (working conditions & job satisfaction - Herzberg)

4. The pension scheme of the teachers and other allowances such as: the Sabbatical year?  
   (Security and working conditions - Maslow and Herzberg)

5. The number of your working hours and your time table?  
   (Working conditions - Herzberg)

6. The environment of the school for social relationship among teachers?  
   (Working conditions - Herzberg)

7. The effectiveness of staff meetings? (from the point of view of the agenda put for the meetings)  
   (Working conditions & teacher’s strategies)
8. The probability of your growing in the academic hierarchy, e.g., from a qualified teacher to a B.A. degree or to an M.A. degree? 1 2 3 4 5
   (Growth-Herzberg and McClelland)

9. Improving your status financially through the in-service training? 1 2 3 4 5
   (Growth-Herzberg and McClelland)

10. Improving your status academically through the in-service training? 1 2 3 4 5
    (Growth-Herzberg and McClelland)

11. The teacher’s image in the eyes of the community? 1 2 3 4 5
    (Self actualization- Maslow & McGregor)

12. Seeing the school you teach in as your own school? 1 2 3 4 5
    (Affiliation-McCleland and McGregor)

13. Seeing commitment to one’s job as related to the way the values were installed in your upbringing? 1 2 3 4 5

**Group C**

Within the context of the assumed segregation and discrimination against Arab schools

What is your feeling about:

1. Seeing your job compensating for the assumed discrimination against Arab educational system? 1 2 3 4 5

2. Seeing your job compensating for the assumed segregation of the Arab educational system from the Jewish educational system? 1 2 3 4 5

3. Seeing your job in this context as an agent to help in decreasing the percentage of students’ drop out? 1 2 3 4 5

4. Seeing your job in this context as an agent to help increasing the percentage of students passing the Bagrut exams? 1 2 3 4 5

N.B. (1) The questionnaire will include variables such as: gender, age, years of service, primary or secondary teacher, degree, town or village and a public
school or a private (church) school.

(2) The scale of the questionnaire runs from: (1) mostly dissatisfied to mostly satisfied, intervened by dissatisfied, neutral, and satisfied (5) satisfied.