Andrews University

Digital Commons @ Andrews University

Dissertations

Graduate Research

2007

Organizational Orientations of K-12 School Leaders in the Columbia Union Conference of Seventh-day Adventists

Rose Tooley Gamblin
Andrews University

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.andrews.edu/dissertations>

Part of the [Educational Administration and Supervision Commons](#), and the [School Psychology Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Gamblin, Rose Tooley, "Organizational Orientations of K-12 School Leaders in the Columbia Union Conference of Seventh-day Adventists" (2007). *Dissertations*. 387.
<https://digitalcommons.andrews.edu/dissertations/387>
<https://dx.doi.org/10.32597/dissertations/387>

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by the Graduate Research at Digital Commons @ Andrews University. It has been accepted for inclusion in Dissertations by an authorized administrator of Digital Commons @ Andrews University. For more information, please contact repository@andrews.edu.

Seek Knowledge. Affirm Faith. Change the World.

Thank you for your interest in the

**Andrews University Digital Library
of Dissertations and Theses.**

*Please honor the copyright of this document by
not duplicating or distributing additional copies
in any form without the author's express written
permission. Thanks for your cooperation.*

Andrews University

School of Education

**ORGANIZATIONAL ORIENTATIONS OF K-12 SCHOOL
LEADERS IN THE COLUMBIA UNION CONFERENCE
OF SEVENTH-DAY ADVENTISTS**

A Dissertation

Presented in Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Doctor of Philosophy

by

Rosalee Tooley Gamblin

November 2007

UMI Number: 3304591

Copyright 2008 by
Gamblin, Rosalee Tooley

All rights reserved.

INFORMATION TO USERS

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted. Broken or indistinct print, colored or poor quality illustrations and photographs, print bleed-through, substandard margins, and improper alignment can adversely affect reproduction.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if unauthorized copyright material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.

UMI[®]

UMI Microform 3304591

Copyright 2008 by ProQuest LLC.

All rights reserved. This microform edition is protected against
unauthorized copying under Title 17, United States Code.

ProQuest LLC
789 E. Eisenhower Parkway
PO Box 1346
Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1346

©Copyright by Rosalee Tooley Gamblin 2008
All Rights Reserved

ORGANIZATIONAL ORIENTATIONS OF K-12 SCHOOL
LEADERS IN THE COLUMBIA UNION CONFERENCE
OF SEVENTH-DAY ADVENTISTS

A dissertation
presented in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree
Doctor of Philosophy

by

Rosalee Tooley Gamblin

APPROVAL BY THE COMMITTEE:

Chair: Loretta B. Johns

Dean, School of Education
James R. Jeffery

Member: Jimmy Kijai

Member: Gary Clifford

External: Sunimal Kulasekera

November 20, 2007
Date approved

ABSTRACT

**ORGANIZATIONAL ORIENTATIONS OF K-12 SCHOOL
LEADERS IN THE COLUMBIA UNION CONFERENCE
OF SEVENTH-DAY ADVENTISTS**

by

Rosalee Tooley Gamblin

Chair: Loretta B. Johns

ABSTRACT OF GRADUATE STUDENT RESEARCH

Dissertation

Andrews University

School of Education

Title: ORGANIZATIONAL ORIENTATIONS OF K-12 SCHOOL LEADERS IN
THE COLUMBIA UNION CONFERENCE OF SEVENTH-DAY ADVENTISTS

Name of researcher: Rosalee Tooley Gamblin

Name and degree of faculty chair: Loretta B. Johns, Ph.D.

Date completed: November 2007

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to examine the organizational orientations—*structure, human resource, political, and symbolic*—of the K-12 school leaders in the Columbia Union Conference of Seventh-day Adventists, and the relationship, if any, to their personal variables of age, gender, experience, and their professional variables of grade levels served, educational attainment, enrollment, support, feelings of success, and job satisfaction.

Method

A self-administered Organizational Orientations survey instrument, based on the multiple orientation framework of Bolman and Deal, was used to gather information about

the school leaders. The population surveyed provided 56 usable responses, which were analyzed by descriptive statistics, *t* test, analysis of variance (ANOVA), and test of correlation coefficient. Sixteen orientation use (patterns) hypotheses were tested at an alpha level of 0.05. Sixteen orientation level (means) hypotheses were tested at an alpha level of 0.01, except for support, feelings of success, and job satisfaction (0.05). Findings from the content analysis—qualitative data—were compared to the findings from the survey data.

Results

As a group, Adventist school leaders in the Columbia Union Conference rated the human resource orientation highest followed by the structural, symbolic, and political. The findings indicate that high-school configured school leaders were more politically oriented than Grade 8 configured school leaders. School leaders of small schools were more structurally oriented than school leaders of large schools. Structurally oriented school leaders felt more supported by their pastors and school boards than other school leaders. Multi-oriented school leaders felt more supported by their conference personnel. Qualitative findings indicated that school leaders were more symbolically oriented than they reported on the survey.

Conclusions

School leaders use the human resource orientation more than other orientations when making decisions concerning their organizations. High-school configured school leaders are more politically oriented. A significant number of structurally oriented school leaders of small schools feel supported more by the school board and pastors than do the

other school leaders. In contrast multi-oriented school leaders felt more successful, satisfied, and supported by their conference personnel. The differences between support of school boards and pastors, and conference support to school leadership organizational orientation may be of concern.

In loving memory of my mother, Melba Tooley,
who devoted her life to the Adventist educational system;
and in loving appreciation to my father, Paul Tooley, Sr.,
who is still devoting his life to Adventist education
and who has faithfully supported me in my journey

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES	vii
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	ix
Chapter	
I. INTRODUCTION	1
Introduction	1
Background of the Problem	6
Statement of the Problem	8
Purpose of the Study	9
Research Objectives and Questions	10
Research Hypotheses	11
Significance of the Study	12
Theoretical Framework	13
Definitions of Terms	14
Delimitations	18
Limitations	19
Assumptions	19
Organization of the Study	20
II. REVIEW OF RELEVANT RESEARCH AND THEORY	22
Introduction	22
A Historical Overview of Leadership Theory	23
Great Man Leadership Theory	23
Trait Leadership Theory	24
Behavioral Leadership Theory	25
Contingency and Situational Leadership Theories	26
Multiple Leadership Theories	27
Leadership Versus Management	27
Community Leadership	28
Constructivist Leadership	29
Leadership Theories and Organizational Orientations ...	29
A Historical Overview of Organizational Theory	34

Scientific Management Theory	34
Human Relations Organizational Theory	34
Political Perspective Organizational Theory	36
Cultural Perspective/Symbolic Organizational Theory	36
An Organizational Model	40
Structural	40
Human Resource	41
Political	42
Symbolic	44
School Leadership	45
Personal Variables	48
Age	48
Gender	49
Experience Variables	50
Professional Variables	51
Grade Levels Served	52
Highest Educational Attainment	53
Enrollment	53
Support Variables	54
Feelings of Success	55
Job Satisfaction	55
Related Research	57
Summary	61
 III. METHODOLOGY AND PROCEDURES	 63
Introduction	63
Research Design	63
Description of the Population and Sample	65
Instrumentation	66
Description	66
Personal and Professional Variables	67
Research Instrument	70
Validity for the Orientation Scale	71
Reliability for the Orientation Scale	71
Validity and Reliability for the Job Satisfaction Subscale	72
Pilot Study	74
Procedures and Data Collection	75
Data Analysis of the Null Hypotheses	78
Chapter Summary	82

IV. PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA	84
Introduction	84
Description of Population	85
Demographic Data and Profile of Respondents	86
Personal Demographic Data	86
Professional Demographic Data	88
Dealing With Missing Values	92
Results	93
Research Question 1	93
Patterns of Organizational Orientations	94
Levels of Organizational Orientations	94
Research Question 2	97
Orientation Use and Personal Variables	97
Orientation Levels and Personal Variables	100
Research Question 3	108
Orientation Use and Professional Variables	109
Orientation Use and Support	111
Orientation Levels and Professional Variables	113
Orientation Levels and Support	118
Research Question 4	122
Orientation Use and Success and Satisfaction	123
Orientation Levels and Success and Satisfaction	124
Categorizing the Quantitative and Qualitative Data Findings	128
Summary of Findings	131
V. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS	142
Introduction	142
Summary of Methodology	142
Discussion of Major Findings	145
Research Question 1	145
Research Question 2	148
Research Question 3	152
Research Question 4	159
Research Question 5	161
Conclusions	164
Recommendations for Practice	166
Recommendations for Research	167
Endnote	169

Appendix

A. ORGANIZATIONAL ORIENTATIONS SURVEY	173
B. CORRESPONDENCE	178
C. PILOT STUDY ORGANIZATIONAL PROFILE	184
D. CONTENT ANALYSIS	186
REFERENCE LIST	203
VITA	220

LIST OF TABLES

1. Columbia Union Conference Opening Enrollment for Selected Years	4
2. Leadership Theories and Organizational Orientations	33
3. Organizational Theorists	39
4. Organizational Theories and Organizational Orientations	43
5. Leadership Orientations Reliability Analysis	72
6. Job Satisfaction Reliability Analysis	73
7. Population, and Survey Responses by Grade Levels Served	86
8. Personal Demographic Variables of Columbia Union School Leaders	89
9. Professional Demographic Variables of Columbia Union School Leaders	90
10. Frequency Distribution of Columbia Union School Leaders' Orientation Use	95
11. Mean Score, Mean Score Range, and Standard Deviation of School Leaders in the Columbia Union Conference of Seventh-day Adventists	96
12. Orientation Use and Personal Variables	98
13. Orientation Levels and Age	102
14. Orientation Levels and Gender	103
15. Orientation Levels and Professional Experience	104
16. Orientation Levels and School Leadership Experience	106
17. Orientation Levels and Experience at Current Job	107

18. Orientation Use and Professional Variables	110
19. Percentage of Respondents by Orientation Use	111
20. Mean Score, Mean Score Range, and Standard Deviation of Support	112
21. Spearman Rho Correlation Between Support and Orientation Use	113
22. Orientation Levels and Grade Levels Served	114
23. Orientation Levels and Highest Educational Attainment	116
24. Orientation Levels and Current Enrollment	117
25. Inter-correlations Between Orientation Levels and Support	119
26. Canonical Correlation Analyses for Orientation Levels and Support	121
27. Mean Score, Mean Score Range, and Standard Deviation of Success/Satisfaction	123
28. Spearman Rho Correlation Between Orientation Use and Success/Satisfaction ...	124
29. Inter-correlations Between Orientation Levels and Success/Satisfaction	125
30. Canonical Correlation Analyses for Orientations and Success/Satisfaction	127
31. Content Matrix	129
32. Summary of Hypotheses Testing for Research Question 2	133
33. Summary of Hypotheses Testing for Research Question 3	137
34. Summary of Hypotheses Testing for Research Question 4	140

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

It is with sincere appreciation that I wish to express gratitude to my dissertation committee: Dr. Loretta Johns, for her constant encouragement; Dr. Jimmy Kijai, who taught me everything I know about research; and Dr. Gary Gifford, an experienced school leader, who understood my story.

I am grateful to the Columbia Union Conference, in particular Dr. Hamlet Canosa, for allowing me to study the school leaders in that union. I also would like to thank all the school leaders who filled out the survey forms and wrote meaningful comments, suggestions, and concerns. Their insights were priceless.

I would like to thank my family for their support: my father, Paul Tooley, Sr., who spent hours editing and proofing draft after draft; my sister, Cathy Jackson, who often sat by his side reading with him; my brother, Richard Tooley, who empowered me to begin this journey in the first place; and my brother Paul Tooley, Jr., who always reminded me to keep first things first.

Finally, I am deeply grateful to my beloved husband Michael Gamblin, who faithfully did the everyday things that needed to be done and served as my anchor when my brain was storming. He, along with our four children, Andy, Wendy, Rod, and Raelinda, have been an unfailing source of support, encouragement, and patience.

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Introduction

In North America, the Seventh-day Adventist Church operates an educational system of 1,000 elementary and secondary schools and 15 colleges and universities (General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists, 2002). In a 1997 North American Division study, a 10% decline was projected for the K-12 student enrollment by the year 2006 (North American Division, 1997). By the 2004-2005 school year their projection had become a reality with a 15% decline in enrollment. However, a slight reversal of this trend occurred for the 2005-2006 school year when the enrollment increased by 945 (1.67%) students (see Fig. 1).

Educational leaders at all levels of the Adventist Church have been seeking ways to curtail this declining enrollment trend. Paul Brantley, of Andrews University, was asked by the General Conference Education Department director to survey union conference education directors and selected church congregations, to obtain ideas for developing strategic plans for growth in enrollment. The data from this study precipitated The Journey to Excellence Model (Brantley, 1999). This model includes a vision, shared values, common goals, and a clear understanding of the philosophy and history of

Adventist education. Utilizing the growing body of research on effective education, it addresses educational leadership at all levels and advocates a renewing cycle of improvement (North American Division Office of Education, 2003). It was initially distributed by the local conferences' respective educational superintendents and given to all educators (school leaders and teachers) in the North American Division in 2003.

Another decision made in 2003 as a result of the Brantley study was the employment of an associate director of education for the North American Division, whose major responsibilities were to coordinate The Journey to Excellence concepts and to promote Adventist education.

In spite of these efforts enrollment trends continue to decline. For example, the Columbia Union Conference has experienced a steady decline (20%) in enrollment over the past 7 years, with the closure of 19 small schools, and at least one boarding academy (see Table 1). The North American Division Office of Education and the Columbia Union Conference Office of Creative Ministries suggest several key reasons for this phenomenon: (a) cost, (b) accessibility—fewer schools, (c) demographic shifts from urban to suburban, (d) birth rates, (e) qualified teachers and principals, and (f) the growing influence of home-schooling (Canosa, 2006; Osborn, 2000). The Health of Schools Project conducted in 1998 by the Southeastern California Conference of Seventh-day Adventists found that of the 859 Adventist students surveyed, 4.4% reported that they were home schooled, 36.9% attended the local Adventist school, and 58.7% attended a non-Adventist school (Lee, 1998).

Figure 1. Declining enrollment in K-12 Adventist schools in North America. Data from the opening enrollment figures, 2006-2007, North American Division of Seventh-day Adventists.

Table 1

*Columbia Union Conference Opening Enrollment
for Selected Years*

Year	K-12
1999	7,532
2000	7,427
2001	7,408
2002	7,381
2003	7,088
2004	6,787
2005	6,276
2006	5,979

Note. Data collected from K-12 school's opening reports for the
Columbia Union Conference of Seventh-day Adventists, Columbia, MD.

Parents are questioning the quality of Adventist education. Are teachers competent in their subject areas? Do students have a variety of learning activities? Do students have the resources to help them succeed in learning? Are their students safe? Does the spiritual climate of the school justify the tuition cost? (Haakmat, 1995; Hunt, 1996; Jewett, 1968; Kroman, 1982; Lee, 1998; Lekic, 2005). For this study, school leaders are defined as: (a) the head teacher of a one- or two-room school and no more than 20 students per teacher, or as: (b) a principal in a larger school with three or more teachers, and no more than 20 students per teacher.

Dr. Hamlet Canosa, vice president of the Columbia Union Conference, suggests that finding willing and capable leadership at the local school level to contend with these factors presents the biggest challenge of all (Canosa, 2002). In view of this, it seems

important to study the school leader. Does the way school leaders perceive their school organization impact their approach to dealing with issues such as declining enrollment? If so, then understanding how school leaders perceive their school organization may contribute to finding and implementing solutions to this critical issue for Seventh-day Adventist education.

Therefore, the purpose of this study was to examine the Columbia Union Conference Adventist K-12 school leaders' organizational orientations, to conceptualize how they approach issues and problems that occur within the organization (Bolman & Deal, 2002). Adventist school leaders are the DNA of the Adventist educational system (J. Tucker, personal communication, April 30, 2006); since organizations tend to choose leaders who perpetuate the culture of their organization, the study of any organization's leaders is beneficial (Schein, 1992). In this case the focus or orientation of the school leader will most likely reflect the focus or orientation of the Columbia Union educational organization.

Bolman and Deal (1997) identify this focus as the frames through which a school leader views his/her world. This focus has been used as a predictor for leadership effectiveness for educational and corporate organizations. For example, in 1982, when General Motors gave their Fremont, California, assembly plant over to the Japanese to manage, it was floundering. Within 2 years sales were positive and quality and customer satisfaction were the highest in any of the General Motors plants. More than 20 years later, this still serves as an example to GM and other organizations. They believe the

reason for this change was a “gut-level, values-centered, in-the-bone” change from viewing the world one way in 1982 to viewing it entirely differently a year later (Cameron & Quinn, 1999, p. 13). Is it possible that the declining enrollment in addition to high costs, limited accessibility, demographic shifts, quality, birth rates, and home-schooling be better resolved by understanding school leadership?

Background of the Problem

The Adventist Church promotes the concept that education and redemption are one (White, 1952, p. 31). The mission of the church is to provide opportunities for students to accept Christ as their personal Savior (General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists, 2003; North American Division, 2001-2002; Columbia Union Conference, 1999).

Education is considered the third lifestyle institutional development of the Adventist Church, with health reform first and military noncombatancy second (Knight, 1999). Educational development came later than other developments because the movement was focusing on the nearness of end times. The logic was, “Why send children to school if the world is soon to end, and they will never grow up to use their hard-earned learning?” James White, a well-respected church leader, responded, “The fact that Christ is very soon coming is no reason why the mind should not be improved. A well-disciplined and informed mind can best receive and cherish the sublime truths of the Second Advent” (White, 1862, p. 6).

By 1990, Adventists operated the second largest parochial school system in the

world (Griffiths, 1990). As of this writing, there are approximately 1,293,758 students, preschool through university, enrolled in 6,845 schools globally. Of that total, 877,276 are enrolled in 5,322 elementary schools, and 318,733 in 1,385 secondary schools. Of the worldwide total of 1,293,758 K-12 students, 57,809 are enrolled in 1,000 schools in the North American Division (General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists, 2002).

The beliefs and values of Adventists are disseminated throughout the organization through the relationship each Adventist school has to the other schools through the local conference, union conference, the divisions, and the General Conference. The General Conference (world governance) sets policies that are broad enough to apply to a global educational system. It oversees the world divisions including the North American Division. The North American Division sets policies that are within the guidelines of the General Conference and are pertinent to all the Adventist schools in North America. It oversees the union conferences. The union conferences, of which the Columbia Union is one, sets policies that are within North American Division guidelines, but are more specific to regional goals and needs. Each local conference—there are eight in the Columbia Union—has a K-12 school board that governs the schools within its jurisdiction. Each of those conferences has within its jurisdiction a number of schools governed by local school boards.

The organization of all Adventist schools in North America is designed to meet the needs of its members and embodies the Adventist Educational Aim and Mission Statement which states that “Adventist education prepares people for useful and joy-filled lives, fostering friendships with God, whole-person development, Bible-based values, and

selfless service in accordance with the Seventh-day Adventist mission to the world”

(General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists, 2003, p. 222).

At the North American Division, Adventist leaders became concerned with the K-12 declining enrollment. A major component of a strategic plan to turn this trend around consisted of The Journey to Excellence Model (Brantley, 1999). This plan was initially disseminated by the local conferences’ respective educational superintendents and given to all educators (school leaders and teachers) in the North American Division in 2003.

This model includes a vision, shared values, common goals, and a clear understanding of the philosophy and history of Adventist education. It utilizes the growing body of research on effective education. It encourages school leaders and governing boards to be accountable for creating school cultures that encourage innovation without fear of failure, in hopes of promoting a renewing cycle of improvement. While this model has been designed to empower school leaders to better serve their schools (North American Division, 2003), little research has been done to understand how school leaders view their school organizations in the first place. Understanding their focus might better serve this change process (Kotter, 1996).

Statement of the Problem

If leadership is treated as an organizational quality—an organization tends to choose leaders who best serve the mission of the organization—then studies of the organization must have as one of their units of analysis, the leader (Tannenbaum, 1962). Studies using Bolman and Deal’s theoretical framework for organizational orientations among public

school educators (Davis, 1996; Durocher, 1996; Eckley, 1997; Gilson, 1994; Harlow, 1994; Hollingsworth, 1995; Martinez, 1996; Peasley, 1992; Rivers, 1996; Strickland, 1992; Suzuki, 1994; Winans, 1995) indicate that school leaders who have effectively led change, operate from a multifaceted organizational orientation.

Understanding how Adventist school leaders are oriented toward their organization is important because these orientations, whether *structural* (defines organizational goals, divides people into roles, and develops policies, rules, and chain of command), *human resource* (focuses on human needs and feelings, tailors organizations to meet human needs, and postulates that people must feel good about the work they do), *political* (assumes competition for scarce resources, conflict is expected, and compromise is routine), *symbolic* (abandons assumptions of rationality, views organizations as united by shared values, improvements are made through symbols and myths), or a combination of all of the above (Bolman & Deal, 2002), are the first step in understanding Adventist school leadership and the educational organization itself. Little or no organizational orientation research has been done with the front-line Adventist K-12 school leaders' population.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to examine the K-12 Columbia Union Conference of Seventh-day Adventist school leaders' organizational orientations (leader's focus) and their relationship to personal variables of: age, gender, and experience, as well as the professional variables of grade levels served, highest educational attainment, current

enrollments, and support from parents, faculty, school board, peers, pastor(s), and conference personnel.

Research Objectives and Questions

The objectives for this research were to (a) identify the leadership organizational orientations of the school leaders in the Columbia Union, and (b) examine the relationships between these leadership organizational orientations and personal and professional variables. The following five questions guided this research.

1. What organizational orientations—structure, human resource, political, and symbolic—in terms of use (patterns) and levels (means) do the Columbia Union school leaders function in, as measured by the Organizational Orientations Survey?
2. Are there statistically significant relationships between these orientations (use and levels) as measured by the Organizational Orientations Survey and the personal variables of age, gender, and experience?
3. Are there statistically significant relationships between these orientations (use and levels) as measured by the Organizational Orientations Survey and the professional variables of grade levels served, highest educational attainment, enrollment, and support from parents, faculty, school board, peers, pastor(s), and conference personnel?
4. Are there statistically significant relationships between these orientations (use and levels) as measured by the Organizational Orientations Survey and overall feelings of success and job satisfaction?
5. What are the organizational leadership comments of the Columbia Union

Conference school leaders in section III of the Organizational Orientations Survey? And how do these comments compare to the statistical analysis of Research Questions 1-4?

Research Hypotheses

Research Question 2 generated the following hypotheses:

1. There are relationships between orientation and age.
2. There are relationships between orientation and gender.
3. There are relationships between orientation and professional experience.
4. There are relationships between orientation and leadership experience.
5. There are relationships between orientation and experience in current job.

Research Question 3 generated the following hypotheses:

1. There are relationships between orientation and grade levels served.
2. There are relationships between orientation and educational attainment.
3. There are relationships between orientation and enrollment.
4. There are relationships between orientation and parental support.
5. There are relationships between orientation and faculty support.
6. There are relationships between orientation and school board support.
7. There are relationships between orientation and peer support.
8. There are relationships between orientation and pastoral support.
9. There are relationships between orientation and conference support.

Research Question 4 generated the following hypotheses:

1. There are relationships between orientation and feelings of success.

2. There are relationships between orientation and overall job satisfaction.

As is required for statistical significance testing, these hypotheses are presented in the null form in chapter 3.

Significance of the Study

Even though there has been enrollment growth in Adventist schools around the world, there has not been a similar enrollment growth in North American Adventist schools. This research investigated a possible reason for this trend by examining one aspect of K-12 school leadership. How do the K-12 school leaders view their own positions in their school organizations? It no longer seems appropriate to view school leaders simply as managers, but rather as leaders grappling with difficult decisions and seeking creative solutions (Kotter, 1990).

The results of exploring the organizational orientations (the orientation usage patterns and orientation levels [amount of use]) of the Columbia Union K-12 Adventist school leaders will reveal a greater understanding of front-line organizational leadership. It is also hoped that the findings will be of significance for other Adventist union conferences and comparable private school systems facing similar challenges and serving similar populations.

Information about K-12 Columbia Union Adventist school leaders' organizational orientations may benefit conference personnel by extending the knowledge about the relationship, if any, between school leadership, organizational orientations, and various personal and professional variables. This information may also have implications for

effecting change, growing schools, hiring K-12 school leaders, and designing useful professional developmental tools throughout the Columbia Union.

Theoretical Framework

This study uses the theoretical framework of Bolman and Deal (2002) who consolidated the major organizational theories into a multiple-orientation framework. They are: *structural*, *human resource*, *political*, and *symbolic*.

The structural orientation emphasizes the necessity of formal roles, authority, and relationships by defining organizational goals, dividing people into specific roles, and developing policies, rules, and a chain of command (Bolman & Deal, 2002). The human resource orientation caters to the individual by tailoring the organization to meet human needs. It emphasizes the belief that people must feel good about the work they do (Bolman & Deal, 2002). The political orientation emphasizes the need for negotiation of resources. This orientation assumes there will be competition for scarce resources and expects conflict between different groups. Bargaining, coercion, and compromise are routine (Bolman & Deal, 2002). The symbolic orientation is driven by rituals and ceremonies rather than by rules or competition. It abandons assumptions of rationality and views the organization as united by shared values. Improvements are often made through symbols and stories (Bolman & Deal, 2002).

Bolman and Deal (1992) argue that leaders are morally bound to think before they act. It is essential for school leaders to organize ambiguous information into rational and meta-rational understandings in order to make sense of their complex organizations called

schools. Bolman and Deal (1984) believe that

frames [orientations] are windows on the world. Frames [orientations] filter out some things while allowing others to pass through easily. Frames [orientations] help us order the world and decide what action to take. Every manager [leader] uses [has] a personal frame [orientation], or image, of organizations to gather information, make judgments and get things done. (p. 4)

They believe that leaders who understand their own orientation and can learn and rely on more than one orientation will be better equipped to understand and manage their organizations.

Definitions of Terms

The following definitions are provided for terms that are used in this study.

Conference: An administrative unit of the Seventh-day Adventist Church organization composed of the local churches within a given geographic area.

Columbia Union Conference of Seventh-day Adventists: An organizational entity which oversees the Seventh-day Adventist church, including the educational system, in the states of Ohio, Pennsylvania, New Jersey, Delaware, Maryland, Virginia, and West Virginia. It is divided into eight conferences: Allegheny East, Allegheny West, Chesapeake, Mountain View, New Jersey, Ohio, Pennsylvania, and Potomac. The Columbia Union is comprised of 82 elementary schools, 12 junior academies (K-10 grade schools), six senior academies (high schools) and four K-12 schools (Columbia Union Conference, 1999; Columbia Union Conference Directory, 2005-2006).

Descriptors: Verbatim comments provided by research subjects on their survey, which contributes to the understanding emerging from the data (Merriam, 1998).

Feelings of Success: Researchers have found that feelings of success or accomplishment are related to job satisfaction (Bacharach & Mitchell, 1983). In a study done by Donaldson and Hausman (1998) a large majority of Maine principals felt successful in their jobs despite the stressful conditions they encountered.

General Conference: The highest governing organization of the Seventh-day Adventist Church, currently located in Silver Spring, Maryland. It oversees the worldwide work of Seventh-day Adventists through governing units called divisions, which operate within a specific geographic territory of the world.

Grade Levels Served: In the Seventh-day Adventist school system, some school leaders may serve different grade populations. Many times those serving in the lower grades also teach full time (Columbia Union Conference, 1999).

Job Satisfaction: Being satisfied with one's profession, trade, or employment (Morehead, 1995). "It represents the individual worker's appraisal to the extent to which the work environment fulfills his or her requirements" (Dawis & Lofquist, 1984, p. 55).

North American Division: A unit of the Adventist church organization comprised of the United States, Canada, and Bermuda. It is subdivided into nine union conferences.

Organizational Orientation: A cultural understanding with which the person views the phenomena that occur within an organization. Bolman and Deal (2002) categorized four different orientations: *structural*, *human resource*, *political*, and *symbolic*. The use of all, or some, of these orientations provides viewpoints from which leaders process events and determine actions.

1. Structural Orientation: This orientation emphasizes the importance of formal

roles and relationships through organizational charts and other means which are created to fit the organization's environment and technology. Responsibilities are allocated to participants through clear divisions of labor. Organizations create rules, policies, and manage hierarchies to coordinate diverse activities and further organizational efficiency. When problems arise, it is because the structure does not fit the situation. The solution is to reorganize (Bolman & Deal, 2002).

2. Human Resource Orientation: This orientation establishes territory, because organizations are inhabited by people. Individuals have needs, feelings, and prejudices. The key to organizational effectiveness is to tailor structure, policies, and rules to people and find the forum that will enable people to get the jobs done while feeling good about what they are doing. Problems arise when the focus becomes so "feel-good" that the job is not done efficiently (Bolman & Deal, 2002).

3. Political Orientation: This orientation views organizations as arenas of scarce resources where power and influence are constantly affecting the allocation of resources between individuals and groups. Conflict is expected because of differences in needs, perspectives, and lifestyles. Coalitions form around specific interests and may change as issues come and go. There are problems when power is unevenly distributed or so broadly dispersed that it is difficult to accomplish anything (Bolman & Deal, 2002).

4. Symbolic Orientation: This orientation abandons rationality and treats organizations as theaters or carnivals that are held together by shared values and culture rather than goals and policies. Organizations are propelled more by rituals, ceremonies, stories, heroes, and myths than by rules, policies, and managerial authority. Problems arise

when actors play parts badly, symbols lose meaning, ceremonies and rituals lose potency (Bolman & Deal, 2002).

5. Multi-orientations: Using all of the above orientations constitutes multi-oriented leaders who possess the ability to process events and shift leadership orientations to best address the situation (Bolman & Deal, 2002).

School leaders (Adventist school leaders): This term will be used interchangeably with the titles, “principals” and “head teachers.” In the Seventh-day Adventist educational system the school administrator’s title is determined by school size (leaders of large schools are titled “principal” and leaders of small schools are titled “head teacher”). In a small school there may be only one or two teachers with usually no more than 20 students per teacher and no more than six grades per classroom. In a large school there may be three or more teachers with approximately 20 students per classroom and one to two grades. The “head teacher” or “principal” is the chief administrator of the school with responsibilities that are detailed and defined by the conference superintendent of education in conjunction with the local school board (Columbia Union Conference, 1999).

Seventh-day Adventist parochial school system: This system is one of the largest Protestant school systems in the world (Columbia Union Conference, 1999).

Sources of Support: Six sources of support and assistance were identified for this study: (a) parents, (b) faculty, (c) school board, (d) peers, (e) pastor(s), and (f) conference personnel. *Webster’s Dictionary* defines support as something that upholds; something which backs, speaks for, encourages, and aids (Morehead, 1995). A number of researchers (Gmelch, Gates, Parkay, & Torelli, 1994; Sarason, 1971; Sarros & Sarros, 1992) have

agreed that the impact of peer support and support from supervisors lessens stress and burnout, and supports job satisfaction among school principals.

Years of Experience in Current Job: The total years the participant has spent employed at his/her current school. In the Columbia Union the average length of term for the elementary school leader is 5 years, and the average length of term for a senior academy principal is 3.2 years (Canosa, 2002). It is important to understand some of the dynamics surrounding the length of term for school leaders because research in private and public school systems indicates that those schools with effective, long-term school leaders thrive (Adams, 2002).

Years of Professional Experience: The number of years that a school leader has served in the field of education and includes all teaching experience. In teacher preparation, more emphasis is placed on management, whereas in school administration more emphasis is placed on leadership (Bennis & Nanus, 1997).

Years of Experience as a School Leader: The number of years that a school leader has served in the field of educational administration. Research has confirmed that less experienced principals approach and experience their work challenges differently from more experienced principals (Greller & Stroh, 1995; Roberts, 1991; Sarros, 1998).

Delimitations

The scope of this study is delimited to the K-12 school leaders identified in the Columbia Union Conference of Seventh-day Adventist education system directory for the 2005-2006 school year. This study was also delimited to the four organizational

orientations as defined by Bolman and Deal (2002).

Limitations

Because the study was limited to school leadership in the Columbia Union Conference of Seventh-day Adventists, generalizations derived from this study may not be applicable to school leaders in public schools or from other denominations' schools. Generalizations could be argued logically to other Adventist educational systems in North America.

This study is limited in that the demographic and survey are a self-reporting instrument. Because of this, answers cannot be probed for more specific or relevant responses. Additionally, question-order bias may also occur because the respondent can study the entire questionnaire before answering the first question (Rossi, Wright, & Anderson, 1983).

It is recognized that organizations are dynamic entities and there are many uncontrollable variables that may impact the study. Changes in the external environment as well as an organization's people, behavior, and events must be recognized.

This study examines the leaders' orientations at one point in time. There are multiple realities that coexist in organizations. Consequently, any study may or may not capture the entire gamut of these realities.

Assumptions

This study is based on the following assumptions:

1. That all respondents will answer truthfully.

2. That the respondents have some knowledge about educational learning theory and leadership theory because of their positions as leaders in their schools.

3. That the respondents have a similar understanding of the terminology used in the survey instrument.

4. That the survey instrument for this research was appropriate to obtain respondents' self-ratings of leaders' organizational orientations.

5. That responses to the instrument will provide accurate data regarding the utilization of the four orientations by school leaders.

6. That the Columbia Union Conference educational system selects school leaders who best reflect the mission of the organization as a whole.

Organization of the Study

This study is organized into five chapters: The first chapter introduces the problem by citing statistical data describing the declining enrollment in Adventist schools and suggests that one area for further exploration is school leadership. This chapter provides (a) a background to the problem, (b) the problem, (c) rationale of the topic, (d) a purpose for the study, (e) research questions, (f) an overview of the theoretical framework, (g) definitions of terms, delimitations, limitations, and assumptions, and (h) concludes with an overview of the organization of the study.

Chapter 2 is organized into eight main sections and begins with an introduction, followed by (a) a brief historical overview of leadership theory, (b) a historical overview of organizational theory, (c) a description of the organizational model developed by

Bolman and Deal, (d) a survey of the current research on school leadership, (e) descriptions of personal variables, (f) professional variables, (g) related research, and (h) concludes with a summary.

Chapter 3 is organized into seven main sections. After a brief introduction, the chapter is divided into the following sections: (a) a description of the research design, (b) a description of the population and sample, (c) a description of the instrument, (d) the personal and professional variables, (e) a discussion of the validity and reliability for the Leadership Orientation, and Job Satisfaction scales, (f) a discussion of procedures and data collection, (g) the data analysis of the null hypothesis and the pilot study, and (h) concludes with a summary.

Chapter 4 is organized into six main sections and begins with an introduction, followed by, (a) a description of the population, (b) the demographic data and profile of the respondents, (c) handling of missing data, (d) the results, (e) categorizing of the quantitative and qualitative data findings, and (f) summary of the findings.

Chapter 5 is a summary and discussion of the findings of the study. It is organized in the following manner, (a) a summary of the methodology, (b) discussion of the major findings, (c) conclusion, (d) recommendations for practice, (e) recommendations for research, and concludes with an endnote.

The appendices include: (a) The Organizational Orientations Survey Instrument; (b) Correspondence; (c) The Pilot Study Organizational Profile, and (d) Content Analysis.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELEVANT RESEARCH AND THEORY

Introduction

This chapter provides a context for this study and is organized into nine sections beginning with this introduction and then an overview of the historical development of leadership theory. The third section is a historical overview of organizational theory and culminates by combining organizational and leadership theories. The fourth section explains the organizational model developed by Bolman and Deal. The fifth section explores current school leadership research. The sixth and seventh sections discuss personal and professional variables and their possible relationship to orientations. The eighth section examines relevant and related organizational research, updating and bringing into focus the body of knowledge germane to this study. The last section is the summary of the chapter. The following resources were used to examine relevant research studies and theoretical constructs: Academic Search EBSCO, Dissertation Abstracts (Proquest), Andrews University dissertations, FirstSearch-OCLC, JSTOR, ERIC, James White Library, Frostburg State University Library, and Hood College Library.

A Historical Overview of Leadership Theory

Studying about leaders, followers, and leadership is an ancient enterprise (Bass, 1990). The integration between religion and leadership is well documented in the Old and New Testaments, with leaders such as Noah, Abraham, Moses, Samuel, and David serving as prophets, chiefs, priests, and kings. This integration is also supported in the historical account of the Babylonian King Hammurabi (2123-2071 B.C.), who issued a code of 282 laws that governed business dealings as well as personal behaviors. The Chinese scriptures, the *Tao Te Ching*, written around the 6th century B.C., gives advice about the relationship the leader should have with his followers (Hamill, 2007). Leo Tolstoy (1828-1910), a Russian novelist, is quoted as saying, “Rulers and generals are history’s slaves” (Tolstoy, 1933). Since leadership has been a component of all effective civilizations it seems appropriate that understanding the rudiments of leadership is vital for any successful organization today.

Great Man Leadership Theory

The study of leadership can be broadly divided into five periods, the first being the “great man” period—late 1800s through the early 1900s. Theorists such as Galton (1879), Carlyle (1841/1907), Woods (1913), and Dowd (1936) viewed leadership as a phenomenon by which a person endowed with unique qualities and capabilities became a man of power and influence. Leadership abilities were thought to exist within the individual, and that the study of history was the study of leaders (Bass, 1990). This limited view of leadership dominated the literature up until the 1930s and then gave way to the

era of the scientific study of leadership (Wren, 1995).

At that time, leadership studies began to emerge from every discipline that had some interest on the subject: anthropology, business administration, educational administration, history, military science, nursing administration, organizational behavior, philosophy, political science, public administration, psychology, sociology, and theology (Bass, 1990). With leadership studies coming from so many different disciplines it was inevitable that a disconnect would exist between leadership theory and practice.

First, there was not a definitive definition for leadership. It was assumed that, like art, we know it when we see it. Second, most theorists studied leadership from the context of their own discipline, letting that context color their subsequent definition of leadership (Bennis & Nanus, 1997; Burns, 1978; Rost, 1993). More important, and with dire results, leadership theorists, rather than building upon existing theories, often looked at previous theories as inconsequential and obsolete.

Trait Leadership Theory

The second period, from around 1910 to World War II, is known as the “trait” period. Theorists Bernard (1926), Bingham (1927), Tead (1951), and Kilbourne (1935) explained leadership in terms of traits of personality and character. Though more rigorous than the “great man” theory, some traits were thought to be innate and some learned (Bass, 1990). According to Bass’s (1990) review of trait research, the factors most often associated with leadership were capacity, achievement, responsibility, participation, status, and situation. However, findings were inconsistent and researchers began to recognize the

importance of organizational situational variables. Stogdill (1974) noted that “leadership must be conceived in terms of the interaction of variables which are in constant flux and change. The factor of change is especially characteristic of the situation” (p. 64).

Consequently, trait research shifted from a narrow perspective of identifying a finite set of leadership traits to identifying variables of leader effectiveness, such as personality, motivation, administrative skills, and the situation itself (Bass, 1990; Bensimon, 1989; Hersey & Blanchard, 1969; Hoy & Miskel, 1996; Yukl & Van Fleet, 1982).

Behavioral Leadership Theory

The third period, from World War II to the late 1960s, was known as the “behavioral” period. Theorists of leadership during this time focused more on the complex nature of leadership and took into consideration the leader’s relationship with groups (Bennis, 1961; Cattell, 1951; Gerth & Mills, 1952; Gibb, 1954; Hollander, 1964; Stogdill & Shartle, 1955). Because of the complexity of human behavior and behavioral variables, objective, valid measurement tools and methods posed difficult problems. Issues of causality, the changing nature of behaviors and situations and other variables made it impossible to conclude that a leader’s behavior is the dominant or central factor.

Researchers up to this point had focused on a narrow taxonomy, hoping to discover a magic formula for effective leadership behavior (Yukl & Van Fleet, 1982). But behavior theories in general have not proven effective in predicting desired outcomes. They have, however, provided a broad context for understanding leader and follower behavior (Bensimon, 1989).

Contingency and Situational Leadership Theories

The fourth period, from the late 1960s to the 1980s, known as the “situational and contingency” period, viewed leadership as more than just directing others, but also as interactive and relational. Situational theorists Paul Hersey and Ken Blanchard (1969) looked at characteristics of situations that could be attributed to the leaders’ success. They believed that effective behavior depends on the nature of the situation. Studies of situational factors demonstrated that a situation has a direct influence on the leader. The interaction of situational factors and leadership traits is key to producing certain leader behaviors that lead to effectiveness (Bensimon, 1989; Blanchard, 1998; Hoy & Miskel, 1996; Yukl & Van Fleet, 1982).

The Contingency theorists Fiedler and Chemers (1974) theorized that leadership functions in multiple variables—the group, task, individual qualities, relationships, and contextual challenges. Fiedler’s Leadership Contingency Model classifies group situations and tasks or relationship-oriented leadership patterns to determine the most favorable combination. This view postulates that leadership is differentiated, based on the maturity level or work style of the follower.

There is considerable overlap in situational and contingency theories. While situational theory assumes that effective behavior depends on the nature of the situation, contingency theory focuses on the factors outside the organization.

Multiple Leadership Theories

During the fifth period, from the 1990s to the 21st century, leadership theorists began looking at leadership in a more multi-theoretical construct. Previously, leaders tended to control and administer by utilizing repression; now they organized, encouraged expression, and empowered others. The following multi-theoretical or integrated theories will be briefly reviewed: *Leadership versus Management* (Bennis & Nanus, 1997; Kotter, 1996; Rost, 1993), *Community* (Barth, 1990; Gardner, 1990; Garmston & Wellman, 1999; Miller, 2000; Sergiovanni, 1994;), and *Constructivist* (Barnett, 1992; Greene, 1992; Kegan, 1982; Lambert, 1995; Senge, Kleiner, Roberts, Ross, Roth, & Smith, 1999; Wheatley, 1994; Zohar & Marshall, 1994) leadership ideologies.

Leadership Versus Management

Kotter (1996), Rost (1993), Bennis and Nanus (1997), and others recognized differences between leadership and management. They defined *leadership* as an influential relationship. Leaders and followers intend real change and the change reflects mutual purposes (Rost, 1993). Leadership establishes direction by aligning, motivating, and inspiring people, thus producing useful and dramatic change (Fullan, 1993; Kotter, 1996).

Kotter and Rost defined *management* as an authoritative relationship with managers and subordinates who produce and sell goods or services (Rost, 1993). Management is about planning and budgeting; organizing and staffing; controlling and problem-solving; producing order, predictability, and consistency (Kotter, 1996).

The dilemma with any historical timeline of leadership studies is that it implies that

each theoretical era was separate and distinct from the others, and that theories, once superseded by a new perspective, were completely discarded. In fact, as Rost (1993) points out, "The theories did not run riot in any one separate time period, nor did they disappear from the picture when the next so-called dominant theory appeared on the scene. . . . There were periods of heightened popularity for certain theories, but when that popularity waned, the theories remained in the minds of scholars" (pp. 28-29). From these existing theories emerged two interconnected leadership views: (a) community or relational leadership, and (b) constructivist or organizational leadership (Rost, 1993).

Community Leadership

Community leadership asserts that leadership is not within the individual, but exists within relationships that provide direction, stability, and the potential for organization and self-renewal. The power for change rests within the relationships people have with one another, and occurs when one or more persons engage with others in such a way that leaders and followers raise one another to higher levels of motivation and morality (Burns, 1978). The interactive nature of a community promotes continuous improvement. This view of leadership has its roots in a number of theoretical constructs, including human relations, systems theory, and ecological thought. Community theorists such as Lieberman and Miller (2004), Sarason (1971), Barth (1990), Sergiovanni (1994), Gardner (1990), Garmston and Wellman (1999), and Glickman, Gordon, and Ross-Gordon (2001) influenced school leadership with the belief that leadership should be a shared process among educators, principals, and teachers.

Constructivist Leadership

Constructivist (organizational) leadership creates and manages the cultural values within an organization to accomplish group goals (Drucker, 1999). Lev Vygotsky (1962), a Russian cognitive psychologist, described this theory in the early part of the 20th century whereby language serves as a vehicle for shaping the organizational culture, conveying the commonality of experience, and articulating a joint vision. The theory was not translated into English until well after his death, and did not receive prominence until recently (Moll, 1990). The theory of constructivist leadership has been strengthened by the work of Kegan (1982), Senge et al. (1999), Barnett (1992), Greene (1992), Wheatley (1994), Zohar and Marshall (1994), Lambert (1995), and others who view leadership as a reciprocal process between the organization and its workers. This theory emphasizes language as a vehicle for shaping the organizational culture, conveying commonality of experience, and articulating a joint vision. Using a constructivist leadership approach might enable school leaders to bring to the center of their leadership the kind of content and substance that provides meaning to what schools are and do (Sergiovanni, 1994). This constructive approach sustains and promotes change, allowing the school leader to shape the culture of their educational organization (Schein, 1992).

Leadership Theories and Organizational Orientations

The organizational leadership orientation's framework of Bolman and Deal (1991) was a result of an assigned team-teaching course on organizations at Harvard. They initially developed the orientations inductively in an effort to capture the differences in

their own world views and in different strands in organizational leadership literature. They noticed that effective leaders did not oversimplify these theories in their application but understood that individual and organizational behaviors were unpredictable and dynamic. Over the course of many research studies and life experiences their organizational model has helped leaders to understand and lead their organizations more effectively (Bolman & Deal, 2002).

Bolman and Deal (1991) developed this framework by analyzing leadership and organizational theories and synthesizing them into four main organizational leadership orientations—*structural* (policies, rules, and regulations), *human resource* (human needs are met by the organization), *political* (negotiation and competition are inevitable), and *symbolic* (myths, stories, and spirituality). Beginning with the Great Man leadership theory, they felt that certain elements were incorporated in the *structural*—roles, rules, and chain of command; *human resource*—human beings are there to serve the *Great Man*; *political*—survival of the fittest; and *symbolic*—only the Great Man has the vision, orientation concepts. Their organizational model relates to Trait theory in that specific traits are common to leaders who function in that orientation such as a manager is a good organizer and effective political leaders are persuasive.

Like behavioral theories, they stressed the unique, personal nature of being an effective leader (Bolman & Deal, 1997). The human resource and the symbolic orientations pertain more directly to the behavioral theories than do the other orientations. From the perspective of the human resource orientation, leaders must be concerned with the human needs within the organization. Similarly, the symbolic orientation recognizes

that people have an innate need and desire for inspiration and shared values in their work (Argyris, 1957, 1964).

Contingency and Situational Leadership theories correspond with Bolman and Deal's tenet that leaders must choose the best course of action based upon situational variables. This view postulates that leadership is differentiated, based on the maturity level or work style of the follower. For example, school leaders may be either more or less directive with those they lead, depending on their follower's experience and competency (Lambert, 1998).

In the discussion concerning Leadership versus Management, the definition of leadership reflects the human resource and symbolic orientations and the definition of management reflects the structural and political orientations (Bolman & Deal, 2002). Kotter and Rost's definition of management as an authoritative relationship with managers and subordinates, including the production and sale of goods or services (Rost, 1993), is not unlike the definition of the structural orientation.

The organizational orientation framework of Bolman and Deal supports Community leadership theory in that a structurally-oriented leader would ensure an appropriate structure for supporting relationships and furthering the mission within the organization. The human resource-oriented leader would perceive the issues impacting the people of the organization. The politically oriented leader would make sure that important relationships were in place to acquire needed resources. The methods of a symbolically-oriented leader would be to attempt to empower and inspire those in the organization. A leader who serves in all of the above orientations would contribute to a well-functioning

community.

The organizational orientation framework of Bolman and Deal aligns with the constructivist leadership theory, by recognizing that within each organizational orientation culture exists. This differs from other organizational models that isolate culture as its own orientation. In the structural orientation, the leader would examine policies, rules, and structure in the light of the organization's structural history and culture. The human resource oriented leader would seek to understand the unspoken or cultural issues impacting the people of the organization. The politically oriented leader would make sure that important relationships were in place to weather cultural change and acquire necessary resources to accomplish the mission of the organization. The symbolically oriented leader would inspire those in the organization by example and by relating in story and symbols the vision of the organization. A leader who operates in all of the above orientations would be considered a constructivist leader or a multi-oriented leader. Table 2 presents a matrix of the major leadership theories that influenced Bolman and Deal's organizational orientation's framework.

An understanding of different leadership theories and practices within organizations is important for leaders at all levels—teachers, home and school leaders, school leaders, school board, church board, pastor(s), and conferences. For example, if the organization embraces the Great Man leadership theory, it would naturally try to recruit and hire the “Great Man.” If this limited leadership view is practiced in the Adventist educational system, there may be drastic consequences for the accomplishment of the organization's goals.

Table 2

Leadership Theories and Organizational Orientations

Organizational Orientations Leadership Theories	Structural defines goals, roles, rules and chain of command	Human Resource benefits both the individual and the organization	Political bargaining and compromise are routine	Symbolic organization is mission, vision driven
Great Man 1900s abilities exist within the individual	chain of command	human beings serve the Great Man	survival of the fittest	Great Man centered
Trait 1910 to 1950s traits can be innate or learned	manager good organizer	sanguine people are important	persuasive builds coalition	visionary intuitive
Behavioral 1950s to 1960s leader's relationship with the group	as it serves behavioral needs	reward good behavior	manipulate behavior	mission of the group
Contingency/Situational 1960s to 1990s interactive and relational	behavior is contingent upon situation	human needs are addressed contingent upon situation	builds coalition contingent upon situation	mission is contingent upon situation
Leadership vs Management 1990s to Present <i>leadership</i> as an influential relationship and <i>management</i> as an authoritative relationship	Management attributes	Leadership attributes	Management attributes	Leadership attributes
Community/Constructivist 1990s to Present relational/ability to create culture	shapes structural culture	uses shared values to build community	shapes and destroys culture	uses stories to accomplish goals

A Historical Overview of Organizational Theory

Scientific Management Theory

Organizational theory has its roots in the Scientific Management Theory (also known as Classical Management Theory) of Frederick Taylor (1911), Fayol (1949), and Weber (1949), and their followers who believed that the design of tasks within the organization were based on precise scientific study and measurement. Tasks were clearly defined routines. Taylor believed that workers could be programmed to function essentially as efficient machines and were motivated by economics (Owens, 1970). The *structural* orientation is based on this theory. In defense of the *structural* orientation which is often associated with red tape and routine, one has only to deal once with a poorly structured organization to appreciate its virtues (Bolman & Deal, 1991).

Human Relations Organizational Theory

The Human Relations Movement originated with the theory of Mary Parker Follett (1918), who theorized that productivity is influenced by how workers feel about their work. If the work environment and relationships are pleasing, workers will feel good and will be more productive. Human relations theory emphasized the interdependence between people and organizations.

One of the most influential theories about human needs was developed by Abraham Maslow (1954). Maslow postulates that human beings have a variety of needs, some more fundamental than others. In Maslow's view, once lower needs are satisfied, an individual begins to focus on higher needs.

Another influential theorist in the area of human relations was Douglas McGregor (1960), who contributed to Maslow's theory of motivation by expanding the idea that the way managers view their workers determines how they respond. McGregor suggested that most managers subscribe to Theory X (direct control) and that their management practices ranged from "hard" Theory X to "soft" Theory X. McGregor argued that new knowledge from behavioral science challenged conventional views. He suggested a different view, which he called Theory Y, whose key proposition was to arrange organizational conditions so that people could achieve their own goals best, by working for the company (McGregor, 1960).

Chris Argyris (1957, 1964) added another component of the *human resource* orientation, in that he theorized that organizations often create a situation that is in conflict with the needs of healthy human beings. This conflict situation increases as one moves down the hierarchy, as jobs become more mechanized, as leadership becomes more directive, as formal structure becomes tighter, and as people attain increasing maturity. Both Argyris and McGregor argued that management practices were inconsistent with employee needs, and that this conflict produced resistance and withdrawal. Both believed that managers misinterpreted employee behavior to mean that something was wrong with the employees when in reality it was with the organization (Bolman & Deal, 1992). The efforts of these two theorists have moved in two primary directions, one focusing on the individual and the other on the organization.

Because the Scientific Management and Human Relations theories minimized both the impact of social relations or formal structure, Barnard in the 1930s and Simon in the

1940s/50s added perspectives drawn from psychology, sociology, political sciences, and economics (Simon, 1945), and called it the Behavioral Management theory. This added the political dimension to organizational theories.

Political Perspective Organizational Theory

The Political Perspective Theory proposed that the leadership of an organization should be viewed as control centers with power to determine which organizational goals were established and achieved (Simon, 1945). This understanding of the alliances of individuals and special interest groups who share the organizations' limited resources added an important perspective. Burns (1978) noted the following:

We must see power—and leadership—as not things but as *relationships*. We must analyze power in a context of human motives and physical constraints. If we can come to terms with these aspects of power, we can hope to comprehend the true nature of leadership—a venture far more intellectually daunting than the study of naked power. (p. 11)

Cultural Perspective and Symbolic Organizational Theory

The *structural*, *political*, and *human resource* theories utilized different analytical approaches for describing an organization (Bolman & Deal, 1997), but each of these theories of practice failed in its own way to render a comprehensive view of the organization and its rich, subjective life. In contrast, the *cultural perspective/symbolic* theory assumed that human beings create symbols to resolve confusion, increase predictability, or provide direction in organizations. Over time, these symbols and the behaviors representing them integrate into culture. In the 1980s scholars began paying serious attention to this concept (Deal & Kennedy, 1982; Ouchi, 1981; Pascale & Athos,

1981; Peters & Waterman, 1982). For example, Schein (1985) defined organizational culture as

a pattern of basic assumptions—invented, discovered, or developed by a given group as it learns to cope with its problems of external adaptation and internal integration—that has worked well enough to be considered valid and, therefore, to be taught to new members as the correct way to perceive, think, and feel in relation to these problems. Organizational cultures (*culture* refers to those elements of an organization that are most stable and least malleable) are created and sometimes even destroyed as decisive functions of leadership. (p. 9)

According to several organizational theorists, there is a great need to construct a cultural analysis of educational leadership as an alternative to the inherent pursuit of behavioral science (Bates, 1980, 1981; Foster, 1980; Giroux, 1981; Greenfield, 1979, 1980). They suggest that understanding school organizational culture can be most useful in solving complex aspects of school life. This understanding cannot be obtained by the use of superficial definitions, but by being familiar with the dynamics of the organizational culture of schools. School leaders would be less puzzled when they encountered the unfamiliar and seemingly irrational behavior of people in their organizations. They would be less puzzled over the resistance to change (Drucker, 1999, Schein, 1992) if they understood the *symbolic* concepts undergirding the organizational phenomena. Bolman and Deal (1991) felt that the symbolic orientation explained many of these dynamics.

All of the organizational theories described above served as a springboard for the Systems Approach to organizational understanding. This theory holds that organizations are open systems—open to external environments. At times, both the organization and the environment may approach chaos, depending upon the viability of the fit between the organization and the environment. Structures, relationships, and processes must be

responsive to change—even proactive. Multiple orientations are necessary for understanding the multiple characteristics of organizations. As they studied organizational theory, Bergquist (1992), Birnbaum (1988), Bolman and Deal (1997), Cameron and Quinn (1999), Wheatley (1994), and others consolidated these theories into understandable models (see Table 3).

The first example is in the work of Birnbaum (1988), who created a multidimensional organizational model drawing from the four major organizational theories. The organizational characteristics that could be explained by the scientific management theory he labeled as “bureaucratic.” The organizational characteristics that could be explained by the behavioral management theory he labeled “collegial.” The organizational characteristics that could be explained by the political perspective theory he labeled “political.” And the organizational characteristics that could be explained by the symbolic or cultural theory he labeled “anarchical.”

In 1992, Bergquist maintained that the word managerial best described the scientific management aspect of organizations. He thought the word *negotiating* was better than political for the political perspective theory, and he referred to the cultural perspective/symbolic theory as developmental rather than anarchical. Bolman and Deal (1997), from an academic paradigm, thought that structural, human resource, political, and symbolic better described these organizational phenomena. Cameron and Quinn (1999), from the corporate paradigm, thought that hierarchy, clan, market, and adhocracy best described organizational phenomena (see Table 3).

The theoretical framework of Bolman and Deal was selected for this study

because, (a) of its extensive use in the field of education, and (b) the symbolic description of organizations seemed more appropriate than the other models for a faith-based educational system, whose sole reason for existence is a spiritual one. The organizational model of Bolman and Deal (1997) has been used by organizational researchers since 1984 (Bensimon, 1989; Bolman & Deal, 1984; Bowen, 2004; Davis, 1996; Durocher, 1996; Eckley, 1997; Gilson, 1994; Granell, 1999; Harlow, 1994; Hollingsworth, 1995; Martinez, 1996; Meade, 1992; Miro, 1993; Pavan & Reid, 1991; Peasley, 1992; Redman, 1991; Rivers, 1996; Shee, 2001; Strickland, 1992; Suzuki, 1994; Wilkie, 1993; Winans, 1995; Yerkes, Cuellar, & Cuellar 1992). Over this 22-year span, it has provided leaders of organizations with a multifaceted paradigm—a map.

Table 3

Organizational Theorists

Theorists	Scientific Management Theory	Behavioral Management Theory	Political Perspective Theory	Symbolic Theory
Birnbaum	Bureaucratic	Collegial	Political	Anarchical
Bergquist	Managerial	Collegial	Negotiating	Developmental
Bolman & Deal	Structural	Human Resource	Political	Symbolic
Cameron & Quinn	Hierarchy	Clan	Market	Ad hococracy

Leaders, and their boards of trustees, may have positive attitudes and great expectations, but may experience failure as a result of a poor focus or following the wrong map (Covey, 1999; Greenleaf, 2003). Mature organizations must, periodically, refocus (Cameron & Quinn, 1999). The Adventist educational system may have reached that apex, as a mature organization, where it is imperative to reassess its policies and programs. Benefits, it appears, would accrue from a reappraisal of every aspect of the organization—the structure, people, resources, and vision.

An Organizational Model

The following section briefly outlines organizational and leadership theories and the core assumptions used as the premises for Bolman and Deal's organizational orientation's model. These consolidated theories are categorized into four broad perspectives called orientations— structural, human resource, political, and symbolic.

Structural

Scientific (Classical) Management Systems theorists, such as Taylor (1911), Fayol (1949), and Weber (1949), emphasized organizational goals and roles. They looked for ways to develop organizational structures that best fit organizational purpose and the demands of the environment (McKinlay & Starky, 1998). This theory provides the basis for the structural orientation and is predicated on the following core assumptions:

1. Organizations exist primarily to accomplish established goals.
2. For any organization, a structural form can be designed and implemented to fit its particular set of circumstances.

3. Organizations work most effectively when environmental turbulence and personal preferences are constrained by norms of rationality.
4. Specialization permits higher levels of individual expertise and performance.
5. Coordination and control are essential to effectiveness.
6. Organizational problems typically originate from inappropriate structures or inadequate systems and can be resolved through restructuring or developing new systems (Bolman & Deal, 2002). See Table 4.

Human Resource

Bolman and Deal—along with Human Resource theorists such as Abraham Maslow and his Hierarchy of Needs (Maslow, 1954), Douglas McGregor with his Theory X and Theory Y (McGregor, 1960), Frederick Herzberg and his Job Satisfiers and Job Motivators (Herzberg, 1966), and Kurt Lewin with Theories of Change Management (Lewin & Cartwright, 1951), theorized that there is an interdependence between people and organizations (McKinlay & Starky, 1998). The roots of the human resource orientation are derived from these human relations and behavioral management theories. The orientation functions from the premise that the people in the organization are the most important resource. This orientation holds the following core assumptions:

1. Organizations exist to serve human needs, rather than the reverse.
2. Organizations and people need one another.
3. When the fit between the individual and the organization is poor, one or both will suffer; individuals will be exploited, or will seek to exploit the organization, or both.

4. A good fit between individual and organization benefits both; human beings find meaningful and satisfying work, and organizations get the human talent and energy that they need (Bolman & Deal, 2002). See Table 4.

Political

Bolman and Deal agree with the political theorists who regard power, conflict, and the distribution of scarce resources as the central issue in organizations. Herbert A. Simon (1945) was the forerunner in recognizing the importance of political leadership (Bates, 1980, 1981; Foster, 1980; Giroux, 1981; Greenfield, 1979, 1980) and even argued the necessity of constructing a political analysis of educational organizations. These political theorists suggested that organizations are like jungles, and that leaders need to understand and manage power, coalitions, bargaining, and conflict. Both Gamson (1990) and Baldrige (1971) focused on how much a given group or organization trusts or mistrusts existing authority as to the possibility for change. Baldrige (1971) also argues in favor of viewing schools as political organizations as opposed to collegial, bureaucratic, or purely rational systems. These theories or beliefs about power support the political orientation, which describes organizations as places where individuals use power and influence to affect the allocation of scarce resources. This orientation has its roots in political perspective theory. The following five core assumptions summarize the political orientation:

Table 4

Organizational Theories and Organizational Orientations

Organizational Theory	Orientation	Definition of the Orientation
Classical Theory Behavioral Theory	Structural	Defines organizational goals Divides people into specific roles Develops policies, rules, and a chain of command
Human Relations Theory Behavior Theory	Human Resource	Organizations serve human needs Organizations and people need each other A good fit between individual and organization benefits both
Political Perspective Theory	Political	Competition for scarce resources Conflict is expected Bargaining, coercion, and compromise are routine
Symbolic Theory Cultural Perspective Theory	Symbolic	Abandons assumptions of rationality Organizations united by values Improvements are made through symbols and myths

Note. From "Leadership and Management Effectiveness: A Multi-frame, Multi-sector Analysis," by L. G. Bolman and T. E. Deal, 1991, *Human Resource Management*, 30, 509-534.

1. Organizations are coalitions composed of varied individuals and interest groups.
2. There are enduring differences between individuals and groups in their values, preferences, beliefs, information, and perceptions of reality. Such differences change slowly, if at all.
3. Most of the important decisions in organizations involve the allocation of scarce resources—they are decisions about who gets what.
4. Because of scarce resources and enduring differences, conflict is central to

organizational dynamics, and power is the most important resource.

5. Organizational goals and decisions emerge from bargaining, negotiation, and jockeying for position among members of different coalitions (Bolman & Deal, 2002). See Table 4.

Symbolic

In the 1980s organizational scholars began paying serious attention to the concept of culture (Deal & Kennedy, 1982; Ouchi, 1981; Pascale & Athos, 1981; Peters & Waterman, 1982). From these theorists, the idea of symbolism in organizations emerged.

The Symbolic or Cultural Perspective theorists focused on problems of meaning in organizations. They were more likely to find serendipitous virtue in organizational misbehavior and to focus on the limits of leaders' abilities to create organizational cohesion through power or rational design. This theoretical construct acknowledges that school leaders may rely on the supernatural to bring some semblance of order to their organizations (Bolman & Deal, 1997; Cameron & Quinn, 1999).

This orientation has its roots in cultural perspective/symbolic orientation theory and is based on the following assumptions:

1. Importance about any event, is not what happened, but what it means.
2. Events and meanings are loosely coupled—the same event can have very different meanings for different people because of differences in the schema that they use to interpret their experience.
3. Many of the most significant events and processes in organizations are

ambiguous or uncertain—it is often difficult or impossible to know what happened, why it happened, or what will happen next.

4. The greater the ambiguity and uncertainty, the harder it is to use rational approaches for analysis, problem-solving, and decision-making.

5. Faced with uncertainty and ambiguity, human beings create symbols to resolve confusion, increase predictability, and provide direction.

6. Events and processes are more important for what they express than for what they produce. They are myths, rituals, ceremonies, and sagas that help people find meaning and order in their experience (Bolman & Deal, 2002) (see Table 4).

Bolman and Deal (1984) advocate “the use of diverse outlooks to obtain a more comprehensive understanding of organizations and a broader range of options for decision-making” (p. 185). They were not alone in their belief that the analysis of organizational phenomena is more valid when one views it from many perspectives (Cameron & Quinn, 1999; Sergiovanni, 1984, 1994).

School Leadership

The role and function of K-12 school leaders have changed substantially during the 20th century (Caldwell & Spinks, 1992; Murphy & Louis, 1994; Odden, 1995). In the early 1900s, school leaders were concerned primarily with instructional problems, such as the grade placement of pupils, determination of courses of study, and supervision of instruction. They paralleled the classical management theory of Frederick Taylor (1911), Fayol (1949), and Weber (1949), and their followers who believed that the design of tasks

within the school organization was based on precise scientific study and measurement. Tasks were to be clearly defined routines. This belief and practice also impacted how teachers were taught and treated, and how they guided instruction and learning for students. These beliefs and practices correspond to the structural orientation in that school leaders recognize the need for order and structure in their schools, providing a foundation for the multiple ways of looking at things (Bolman & Deal, 1997).

During the 1930s, the employment of a full-time school administrator became commonplace in the nation's public school system. These school leaders filled their days with the activities, responsibilities, and techniques necessary to carry out policies established by school boards and district supervisors.

During the human relations movement, from about 1935-1950, school leaders emphasized group cohesiveness, collaboration, and organizational dynamics (Owens, 1970). During the decade of the 1950s, the emphasis shifted to the work behavior in organizations (Durocher, 1996) and coincided with the behavioral theory period (Argyris, 1957; Follett, 1918; Maslow, 1954; McGregor, 1960). School leaders then focused on efficiency, attention to detail, job descriptions, and general accountability (Owens, 1970). By the early 1960s, the role of the principal or school leader had again shifted to making great teaching possible within schools. In so doing, the boundaries of the school leader were pushed from that of policy enforcer to that of facilitator and leader (Fullan, 1993). By the 1980s the principal had emerged as the one who set the focus, direction, philosophy, and tone of effectiveness within his or her school (Fullan, 1993). Now, in order to be an effective school leader, the principal needed a wide knowledge base of

educational programing and organizational skills (Drake & Roe, 2002).

Peter Northouse, in his book *Leadership: Theory and Practice*, described school leadership as “a process whereby an individual influences a group of individuals to achieve a common goal” (Northouse, 1997, p. 3). He further stated that school leaders are “emotionally active” and involved in their schools—they care about what they do. “They seek to shape ideas instead of responding to them, and act to expand the available options to long-standing problems. School leaders often change the way people think about what is possible” (Northouse, 1997, p. 3). These statements correspond to the human resource orientation—they care about what they do, and the symbolic orientation—they seek to shape ideas instead of responding to them.

School leaders come to their positions with varied backgrounds, personalities, and experiences. Not only do these factors play a role in their ability to lead, but their professional experiences and circumstances do as well. Various organizational orientation research shows that leader characteristics (personal and professional variables) may affect orientations (Beck, 1994; Benson & Donahue, 1990; Bolman & Deal, 1997; Bowen, 2004; Granell, 1999; Sarros, 1998; Shakeshaft, 1989). It is for this reason that we will not only be looking at Adventist school leaders’ organizational orientations but also the relationship if any to their personal variables of age, gender, and experience, and their professional variables of grade levels served, highest educational attainment, enrollment served, parental support, faculty support, school board support, peer support, pastoral support, conference support, feelings of success, and overall job satisfaction.

A number of studies have examined the leadership orientations of secondary public

school principals (Davis, 1996; Durocher, 1996; Eckley, 1997; Gilson, 1994; Harlow, 1994; Miro, 1993; Peasley, 1992) and elementary school principals (Martinez, 1996; Meade, 1992; Pavan & Reid, 1991; Strickland, 1992; Suzuki, 1994), yet few have investigated a private school system with a sophisticated theoretical framework.

Personal Variables

The following personal variables have been included in the study. Shee (2001), who examined K-12 school leaders' organizational orientations and religiosity in a Seventh-day Adventist school system, included the personal variables of gender and years of leadership experience. Expanding the number of personal variables to include age and different types of experience may contribute to the body of knowledge because school leaders of different ages and experiences will naturally view their school organizations differently.

Age

Age is an important personal variable because employees of any organization usually vary in age. In studies of organizational orientations, younger administrators tended to be evaluated by others as rating higher in the structural orientation, while seeing themselves as less structural. This may occur because younger managers follow the models they have witnessed, yet their need for control is felt by their subordinates until they learn from experience that this approach does not always work. The younger administrators also tended to be more political, more focused on mobilizing people, whereas more senior administrators put more emphasis on relationships with others

(Granell, 1999). On the basis of this literature, age was identified as an important demographic variable and included in the survey instrument.

Gender

Gender has long been a factor in many aspects of human existence such as child-rearing, voting rights, military participation, and the workforce. Many people take for granted that most people, male and female, will hold down a job for much of their lives. But technological and industrial change has played a major role in what kinds of jobs are available to men and women (Figart, Mutari, & Power, 2002). Gender issues in educational leadership have only recently come to the forefront of research as a result of the increase in females in administrative positions (Flak, 1998). Now that similar jobs are available for both genders, the literature indicates that men and women school leaders approach and experience their work differently (Beck, 1994; Sernak, 1998; Shakeshaft, 1989; Smulyan, 2000).

There have been a number of school leadership organizational orientation studies that have included gender as a personal variable (Davis, 1996; Durocher, 1996; Eckley, 1997; Flak, 1998). All of these studies substantiate Bolman and Deal's findings that women are more likely than men to report using the human resource, symbolic, and political orientations, and that women report using all four orientations more often than men, who reported using one or two orientations more frequently (Bolman & Deal, 1990). On the basis of this literature review, gender was identified as an important demographic variable to be included in a study of orientations within the Seventh-day Adventist

educational context.

Experience Variables

Research has confirmed that less experienced principals approach and experience their work challenges differently than do more experienced principals (Greller & Stroh, 1995; Roberts, 1991; Sarros, 1998).

In a report televised on National Television on July 2004, the District of Columbia Public School System (DCPS) reported spending \$15,000 a year per student and yet the students scored the lowest in the nation on standardized tests. The April 1982 decision to eliminate principal tenure (because the school district hoped to preserve the public welfare and simultaneously improve local school management) seems to have accomplished just the opposite. Research was designed to investigate the relationship of principal tenure to leadership performance. One-third of all principals in the elementary, junior high, middle, senior high, career education, special education, and state schools were randomly selected to participate in the study. Twenty percent of the teachers in the District of Columbia Public Schools were randomly selected to evaluate their principals' performances on a 54-item evaluation instrument (this instrument is used by the assistant superintendents to evaluate principal performance on a yearly basis). A *t* test was used to determine significant differences between tenured and non-tenured principals relative to select demographic characteristics including age, gender, academic level, years of experience, and years in present position. An Analysis of Variance was used to test for interaction effects between tenure and academic levels. The tenured principals were rated significantly

higher than non-tenured principals by teachers in all categories of evaluation—educational leadership, management ability, communications, professional growth and personal traits. The only three demographic variables of significance were age, years of experience, and years in present position (Pinkney-Maynard, 1986).

One study by Harlow (1994) disputes the view that years of experience directly affect the number of orientations used. However, the majority of research demonstrates that there is a significant difference between experience and multiple-oriented leadership (Bensimon, 1989; Neumann, 1989). The implications drawn from this knowledge, as well as from a growing body of knowledge within the field of organizational theory, are important and far-reaching. With an increased understanding of school leaders' organizational orientations comes an increased understanding of the organization. The decision to include three experience variables (years of professional experience, years of experience as a school leader, and years of experience in current job) was made to examine the experienced school leaders' organizational orientation(s), as compared to the orientation(s) of their less experienced counterparts. On the basis of this literature review that explored the organizational orientations of school leaders, experience was identified as an important demographic variable and included in the survey instrument.

Professional Variables

A 1998 study, commissioned by the National Association of Elementary School Principals (NAESP, 1998) and a 2000 study commissioned by the National Association of Secondary School Principals (NASSP, 1998), illustrates not only a shortage of qualified

school leaders, but suggests several reasons as to why the pool of qualified school leader candidates is so limited. These included a lack of systematic recruitment of quality applicants, job stress, societal problems, time commitments, accountability, responsibility, salary/compensation, and lack of tenure (NAESP, 1998; NASSP, 1998). Since there has been little organizational research conducted among elementary or secondary school leaders in regard to orientation use and experience variables, grade levels served, educational attainment, enrollment, and support, these variables were included in this study.

Grade Levels Served

In the Seventh-day Adventist educational system, most school leaders serve in a multi-grade environment (Columbia Union Conference, 1999). Traditionally, elementary school leaders will have a classroom they are responsible for and serve as the administrator for the school. In the secondary schools, Adventist leaders may teach one or two classes in addition to their administrative duties. There may be significant differences in the orientations of elementary school leaders versus secondary school leaders for multiple reasons.

1. Elementary school leaders are trained differently than secondary school leaders.
2. Elementary school leaders may serve one or more churches, but the secondary school leader serves multiple churches and an entire conference.
3. Different professional development opportunities are available to the two groups.

4. Elementary school organization is overseen by the local conference but the secondary system is overseen by the union conference (Columbia Union Conference, 1999).

Highest Educational Attainment

The educational attainment of Adventist school leaders as it relates to leadership orientations has not been studied. In the Adventist educational system, it is possible to become a school leader while still working on a bachelor's degree. Benson and Donahue (1990) report that 97% of the school leaders in the public sector and 69% of those in private sector have a master's degree or higher. Benson and Donahue, in that same report, indicate that only 54% of the Adventist school leaders have a master's degree or higher. School leaders of Adventist K-12 schools are not as well-educated as their counterparts in American public education (Benson & Donahue, 1990). One of the recommendations from the Valuegenesis Report IV was to encourage school leaders to obtain advanced academic degrees (Rice & Gillespie, 1993).

Enrollment

While enrollment is declining in the K-12 Adventist educational system, no study has been done to see whether there is a relationship between the school leader's organizational orientation and enrollment. For example, do multi-oriented school leaders serve a larger enrollment than do single or non-oriented school leaders? A study conducted by Durocher (1996) of effective school administrators (as identified in the February 1993 issue of *The Executive Educator* found that there was no significant

correlation between district enrollment and school leader's orientation(s).

Support Variables

Six sources of support—parents, faculty, school board, other school leaders, pastor(s), and from the local conference educational personnel—are included in the professional context variable.

A number of researchers (Gmelch et al., 1994) have examined the impact of variables of peer support (support from other school leaders) and support from supervisors (support from the local conference educational personnel) on stress and burnout among school leaders. As part of a church-sponsored school system, the Adventist school leader has a distinct relationship with the constituent church pastor, and must rely on him/her for support. Pastoral support is an important element for successful school leaders. In a 1987 study, Adventist school leaders perceived pastoral support for the Adventist schools to be very low as compared to other constituent groups (Rice, 1987). Since then, a more positive trend appears to have occurred. According to Valuegenesis Report IV report, 38% of school leaders felt that pastoral support of the school was excellent and another 36% found it to be good. Only 26% found it poor or fair (Rice & Gillespie, 1993).

Parental support, as well as pastoral support, is also very important. According to the Valuegenesis Report IV, 84% of the school leaders rated parental support as good or excellent (Rice & Gillespie, 1993).

Feelings of Success

Donaldson and Hausman (1998), in a study of 464 active school principals, found that a large majority of these state of Maine principals felt successful in their jobs despite the stressful conditions they encountered. Other researchers have found that feelings of success or accomplishment are related to job satisfaction and burnout (Bacharach & Mitchell, 1983; Gmelch et al., 1994). It was important to examine this professional variable, because feelings of success are frequently related to job satisfaction and burnout, and job satisfaction and burnout are usually deciding factors in school leader tenure. On the basis of this literature review that explored the organizational orientations of school leaders, feelings of success were identified as an important professional variable and included in the survey instrument.

Job Satisfaction

Job satisfaction can be defined as an internal indicator of gratifying feelings with the performance in one's job (Morehead, 1995). "It represents the individual worker's appraisal of the extent to which the work environment fulfills his or her requirements" (Dawis & Lofquist, 1984, p. 55). In a survey study conducted among 183 high-school principals in Virginia, findings suggested that school leaders were least satisfied with their level of compensation and most satisfied with being of service to others (Stemple, 2004).

A 1983 study of 46 superintendents and 95 K-12 public school principals from school districts in New York state was conducted. A role-specific analysis of the sources of dissatisfaction among school leaders was examined. Bacharach and Mitchell (1983)

conceptualized their study to conclude that “performance precedes satisfaction and that sources of satisfaction are those factors that enhance task completion” (p. 106). This led to the conclusion that “the practical implications lie not in telling school leaders how to do their jobs, but in being able to specify the conditions under which it will be possible to do their jobs more effectively” (Bacharach & Mitchell, 1983, p. 106).

As part of a 2001 research study designed by Public Agenda (a nonpartisan opinion and civic engagement research company), questionnaires were mailed to 2,500 superintendents and 4,000 principals. The process netted responses from 853 superintendents, for a response rate of 34%, and 909 principals, for a response rate of 23%. This random sample of school leaders was drawn from a comprehensive list of public school leaders. In the qualitative portion of the research, 22 individual interviews were conducted with school leaders and other educational experts. One focus group was conducted with school leaders in Ohio. Findings indicate that in spite of all the concerns these school leaders expressed, the large majority of school leaders gain deep satisfaction from their jobs and would choose the same line of work again if offered the chance. The majority of these school leaders had 5 or more years of experience in their role. They were confident that they could make a difference, even in the toughest of schools (Farkas, Johnson, Duffett, & Foleno, 2001). This is in contrast to a 1993 study of Adventist educators indicating that only 24% are “very satisfied” with their current teaching jobs (Rice & Gillespie, 1993). It has been well documented that thriving schools have long-term leadership (Adams, 2002; Farkas et al., 2001). And on the basis of this literature review that explored the organizational orientations of school leaders, job satisfaction was

identified as an important professional variable and included in the survey instrument.

Related Research

A number of researchers have reported on school leadership orientations (Durocher, 1996; Meade, 1992; Miro, 1993; Pavan & Reid, 1991; Peasley, 1992; Shee, 2001; Strickland, 1992; Suzuki, 1994; Yerkes et al., 1992).

A study conducted by Elizabeth Durocher (1996) compared the leadership orientations of 70 effective school administrators who were identified in the February 1993 issue of *The Executive Educator* with administrators studied by Miro (1993), Suzuki (1994), Redman (1991), Strickland (1992), Meade (1992), Peasley (1992), Gilson (1994), and Bolman and Deal (1991). Durocher (1996) discovered these effective school leaders showed the highest use of the political and symbolic orientations and the lowest use of the structural orientation compared with the administrators studied by the other researchers. What makes this group stand out from other administrators studied was the high to moderately high use of all the organizational orientations. Durocher's research indicates that the use of multiple orientations is, in part, responsible for the success of these effective school administrators.

Two other studies, Meade (1992) and Peasley (1992), concluded that the most dominant leadership orientation of 243 high school and 265 elementary public school principals was the human resource orientation. These studies also found the symbolic orientation was used the least. These results corresponded to Bolman and Deal's research, and indicated that the very orientations needed to be an effective leader are used the least

by these school leaders.

Pavan and Reid (1991) conducted a study of five elementary public school principals in Philadelphia to determine the organizational orientations held by these administrators. They used the Principal Instructional Management Scale and the Leadership Orientations survey. Each of the principals had served a minimum of 2 years in their current school. The schools had student enrollments of 382 to 816 with minority populations of 16% to 100%. The results showed that one principal used the structural orientation, three used a human resource orientation, and one used a combination of structural, human resource, political, and symbolic orientation. The authors noted that use of the political orientation was surprisingly low in these urban schools.

The study of leadership orientations of 178 public high-school principals in California, by Miro (1993), found that administrators used the structural and human resource orientations more than the political or symbolic orientations. Results were similar to Bolman and Deal (1991), Meade (1992), Peasley (1992), and Pavan and Reid (1991).

Redman (1991), in a study of 106 American and Japanese administrators, found both groups of administrators rated themselves on the Leadership Orientations (Self) survey as having used the human resource orientation the most, followed by structural and symbolic orientations. The political orientation was used the least.

Strickland (1992) conducted a study of 91 Tennessee public school superintendents to determine which leadership orientations were used by these administrators. In their self-ratings on the Leadership Orientations (Self) survey they perceived themselves as using the human resource orientation the most, followed by the

structural orientation. The symbolic orientation was perceived as being used the least by these superintendents.

The findings of Suzuki (1994) contrasted with Bolman and Deal (1991), Meade (1992), Peasley (1992), and Pavan and Reid (1991) in the number of administrators using multiple orientations. Suzuki (1994) studied the self-perceptions of 124 Asian-American K-12 principals using the Leadership Orientations (Self) Survey. The results from this research found that 49% of the principals used multiple leadership orientations with 12% of those having used all four orientations. Thirty-one percent had a primary leadership orientation. The remaining 20% were identified as having dual leadership orientations.

The organizational orientation research of Bolman and Deal (1984, 1991), Pavan and Reid (1991), Redman (1991), Peasley (1992), Meade (1992), Strickland (1992), Yerkes et al. (1992), and Miro (1993) indicated that educators typically do not see the world from a political orientation. This is not beneficial to school organizations because other researchers have found schools to be highly political arenas (Wilkie, 1993).

In a study of three schools that participated in a school-improvement initiative carried out by the Board of Education of the City of New York (sponsored by the Fund for New York City Public Education and IBM), Wilkie (1993) used Bolman and Deal's framework (1984, 1997) to analyze the conflict among key participants—IBM managers, school administrators, and school-based management/shared decision-making teams. Using observations, document analysis, interviews and follow-up interviews, and observations conducted 1 year later, Wilkie's findings suggested that controversy and factionalism among team members, who viewed their concerns from the political

orientation, was the greatest barrier to the implementation of IBM's structural methods. Wilkie (1993) asserts that the structural approach of the business community must be merged with the more political process of the school community.

In another leadership orientation's study about 280 K-12 Adventist school leaders (Shee, 2001), the findings indicated that the human resource orientation was the primary leadership orientation. The structural orientation was second, while the symbolic and political orientations were used the least. About 53% of the school leaders were multi-oriented and reported using two or more orientations "often or always" and approximately 43% were not. Female school leaders reported the use of the human resource orientation more than their male counterparts. Results of this study suggest that the human resource and structural orientations play a significant role in the way Seventh-day Adventist K-12 school leaders operate. However, their hesitant usage of the symbolic and political orientations needs further investigation, since Bolman and Deal's model of reframing leadership recommends effective utilization of all four orientations.

In sum, the review of selected Adventist and public K-12 leadership orientation studies provides similar findings. In general, most school leaders are human resource oriented. Faculty members in higher education may contribute to this phenomena (Yerkes et al., 1992) by predominantly teaching in the human resource orientation. In contrast, the studies of effective school administrators by Durocher (1996) indicated that successful school leaders showed the highest use of the political and symbolic orientations and the lowest use of the structural orientation, and that these effective school leaders were multi-oriented. This research would suggest that the use of multiple orientations is, in part,

responsible for the success of these effective school leaders.

On the basis of this literature review, which dealt with Adventist and public K-12 school leaders' organizational orientations and personal and professional variables, it seemed appropriate to include the following items on the survey: (a) age, (b) gender, (c) years of professional experience, (d) years of school leadership experience, (e) years of experience at current job, (f) grade levels served, (g) highest level of educational attainment, (h) enrollment, (i) support from parents, (j) support from faculty, (k) support from school board, (l) support from pastor(s), (m) support from conference personnel, (n) feelings of success, (n) job satisfaction, and (o) questions concerning organizational orientations. An understanding of the orientations, along with the personal and professional variables of Adventist K-12 school leaders, will provide a better understanding of the Adventist educational organization.

Summary

Views on leadership theory, organizational theory, and school leadership have developed over time. Although the scientific study of leadership somewhat reflects organizational theory development, the views are only loosely connected. Because of the recent emphasis on leadership effectiveness within organizations, a merger of organizational theory and leadership theory has led to a constructivist (organizational) approach.

Bolman and Deal (1984, 1991, 1997, 2002) consolidated these theories (organizational and leadership) into four broad orientations—structural, human resource,

political, and symbolic. By doing this, these scholars have provided a theoretical framework to provide leaders with an understanding of their organizations.

Numerous studies indicate that there is a relationship between how leaders are oriented and their effectiveness as a leader. These studies also indicate that this relationship—orientation and effectiveness—may be affected by personal variables of age, gender, and experience; and professional variables of educational attainment, enrollment served, support, feelings of success, and overall job satisfaction. Conducting research on the leadership orientations of school leaders in the Columbia Union Conference of Seventh-day Adventists and their relationship, if any, to personal and professional variables may help give an understanding of some of the school leadership challenges.

In summary, this literature review examined leadership theory and organizational theory as it relates to the organizational leadership theoretical framework of Bolman and Deal. It then discussed the school leadership and the benefits that school leaders may achieve from using this Bolman and Deal organizational model. It also addressed the fact that leaders are affected by personal and professional variables. This chapter concluded with a look at related research.

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY AND PROCEDURES

Introduction

The purpose of this study was to investigate the leadership organizational orientations—structural, human resource, political, and symbolic—of school leaders in the Columbia Union Conference of Seventh-day Adventists educational system and their relationships to the personal variables of age, gender, experience, and the professional variables of grade levels served, highest educational attainment, enrollment, support, feelings of success, and job satisfaction. This chapter is comprised of the following sections: (a) the nature and design of the research, (b) a description of the population, (c) the instrumentation description, personal and professional variables, and validity and reliability for the instrument, (d) the procedures and data collection, (e) the data analysis of the null hypotheses, pilot study, and concludes with (f) the chapter summary.

Research Design

A survey research design was chosen in order to (a) describe the variables—orientations, personal, and professional—as they exist, and (b) attempt to determine the relationships and effects occurring between these variables. Surveys are often used in educational research because they are easy to use and can gather information

from a group of people and yet maintain anonymity (Aiken, 1997, 2002). Additional correlational analyses was used, allowing a descriptive approach to measuring relationships between more than one variable. In education, researchers are often interested in studying variables simultaneously in order to determine how they relate to one another (Isaac & Michael, 1995; McMillan & Schumacher, 2001; Wiersma, 1995). For example, they may want to know how lighting affects test scores, or whether girls do better than boys in math when teacher instruction changes.

A three-part survey instrument was used to collect data for analyzing the relationship between Columbia Union Conference school leaders' organizational orientations to personal variables of age, gender, and experience and the professional variables of grade levels served, highest educational attainment, enrollment, support, feelings of success, and job satisfaction. This survey instrument used a Likert-type scale which allowed for flexibility of expression, anonymity, privacy, greater uniformity and standardization of data (Likert, 1932). The disadvantages in using a survey instrument may include the misunderstanding of statements or questions, difficulty in interpreting scores in the middle range, and difficulty in gaining a full sense of social processes in their natural setting (Aiken, 1997, 2002; Oppenheim, 1992; Thomas, 1999). Another disadvantage is that school leaders may struggle with a self-assessment process—that of reflecting on information about themselves in order to make an informed decision (Boldt, 1996).

This survey was distributed to all school leaders at conference principal councils (a monthly meeting where all school leaders meet with their respective educational

superintendents) in the Columbia Union Conference. The responses to this survey constituted the data for the comparison of organizational orientations to personal and professional variables.

The quantitative portion was devoted to the statistical presentation of data revealed in patterns and inconsistencies, and evidenced in the hypothesized relationships between school leader organizational orientations to their personal and professional variables.

The qualitative portion of the study looked at the written comments by the participants. This captured a more complete and holistic portrait of the quantitative findings.

Description of the Population and Sample

The population for this study was the 83 school leaders who were identified in the Columbia Union Conference of Seventh-day Adventists educational system directory for the 2005-2006 school year. Of this population, 57 completed surveys were returned—a response rate of 69%. Thirty-seven respondents were from Grade 8 configured schools, and 20 respondents were from high-school-configured schools. These schools operate in eight local conferences: Allegheny East, Allegheny West, Chesapeake, Mountain View, New Jersey, Ohio, Pennsylvania, and Potomac. These conferences cover the mid-Atlantic area of the United States, which is composed of Ohio, Pennsylvania, New Jersey, Delaware, West Virginia, and Virginia.

Instrumentation

Description

The data for this study were gathered using a survey instrument consisting of demographic as well as questions regarding the orientations of the participants (see Appendix A). The survey instrument was composed of three parts. Part one contained the personal and professional demographics. Part two consisted of the Educational Leadership Orientations (Self) instrument and five questions from Dr. Thomas Harvey's Professional Vitality Scale on job satisfaction (Harvey, 2002). And part three asked the participants to write in any comments, suggestions, or concerns regarding their experience as a school leader. The final instrument was titled Organizational Orientations Survey.

Putting the demographic page first served two purposes. First, it gave the respondent easy questions to begin the survey. Second, it reduced the likelihood of the respondents forgoing the demographic data as they might have if the data page were located at the end of the survey (Dillman, 2000). The demographic portion of the survey requested the following information: age; gender; total years of experience in the field of education; years of experience in school leadership; years of experience in current job; grade levels served; highest level of educational attainment; enrollment; support from parents, faculty, school board, fellow head teachers and principals, pastors of constituent churches, and conference educational personnel; and feelings of success and job satisfaction.

Personal and Professional Variables

Research Question 2 addressed the relationship between the orientations and relevant personal variables of age, gender, and experience, and professional variables of grade levels served, highest educational attainment, enrollment, support, feelings of success, and job satisfaction of the school leaders in the Columbia Union Conference of Seventh-day Adventists. A total of 16 demographic variables was selected for this study. In any research study, a number of influencing factors may be present. In this study I considered personal and professional variables, or factors, that may impact organizational orientation of school leaders. These variables were divided into two categories. The first category—personal variables—included age, gender, total years of experience in the field of education, years of experience in school leadership, and years of experience in current job. The second category—professional context variables—included grade levels served; highest level of educational attainment; enrollment; support from parents, faculty, school board, peers (fellow head teachers and principals), pastors of constituent churches, and conference educational personnel; and feelings of success and job satisfaction. A brief description of each demographic variable follows:

Age. Webster's Dictionary defines age as "the length of time during which a being has existed" (Morehead, 1995). It is a logical marker for adult development, whether one is referring to the work of the phase theorists (e.g., Erickson, 1950, 1968; Gould, 1978; Levinson, 1986) or the stage theorists (e.g., Kegan, 1982, Kohlberg, 1984; Lovevinger, 1966). School leaders younger than or equal to 45 years of age were compared to school

leaders older than 45 years of age as to orientation use (patterns) and levels (means).

Gender. There is recognition within the literature that men and women school leaders approach and experience their work differently (e.g., Beck, 1994; Sernak, 1998; Shakeshaft, 1989; Smulyan, 2000). Gender was compared as to orientation use and orientation levels.

Years of Professional Experience. Since age is directly related to years of experience, it is logical that experience variables are similarly related to leadership orientations. School leaders with less than or equal to 20 years of professional experience were compared with school leaders with more than 20 years of professional experience as to orientation use and levels.

Years of Experience as a School Leader. This refers to the total years of experience as a head teacher, assistant principal, or principal. School leaders with less than 10 years, those between 10-20 years, and those with 20 years or more of school leadership experience were compared as to orientation use and levels.

Years of Experience in Current Job. This alludes to the total years the participant has spent employed at their current school. School leaders with less than 10 years at their current job and those with more than 10 years at their current job were compared as to orientation use and levels.

Grade Levels Served. In the Seventh-day Adventist school system, some school leaders may serve multiple grades. Many times those school leaders serving in smaller schools also teach full time (Columbia Union Conference, 1999). For this study Grade 8 configured schools (K-8, 1-8) and high-school-configured schools (K-12, K-10, 9-12)

were compared as to orientation use and levels.

Highest Level of Educational Attainment. This demographic question asked for participants to indicate their level of education. School leaders working on their Bachelor's degree, had a Bachelor's degree, or were working on a Master's degree were compared with those school leaders who had an earned graduate degree as to orientation use and levels.

Enrollment. The declining enrollment trend is one of the main concerns of the Adventist educational system. School leaders who served enrollments of less than or equal to 40 students and school leaders who served enrollments of more than 40 students were compared as to orientation use and levels.

Support. Six sources of support and assistance were included in this context variable: support from parents, faculty, peers, boards, pastors, and conference personnel. A number of researchers (Gmelch et al., 1994; Sarason, 1971; Sarros & Sarros, 1992) have examined the impact of variables of peer support, and support from supervisors on stress and burnout among school principals. Each level of support was compared as to orientation use and orientation levels.

Feelings of Success. Researchers have found that feelings of success or accomplishment are related to job satisfaction (Bacharach & Mitchell, 1983). The variable of feelings of success was compared as to orientation use and levels.

Job Satisfaction. Webster's Dictionary describes job satisfaction as the feeling of satisfaction for the accomplishment in one's job (Morehead, 1995). The Job Satisfaction Survey items imbedded in the Educational Leadership Orientations Survey (Self)–the job

satisfaction items focused on a general feeling of job satisfaction rather than on specific facets of the job—were compared to orientation use and means. Permission to use a portion of the Professional Vitality Scale on job satisfaction was granted by Dr. Thomas A. Harvey on December 20, 2005 (see Appendix B). The variable of job satisfaction was compared as to orientation use and levels.

Research Instrument

Following the demographic section, questions from the Educational Leadership Orientations (Self) instrument were presented. The Educational Leadership Orientations (Self) instrument was developed in the 1980s by Terrence E. Deal and Lee G. Bolman.

Dr. Terrence Deal has taught at Harvard, Stanford, Peabody, and Vanderbilt, and now teaches at the University of Southern California, Keck School of Medicine in Los Angeles, California. Dr. Lee G. Bolman, who previously taught at Harvard, is currently the Leadership Chair at Marion Bloch School of Business and Public Administration at the University of Missouri-Kansas City. Bolman and Deal (1991) reported, “Our survey instrument is constructed on the assumption that [leaders’] behavior mirrors their theories for action” (p. 514). They assume, for example, that leaders cannot demonstrate consistent patterns of political sophistication in their behavior unless their mental maps contain corresponding political elements. Bolman and Deal (1984, 1991) argue that: (a) organizational orientations can be measured, (b) any organization possesses parts of each orientation, but some orientations will be central, and (c) individuals have dominant orientations just as organizations do.

Validity for the Orientation Scale

To determine the content validity of the Leadership Orientation (Self) Survey, thus making sure that the survey instrument would measure what it was designed to measure (Oppenheim, 1992; Sax, 1997; Thomas, 1999), Bolman and Deal (1991) followed this procedure: The items for each scale were selected from a larger pool (of questions) generated by the authors and their colleagues. The instrument was then sent to other colleagues selected on the basis of their knowledge, training, and experience in organizational leadership. These colleagues were asked if in their judgment each item measured the organizational orientation it was intended for. They also evaluated the instrument for clarity and understandability.

Reliability for the Orientation Scale

The reliability of an instrument is a measure of its consistency or stability, the extent to which it gives consistent measures of given behaviors or constructs (Pedhazur & Schmelkin, 1991).

The Leadership Orientation (Self) Survey instrument was pilot tested on populations of both students and managers to assess the internal reliability of each scale. The instrument is now in its fourth iteration, and internal reliability is very high. Cronbach's alpha for each orientation measure ranges between 0.91 and 0.93 (see Table 5).

Table 5

Leadership Orientations Reliability Analysis

Orientation	Number of Survey Items	Gamblin's Alpha (<i>n</i> =56)	Bolman and Deal's Alpha (<i>n</i> =1,309)
Structural	8	0.728	0.920
Human Resources	8	0.796	0.931
Political	8	0.712	0.913
Symbolic	8	0.712	0.931
Total	32	0.737	0.920

Note. Bolman and Deal's data were computed from 1,309 peer responses on the Leadership Orientations (Self) survey.

Validity and Reliability for Job Satisfaction Subscale

A component of Dr. Thomas Harvey's (personal communication, May 7, 2005) dissertation was to develop a valid and reliable scale to measure professional vitality; a subset of the scale consisted of five questions on job satisfaction. With Dr. Harvey's permission, the job satisfaction subset was inserted into the Organizational Orientations Survey used in the present research.

To determine validity of the Professional Vitality Scale, Dr. Harvey (personal communication, May 7, 2005) had eight members of the Educational Leadership department at the University of Maine compare his instrument with a page of subscale descriptors and definitions. They were asked to match each item with the subscale they believed was being measured. Five of the eight responded. Results of this exercise offered strong support for the face validity of the scale. Respondents identified 88% (22/25) for

job satisfaction. Dr. Thomas Harvey then surveyed 185 public school principals from Maine. Data collected from the Maine elementary principals were used to further examine the reliability and validity of the job satisfaction subscale. Four statistical procedures were employed to accomplish this.

First, according to Harvey (personal communication, May 7, 2005), Cronbach's alpha was calculated to establish that the items within the job satisfaction subscale measured the same phenomenon. Item-total correlations and reliability estimates, if the item was deleted, are shown in Table 6. He states that "the job satisfaction subscale proved to be most internally consistent and reliable with an $\alpha = 0.84$ " (p. 72).

Second, correlational analysis was used to reveal the strength of the relationship in each of the dummy items to the subscales. Third, a factor analysis of the professional vitality scale items was conducted. Fourth, simple correlational analysis was used to reveal relationships among the various professional vitality subscales (Harvey, 2002).

Table 6

Job Satisfaction Reliability Analysis

Variable	Number of Survey Items	Gamblin's Alpha ($n=56$)	Harvey's Alpha ($n=185$)
Job Satisfaction	5	0.832	0.840

Note. The data in column 3 are from the *Professional Vitality and the Principalship: A Construct Validity Study*, by T. A. Harvey, 2002, doctoral dissertation, University of Maine, Portland. Harvey's data were computed from 185 public elementary school principals from Maine on the Professional Vitality and Role Stress Scale.

Pilot Study

As a result of a qualitative research class taught by Dr. Shirley Freed for Andrews University, and the University's purpose to provide an education relevant to one's profession, I was allowed to do a pilot study in anticipation of a dissertation topic. This study was conducted in the Chesapeake Conference of Seventh-day Adventists—the fourth largest school system in the Columbia Union Conference. It includes 15 schools in Maryland, 1 school in Delaware, and 2 schools in West Virginia.

After receiving appropriate permissions from the Andrews University Institutional Review Board, the Columbia Union Conference, and the Chesapeake Conference of Seventh-day Adventists, I sent out the pilot survey instrument to the 18 school leaders, and 67% responded. According to Babbie (1973), a response rate of at least 50% is adequate for analysis and reporting. While no clear patterns of concern emerged in the responses as to the clarity of the instrument, upon working with the research questions and the data collected, the following corrections were made to the survey instrument:

1. The survey portion “What my local school board practices and values” was deleted.
2. It was decided to delete the Leadership Styles portions because of low reliability.
3. Questions were included from Dr. Thomas Harvey's Professional Vitality survey on job satisfaction.
4. It was decided to limit the demographic questions and put them at the beginning

of the survey.

Based on descriptive analysis and qualitative procedures, a profile was developed for the Chesapeake Conference school leaders (see Appendix D). This pilot study was designed to evaluate the clarity of the instrument and the logistics of administering the survey.

Procedures and Data Collection

This section includes information as to procedures and data collection. First, permission was obtained to conduct the study. It was then decided to do a census of all the school leaders in the Columbia Union Conference using a survey-type instrument. The following describe how the survey was distributed, collected, and analyzed.

1. Bolman and Deal were contacted for permission to use their Leadership Orientation (Self) research instrument. Permission was granted (see Appendix B), with the stipulations that the instrument was to be used for research purposes only and that the findings would be shared with them. The survey instrument was pilot tested in 2004 among the 18 school leaders in the Chesapeake Conference.

Dr. Thomas Harvey was contacted for permission to use the job satisfaction portion of his Professional Vitality and Role Stress Scale (see Appendix B).

2. Permission to conduct the study was granted by the Institutional Review Board at Andrews University (see Appendix B). The Columbia Union Conference of Seventh-day Adventists Educational Department (see Appendix B) endorsed the study and granted permission to do the research among the school leaders in the Columbia Union

Conference. Initial contact was made with Dr. Hamlet Canosa, vice-president for the Columbia Union Conference of Seventh-day Adventists. He facilitated the process by giving each of the conference educational superintendents a survey packet with a cover letter and instructions for conducting the surveys. These surveys were given to the school leaders at their next principals' council.

3. Follow-up was conducted by e-mails and telephone calls. These contacts served to (a) review and solidify the questionnaire procedures, and (b) gave notification of specific times for survey implementation (during principal councils in each conference).

4. A cover letter (see Appendix B) explaining the purpose of the study and the procedures for filling out the survey and how to submit it was included in the packet for the school leaders. All school leaders were contacted by e-mail or phone in the month of March 2006. Toward the end of May 2006, school leaders were again reminded to send their completed surveys to Andrews University. One conference chose not to participate.

5. All completed surveys were sent to Dr. Jimmy Kijai of the Leadership Department of Andrews University, Berrien Springs, Michigan. This was done to ensure anonymity. The surveys were then repackaged and sent to me for processing.

To determine the organizational orientations of the school leaders in the Columbia Union Conference, a survey was given to each school leader at a regularly scheduled principals' council in the spring of 2006 (see Appendix D). Permission to use the Educational Leadership Orientations (Self) instrument in this study was obtained from Lee Bolman on September 2, 2002.

The respondents were evaluated in the following manner. A mean score was

obtained from a Likert-type scale with the following assigned values: 1=*Never*, 2=*Occasionally*, 3=*Sometimes*, 4=*Often*, and 5=*Always*. Each item from the survey was categorized into one of the four orientations (Bolman & Deal, 1990). Items 1, 6, 11, 16, 21, 26, 30, and 34 were summed, and the mean of the responses was the measure of the structural orientation for that school leader. Items 2, 7, 12, 17, 22, 27, 31, and 35 were summed, and the mean of the responses was a measure of the human resource orientation for that school leader. Items 3, 8, 13, 18, 23, 28, 32, and 36 were summed, and the mean of the responses was the measure of the political orientation for that school leader. Items 4, 9, 14, 19, 24, 29, 33, and 37 were summed, and the mean of the responses was the measure of the symbolic orientation for that school leader. Items 5, 10, 15, 20, and 25 were the job satisfaction questions incorporated into the survey from Dr. Thomas A. Harvey's professional vitality scale.

Organizational orientation is operationally defined as a mean rating of 4.0 or higher for the items of a given orientation in Section II. The total scores of all school leaders in each of the eight conferences in the Columbia Union were tabulated. Following the examples of other organizational researchers such as Bolman and Deal (1992), Chang (2004), Crist (1999), and Mathis (1999), these school leaders were then re-grouped by orientation—undefined, single orientation, paired orientation, or multi-orientation—and compared to the variables, age, gender, years of professional experience, years of experience as a school leader, years of experience in current job, grade levels served, highest educational attainment, enrollment, parental support, faculty support, peer support, school board support, pastoral support, conference personnel support, feelings of

success, and job satisfaction.

If a survey response for Section II had two or more missing values for one or more of the organizational orientations, the survey was not included in the study. The rationale was that if a survey had two or more missing values, this 25% of missing data would jeopardize the validity and accuracy of the organizational orientation score (Howell, 2004). One survey was dropped because the respondent did not answer two of the political orientation questions.

Data Analysis of the Null Hypotheses

For the purpose of follow-up, each survey was coded with a number representing the conference of origination. The conference educational superintendents of the conferences were contacted if surveys were not received from their conference. This ensured that every conference was given opportunity to be represented in the study.

The data obtained from the returned surveys were processed using the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) 14.0 for Windows and analyzed by the use of descriptive statistics (mean scores, standard deviations, frequencies, crosstabs), *t* tests, analysis of variance (ANOVA), and test of correlation coefficient. Null hypotheses for orientation use were tested at an alpha level of 0.05. Null hypotheses for orientation levels were tested at an alpha level of .05/4 or .01, with the exception of the null hypotheses for orientation levels and the support variables, which were tested at an alpha level of 0.05.

For each hypothesis two basic types of relationships were examined, first the relationship to orientation use, and then to orientation level. Chi Square analyses were

used to examine the relationships to orientations use in Research Question 2, Hypotheses 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5 and Research Question 3 and Hypotheses 1, 2, and 3. The use of Chi Square analysis was an appropriate choice since it is used to test the association between two categorical variables. Spearman Rho test of correlation was best suited to examine the relationships to orientation use in Research Questions 3, Hypotheses 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, and Research Question 4, and Hypotheses 1 and 2. The Spearman Rho correlation reveals the magnitude and direction of the association between two variables that are on an interval or ratio scale. The *t* test was implemented to determine whether significant differences existed between two groups to orientation level in Research Question 2, Hypotheses 1, 2, 3, and 5, Research Question 3, and Hypotheses 1, 2, and 3. Since *t* tests compare only the mean scores of two groups on a given variable, a one-way ANOVA was used to determine whether a significant difference existed among the three groups (years of school leadership experience) to orientation level in Research Question 2, Hypothesis 4. The homogeneity of variances was tested in both the *t* test and ANOVA analyses. Canonical correlations were employed to examine the linear combination of orientation means and linear combinations of support variables to orientation levels from Research Question 3, Hypotheses 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, and Research Question 4, and Hypotheses 1 and 2. A canonical correlation is the correlation of two canonical (latent) variables, one representing a set of independent variables, the other a set of dependent variables. This provided a multivariate method for honoring the interaction of all the support variables at one time. Each Research Question generated a number of null hypotheses for testing.

Research Question 2: Are there statistically significant relationships between these

orientations as measured by the Organizational Orientations Survey and the personal variables of age, gender, and experience? This question generated null hypotheses:

1. There are no relationships between orientation and age.
2. There are no relationships between orientation and gender.
3. There are no relationships between orientation and professional experience.
4. There are no relationships between orientation and leadership experience.
5. There are no relationships between orientation and experience in current job.

Research Question 3: Are there statistically significant relationships between these orientations as measured by the Organizational Orientations Survey and the professional variables of grade levels served, highest educational attainment, enrollment, and support?

This question generated the following null hypotheses:

1. There are no relationships between orientation and grade levels served.
2. There are no relationships between orientation and educational attainment.
3. There are no relationships between orientation and enrollment.
4. There are no relationships between orientation and parental support.
5. There are no relationships between orientation and faculty support.
6. There are no relationships between orientation and school board support.
7. There are no relationships between orientation and peer support.
8. There are no relationships between orientation and pastoral support.
9. There are no relationships between orientation and conference support.

Research Question 4: Are there statistically significant relationships between these orientations as measured by the Organizational Orientations Survey and overall feelings of

success and job satisfaction? This question generated the following null hypotheses:

1. There are no relationships between orientation and feelings of success.
2. There are no relationships between orientation and overall job satisfaction.

In order to use the information generated by Research Question 5: What are the organizational leadership comments as described by the Columbia Union Conference school leaders in section III of the Organizational Orientations Survey? The following process was applied.

This process was conducted with three independent field investigators, each applying the process individually and then comparing their findings. The field investigators were selected based on their thorough understanding of the Adventist educational system and experience in qualitative research content analysis. This step in qualitative research, investigator triangulation, is used to help guard against researcher bias and misinterpretation (Creswell, 2003; Patton, 1990).

1. The material was read and compared with the analysis descriptors with the purpose of highlighting phrases or themes that indicated a specific orientation.

2. During the second reading, a record of comments was kept under each major orientation identified during the initial reading. The other concerns were then noted, and the comment's number was recorded under a miscellaneous column.

3. Based on the code of each participant, themes that were specific to different leadership orientations were also noted and compared to the other two investigators' analysis (see Appendix E). If the two analyses were not in agreement, the researcher reviewed the materials and made a decision.

Chapter Summary

This study examined the leadership orientations and relevant personal and professional variables of the school leaders in the Columbia Union Conference of Seventh-day Adventists. This was done through a self-administered Organizational Orientations Survey instrument. The answers constituted the data for a comparison of orientations of Columbia Union Conference Adventist school leaders to their personal and professional variables.

The survey instrument was pilot tested in 2004 among the 18 school leaders in the Chesapeake Conference. A response time of approximately 8 weeks was necessary to collect the survey instruments. After consulting with Dr. Hamlet Canosa, vice president of Education for the Columbia Union Conference, it was decided to administer the surveys during regularly scheduled principal councils. This was done during March, April, and May of 2006. A total of 83 surveys was handed out and 57 (69%) were returned.

Statistical analysis was performed using the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) and analyzed by the use of *t* test, analysis of variance (ANOVA), and test of correlation coefficient. Each hypothesis for orientation use was tested at an alpha level of 0.05. But two alpha levels were used in examining orientation levels (individual orientation means):

1. An alpha of 0.01 (0.05/4) was selected as the level of significance between orientation levels and the variables of age, gender, experience, grade levels served, educational attainment, and enrollment. This was done to prevent the chance of an

incorrect conclusion (by probability our test would be incorrect).

2. In my comparison between one independent variable (support or feelings/satisfaction) and one dependent variable (orientation) the alpha level remained at a 0.05 level of significance. All levels of significance were reported, since educational research commonly uses 0.05 or 0.01 as the criterion for significance levels. The write-in comments made at the end of the survey were analyzed qualitatively and are included in Appendix D.

From the data analysis, it is anticipated that the findings will be helpful to determine areas where suitable plans and strategies for improvement in school leadership, as an organizational quality, may be made in the Columbia Union Conference of Seventh-day Adventists educational system.

CHAPTER IV

PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA

Introduction

The purpose of this study was to examine the organizational orientations and their relationship to the personal variables of age, gender, and experience; and the professional variables of grade levels served, highest educational attainment, current enrollment, feelings of success, and job satisfaction of the school leaders in the Columbia Union Conference of Seventh-day Adventists. This chapter presents the major findings of the study regarding the orientations of these school leaders as measured by the Organizational Orientations Survey and the relationship to personal and professional variables.

The findings are organized according to each research question, first as organizational orientation patterns of use, and then as organization orientation levels (means). The Statistical Package for Social Sciences for Windows (version 14.0) was used for data analysis. An alpha of 0.05 was selected as the level of significance among orientation patterns of use and all the variables. Two alpha levels were used in examining orientation levels (individual orientation means):

1. An alpha of 0.01 ($0.05/4$) was selected as the level of significance between orientation levels and the variables of age, gender, experience, grade levels served,

educational attainment, and enrollment. This was done to prevent the chance of an incorrect conclusion (by probability our test would be incorrect).

2. In my comparison between one independent variable (support or feelings/satisfaction) and one dependent variable (orientation) the alpha level remained at a 0.05 level of significance. All levels of significance were reported, since educational research commonly uses 0.05 or 0.01 as the criterion for significance levels. This level is the probability that the statistic will appear by chance if the null hypothesis is true. If it is less than this probability then the null hypothesis will be rejected (Wiersma, 1995).

This chapter presents the findings from these data and is organized into the following sections: (a) description of population, (b) demographic data and profile of respondents, (c) treatment of missing values, (d) results, (e) categorizing of the quantitative and qualitative data findings, and concludes with (f) a summary of the findings.

Description of Population

The population for this study consists of the school leaders as identified in the Columbia Union Conference of Seventh-day Adventists educational system directory for the 2005-2006 school year. All eight Adventist conferences within the Columbia Union were invited to participate. These eight local conferences, Allegheny East, Allegheny West, Chesapeake, Mountain View, New Jersey, Ohio, Pennsylvania, and Potomac, are located in the mid-Atlantic region of the United States, encompassing the states of Ohio, Pennsylvania, New Jersey, Delaware, West Virginia, and Virginia.

Of those conferences invited to participate, one conference abstained. A total of 83 school leaders who attended the principals' councils between the months of March and May in the spring of 2006 were given the survey by their superintendents. Of this population, 57 completed surveys were returned—a response rate of 69%. Of the 57 respondents, 37 were from elementary school leaders, 12 were from K-10 school leaders, 4 were from K-12 school leaders, and 4 were from 9-12 school leaders (see Table 7).

Table 7

Population, and Survey Responses by Grade Levels Served (n=56)

Population	Elementary	K-10	K-12	9-12	Percentage of Sample
Conference A	5	4	1	2	21.43
Conference B	11	2	-	-	23.21
Conference C	5	-	1	1	12.50
Conference D	3	3	1	-	12.50
Conference E	2	1	-	-	3.57
Conference F	4	1	1	1	12.50
Conference G	7	1	-	-	14.29
Totals	37	12	4	4	100.00

Demographic Data and Profile of Respondents

Personal Demographic Data

The personal demographic data of this study included age, gender, and three types of experience—professional (teaching), school leadership (administration), and current job (tenure). This information is presented in Table 8.

When dividing the age group, the median was considered. School leaders who were 45 years of age or younger were compared with school leaders older than 45 years of age. Of the 54 responses to the age question, 33.3% ($n=18$) were 45 years of age or younger, 66.7% ($n=36$) were more than 45 years of age. The average age of the school leader was 49 years ($M=49.24$, $SD=8.67$). Regarding gender, of the 55 respondents, 43.6% ($n=24$) were male and 56% ($n=31$) were female.

The experience variable was divided into three types of experience: (a) professional experience—how many years of teaching experience? (b) school leadership—how many years of experience as head teacher or principle? and (c) experience at current job—the number of years the school leader had served at their current job (tenure).

1. The mean was used to divide the professional experience data into two groups, placing school leaders with less than or equal to 20 years in one group, and those with more than 20 years of experience in the second group. There were 51.8% ($n=29$) with less than or equal to 20 years of professional experience (teaching experience), and 48.2% ($n=27$) with more than 20 years of professional experience. The average number of years for professional experience (teaching) was 22 years ($M=22.04$, $SD=10.23$).

2. The mean and the median contributed to the decision to divide the school leadership experience data into three groups, those with less than 10 years of school leadership experience, those with 10 to 20 years of school leadership experience, and those with more than 20 years of school leadership experience. There were 46.3% ($n=25$) with less than 10 years of school leadership experience (administrative experience), 29.6% ($n=16$) with 10 to 20 years of school leadership experience, and 24.1% ($n=13$) with more

than 20 years of school leadership experience. The average number of years for school leadership experience was 14 years ($M=14.34$, $SD=10.23$).

3. The mean was used to divide the experience at current job data into two groups, placing school leaders with less than 10 years in one group, and those with more than or equal to 10 years of experience in the second group. There were 74.5% ($n=41$) with less than 10 years of experience at their current job (tenure), and 25.5% ($n=14$) with more than or at least 10 years of experience at their current job. The average number of years for experience at their current job was 7.6 years ($M=7.65$, $SD=7.09$) (see Table 8).

Professional Demographic Data

The professional demographic data of this study included grade levels served, highest educational attainment, current enrollment, support from parents, faculty, peers, school board, pastor(s), and conference personnel, feelings of success, and job satisfaction. This information is presented in Table 9.

Because of a desire to better understand the dynamics of Grade 8 configured (K-8, or 1-8) school leaders as compared to school leaders of high-school-configured (K-10, K-12, or 9-12) schools, it was decided to examine grade levels served using these two groups. Of the 56 respondents, 66.1% ($n=37$) served Grade 8 configuration, K-8 or 1-8 schools, and 33.8% ($n=19$) served a high-school configuration, K-10, K-12, or 9-12 schools (see Table 9).

Table 8

Personal Demographic Variables of Columbia Union School Leaders

Variable	Frequency	Percentage
Age ($n=54$)		
≤ 45 years old	18	33.3
> 45 years old	36	66.7
($M = 49.24, SD = 8.67$)		
Gender ($n=55$)		
Male	24	43.6
Female	31	56.4
Experience		
Professional ($n=56$)		
≤ 20 years	29	51.8
> 20 years	27	48.2
($M = 22.04, SD = 10.23$)		
School Leadership ($n=54$)		
< 10 years	25	46.3
10-20 years	16	29.6
> 20 years	13	24.1
($M = 14.34, SD = 11.07$)		
Current Job ($n=55$)		
< 10 years	41	74.5
≥ 10 years	14	25.5
($M = 7.65, SD = 7.09$)		

Table 9

Professional Demographic Variables of Columbia Union School Leaders

Variable	Frequency	Percentage
Grade Levels Served (<i>n</i>=56)		
K-8 or 1-8	37	66.1
K-10, K-12, or 9-12	19	33.9
Highest Educational Attainment (<i>n</i>=55)		
Bachelor's +	25	45.5
Graduate Degrees	30	54.5
Enrollment in Current School (<i>n</i>=55)		
≤ 40 students	27	49.1
> 40 students	28	50.9
Support (often or always receive support) (<i>n</i>=56)		
Parents	43	77.0
Faculty	50	91.0
School Board	42	75.0
Peers	41	80.0
Pastor(s)	30	54.0
Conference Personnel	52	93.0
Feelings of Success (often or always successful) (<i>n</i>=52)		
	45	86.54
Overall Job Satisfaction (often or always satisfied) (<i>n</i>=56)		
	38	67.86

Since school leaders may experience their leadership differently based on their education (Durocher, 1996), a comparison was made between those school leaders who had a Bachelor's degree with those school leaders who had earned graduate degrees. Fifty-five school leaders responded to the question concerning highest educational attainment, 40% ($n=22$) had less than a Master's, and 60% ($n=33$) had a Master's or higher.

Declining enrollment is one of the main concerns for the Adventist educational system. After examining the data and taking into account the definition of a small school—one or two teachers and each teacher having no more than 20 students—the groups were selected by dividing school leaders with less than or equal to 40 students from school leaders with more than 40 students. Of the 55 school leaders who responded to the question on enrollment in current school, 52.73% ($n=29$) reported their enrollment was less than or equal to 40 students, and 47.27% ($n=26$) reported their enrollment was greater than 40 students.

The support variables—parents, faculty, peers, school board, pastor(s), conference personnel, feelings of success, and job satisfaction—are meaningful because they often affect school leadership tenure. Schools with stable and long-term leadership thrive, “while those with more frequent school leadership turnover, progress, at best, by fits and starts or, at worst, flounder” (Adams, 2002, p. 12). In response to the questions of support, 56 school leaders, 77% ($n=43$), felt often or always supported by parents, 91% ($n=50$) felt often or always supported by faculty, 75% ($n=42$) felt often or always supported by the school board, 80% ($n=41$) felt often or always supported by their peers, 54% ($n=30$) felt

often or always supported by their pastor(s), and 93% ($n=52$) felt often or always supported by their conference personnel.

Of the 52 responses to the question of feelings of success (4 participants did not respond to this question), 86.54% ($n=45$) reported often or always feeling successful. Of the 56 responses to the question of overall job satisfaction, 67.86% ($n=38$) felt overall satisfied with their jobs (see Table 9).

Dealing With Missing Values

Some of the returned Organizational Orientation Surveys contained unanswered questions. In Section I, the personal demographic question most frequently left unanswered was the age question; only 54 participants responded to that question. The professional demographic question most frequently left unanswered was the feelings of success question—only 52 responded to that question. In Section II there were 37 items with eight questions on each organizational orientation and five questions on job satisfaction. If a survey response for Section II had two or more missing values for one or more of the orientations, that survey was not included in the study. The rationale was that if a survey had two or more missing values, this 25% of missing data would jeopardize the validity and accuracy of the orientation score.

Of the 57 returned surveys, there was 1 survey that had two unanswered questions concerning the *political* orientation. This survey was deleted from the study leaving a total of 56 usable surveys. There were no missing values for the human resource, structural, or symbolic orientations.

Results

Research Question 1

Research Question 1 asked: What organizational orientations---*structural, human resource, political, and symbolic*---in terms of use (patterns) and levels (means) do the Columbia Union school leaders function in, as measured by the Organizational Orientations Survey? The survey data from the 56 Columbia Union Adventist school leaders were aggregated in several ways (Bolman & Deal, 1992; Chang, 2004; Crist, 1999; Mathis, 1999; Mosser, 2000).

First, the organizational orientation level was calculated by finding the mean for each orientation—*structural, human resource, political, and symbolic* of the school leaders. Following the initial analysis for orientation levels (means), organizational orientation use was determined in the following way. A school leader with a mean score of 4.0 or higher in an organizational orientation was categorized as oriented as such. There were 46 school leader surveys that had a mean score of 4.0 or higher in a least one orientation. Next the orientation choices were analyzed. School leader scores revealed the actual use of 9 different patterns out of 16 possible patterns or combinations of orientations. These 9 patterns were subsequently categorized into four basic organizational orientations: undefined, single orientation, paired orientation, and multi-orientation.

Patterns of Organizational Orientations

The frequency distributions of the school leader's orientation use patterns are presented in Table 10. About 18% ($n=10$) of the school leaders who did not achieve a 4.00 mean score on any of their orientation questions were classified as undefined. One fourth ($n=14$) of the school leaders had a mean score of 4.00 on at least one orientation. Of these, about 18% ($n=10$) rated highest in the human resource orientation. Approximately 27% ($n=15$) had mean scores of 4.00 or higher on two (paired) orientations. Twelve (21.43%) rated highest in the structural and human resource orientations. About 30% ($n=17$) rated 4.00 or higher on three or more orientations and were classified as multi-oriented (see Table 10).

Levels of Organizational Orientations

Table 11 presents the orientation mean scores to further illustrate the school leaders' organizational orientation levels. The human resource orientation mean score rated the highest ($M=4.18$, $SD=0.38$); the structural orientation rated the second highest ($M=3.94$, $SD=0.44$); the symbolic orientation mean score rated third ($M=3.73$, $SD=0.55$); and the political orientation mean score rated the lowest ($M=3.61$, $SD=0.51$). School leaders rated the human resource orientation higher than other orientations. In contrast, they rated the political orientation lower than any other orientation. The levels for all the orientations were moderately high, suggesting that the school leaders are all somewhat oriented. The standard deviations for the school leaders did not vary much, which suggests our population was relatively homogeneous in the four organizational orientations.

Table 10

Frequency Distribution of Columbia Union School Leaders' Orientation Use (n=56)

Organizational Orientation	Frequency score ≥ 4.0	Percentage score ≥ 4.0
Undefined	10	17.86
Single orientation		
1. Structural	3	5.36
2. Human resource	10	17.86
3. Political		
4. Symbolic	1	1.79
Total single orientation	14	25.00
Paired orientations		
1. Structural-human resource	12	21.43
2. Structural-political		
3. Structural-symbolic		
4. Human resource-political	1	1.79
5. Human resource-symbolic	2	3.57
6. Political-symbolic		
Total paired orientations	15	26.79
Multiple orientations		
1. Structural-human resource-political		
2. Structural-human resource-symbolic	5	8.93
3. Structural-political-symbolic		
4. Human resource-political-symbolic	5	8.93
5. Structural-human resource-political-symbolic	7	12.50
Total multiple orientations	17	30.36

Table 11

Mean Score, Mean Score Range, and Standard Deviation of School Leaders in the Columbia Union Conference of Seventh-day Adventists (n=56)

Organizational Orientation	Mean score	Mean score range	Standard Deviation
Structural	3.94	2.50 – 4.60	0.44
Human resource	4.18	3.25 – 5.00	0.38
Political	3.61	2.38 – 4.75	0.51
Symbolic	3.73	2.50 – 4.75	0.55

To summarize the responses regarding Research Question 1, among those who reported a single orientation, the majority used the human resource orientation most frequently. The most common paired orientation was the structural and human resource. Those who rated 4.0 or higher for three or four orientations had a pattern of structural-human resource-political, or a pattern of structural-human resource-symbolic. The human resource orientation was often used in the single orientation pattern, paired with the structural orientation, and in multi-orientation combinations as well. School leaders most often believed themselves to be oriented in one particular manner—human resource—and were relatively homogeneous in the four orientations. Since organizational orientations influence leadership actions (Bolman & Deal, 2002), these results may be of importance.

Research Question 2

Research Question 2 asked: Are there statistically significant relationships between the orientation use (patterns) and levels (means) as measured by the Organizational Orientations Survey and the personal variables of age, gender, professional experience, leadership experience, and experience at current job? The following null hypothesis were tested.

1. There are no relationships between orientation and age.
2. There are no relationships between orientation and gender.
3. There are no relationships between orientation and professional experience.
4. There are no relationships between orientation and leadership experience.
5. There are no relationships between orientation and experience in current job.

Orientation Use and Personal Variables

Relationships between orientation use—undefined, single orientation, paired orientation, and multi-orientation—and each independent variable were determined using Chi-Square tests of association. Coding for the gender variable was 1.00 = male, and 2.00 = female. Coding for years of professional experience was 1.00 < or = 20 years, and 2.00 > 20 years. Coding for years of school leadership experience was 1.00 < 10 years, 2.00 = 10 to 20 years, and 3.00 > 20 years. Coding for years of experience at current job was 1.00 < or = 20 years, 2.00 > 20 years.

Table 12 presents the number and the percentage of respondents and Chi-Square analyses to examine the relationships between orientation use and selected personal

Table 12

Orientation Use and Personal Variables

Variable	Undefined orientation		Single orientation		Paired orientation		Multiple orientation	
	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%
Age (<i>n</i>=54)								
≤ 45 yrs. (<i>n</i> =18)	4	22.2	4	22.2	5	27.8	5	27.0
> 45 yrs. (<i>n</i> =36)	5	13.9	10	27.8	11	30.6	10	27.8
$(\chi^2=0.67, df=3, p=0.88)$								
Gender (<i>n</i>=55)								
Male (<i>n</i> =24)	4	16.7	6	25.0	8	33.3	6	25.0
Female (<i>n</i> =31)	6	19.4	8	25.8	8	25.8	9	29.0
$(\chi^2 = 0.40, df=3, p=0.94)$								
Professional Experience (<i>n</i>=56)								
≤20 yrs. (<i>n</i> =29)	5	17.2	5	17.2	12	41.4	7	24.1
>20 yrs. (<i>n</i> =27)	5	18.5	9	33.3	4	14.8	9	33.3
$(\chi^2 = 5.33, df=3, p=0.15)$								
School Leadership Experience (<i>n</i>=54)								
<10 yrs. (<i>n</i> =25)	4	16.0	5	20.0	8	32.0	8	32.0
10-20 yrs. (<i>n</i> =16)	4	25.0	5	31.3	6	37.5	1	6.3
>20 yrs. (<i>n</i> =13)	2	15.4	4	30.8	2	15.4	5	38.5
$(\chi^2 = 5.95, df=3, p=0.43)$								
Experience at Current Job (<i>n</i>=55)								
≤20 yrs. (<i>n</i> =41)	7	17.1	9	22.0	13	31.7	12	29.3
>20 yrs. (<i>n</i> =14)	3	21.4	5	35.7	3	21.4	3	21.4
$(\chi^2=1.50, df=3, p=0.68)$								

* $p<0.05$.

variables. The level of significance was set at $\alpha=0.05$.

Age. There were 18 respondents age 45 or younger. Of those, 10 (55%) were either multi or paired-oriented and 8 (44%) were either single-oriented or classified as undefined. Of the 36 respondents older than 45, 11 (31%) were paired-oriented, 20 (28%) either were multi or single-oriented, and 5 (14%) were classified as undefined. The relationship between age and orientation use was not statistically significant ($\chi^2=0.674$, $p>0.05$).

Gender. Interestingly, of the 24 male respondents, 8 (33%) were paired-oriented, 12 (50%) were either single- or multi-oriented, and 4 (17%) were classified as undefined. Similar to the 31 females, 9 (29%) were multi-oriented, 16 (52%) were either single- and paired-oriented, and 6 (19.4%) were classified as undefined. The relationship between gender and orientation use was not statistically significant ($\chi^2=0.401$, $p>0.05$).

Professional Experience. There were 29 school leaders with 20 years or less of professional experience. Of those, 12 (41%) were paired-oriented, 7 (24%) were multi-oriented, and 10 (34%) were either single-oriented or classified as undefined. There were 27 school leaders with more than 20 years of professional experience. Of those, 18 (67%) were either multi- or single-oriented, and 4 (33%) were paired-oriented; only 5 (19%) were classified as undefined. The relationship between professional experience and orientation use was not statistically significant ($\chi^2=5.33$, $p>0.05$).

School Leadership Experience. There were 25 school leaders with less than 10 years of school leadership experience. Of those, 16 (64%) were either multi- or paired-oriented. Five (20%) were single-oriented, and 4 (16%) were classified as undefined.

Sixteen school leaders had between 10 and 20 years of school leadership experience. Of those, only 1 (6%) was multi-oriented, 6 (38%) were paired-oriented, 5 (31%) were single-oriented, and 4 (25%) were classified as undefined. There were 13 school leaders with more than 20 years of school leadership experience. Of those, 5 (39%) were multi-oriented, 4 (31%) were single-oriented, and 4 (31%) were either paired-oriented or classified as undefined. The relationship between school leadership experience and orientation use was not statistically significant ($\chi^2=5.95$, $p>0.05$).

Experience in Current Job. There were 41 school leaders with 20 or less than 20 years of experience at their current job. Of those, 12 (29%) were multi-oriented, 13 (32%) were paired-oriented, 9 (22%) were single-oriented, and 7 (17%) were classified as undefined. Concerning the school leaders with more than 20 years of experience at their current job, six (43%) were either multi- or paired-oriented, five (36%) were single-oriented, and three (21%) were classified as undefined. The relationship between experience in current job and orientation use was not statistically significant ($\chi^2=1.50$, $p>0.05$) (see Table 12). This analysis examined the relationships between personal variables and orientation use (patterns). No statistically significant relationships were found.

Orientation Levels and Personal Variables

Table 13 presents the results from the statistical analyses of the relationships between orientation levels and the personal variables of age, gender, professional experience, school leadership experience, and experience at current job. The level of

significance was set at $\alpha=0.01$. The relationship between orientation levels (mean) and the personal variable of age (less than or equal to 45, and older than 45) are presented in Table 13.

A two-tailed t test for independent samples was computed. No significant differences were found between school leaders 45 years of age or younger ($M=3.84$, $SD=0.39$) and school leaders older than 45 years of age ($M=3.9$, $SD=0.45$) for the structural mean ($t=-1.14$, $df=52$, $p=0.26$). There was no difference between school leaders 45 years of age or younger ($M=3.84$, $SD=0.39$) and school leaders older than 45 years of age ($M=4.20$, $SD=0.38$) for the human resource mean ($t=.25$, $df=52$, $p=0.81$). There was no significant difference between those school leaders 45 years of age or younger ($M=3.80$, $SD=.45$) and those school leaders older than 45 years of age ($M=3.51$, $SD=0.51$) for the political mean ($t=2.03$, $df=36.13$, $p=.05$). There was no difference between school leaders 45 years of age or younger ($M=3.67$, $SD=0.68$) and school leaders older than 45 years of age ($M=3.66$, $SD=0.56$) for the symbolic mean ($t=-0.49$, $df=36.13$, $p=0.63$). The effect sizes were small for all four orientations supporting the suggestion that age does not play a significant role in orientation levels (see Table 13).

Table 13

Orientation Levels and Age

Orientation Mean	Age	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>ES</i>
Structural	≤ 45 yrs	18	3.84	0.39	52	-1.14	0.26	0.16
	> 45 yrs	36	3.98	0.45				
Human Resource	≤ 45 yrs	18	4.20	0.38	52	0.25	0.81	0.03
	> 45 yrs	36	4.17	0.36				
Political	≤ 45 yrs	18	3.80	0.45	52	2.03	0.05	0.27
	> 45 yrs	36	3.51	0.51				
Symbolic	≤ 45 yrs	24	3.67	0.68	52	1.43	0.63	0.08
	> 45 yrs	36	3.66	0.56				

* $p < 0.01$.

The differences between males and females on orientation levels are presented in Table 14. A two-tailed t test for independent samples was computed. No significant differences were found between male ($M=3.92$, $SD=0.50$) and female ($M=3.93$, $SD=0.38$) school leaders for the structural mean ($t=-0.09$, $df=53$, $p=0.93$); and between male ($M=4.16$, $SD=0.39$) and female ($M=4.17$, $SD=0.37$) school leaders for the human resource mean ($t=-0.09$, $df=53$, $p=0.93$); and between male ($M=6.80$, $SD=0.61$) and female ($M=3.60$, $SD=0.42$) school leaders for the political mean ($t=-0.01$, $df=53$, $p=0.99$); and between male ($M=3.67$, $SD=0.68$) and female ($M=3.75$, $SD=.42$) school leaders for the symbolic mean ($t=-0.49$, $df=36.16$, $p=0.63$). The effect sizes were small for all four orientations suggesting that gender does not play a significant role on orientation levels (see Table 14).

Table 14

Orientation Levels and Gender

Orientation	Gender	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>ES</i>
Structural Mean	Male	24	3.92	0.50	53	-0.09	0.93	0.01
	Female	31	3.93	0.38				
Human Resource Mean	Male	24	4.16	0.39	53	-0.09	0.93	0.01
	Female	31	4.17	0.37				
Political Mean	Male	24	3.60	0.61	53	-0.01	0.99	0.00
	Female	31	3.60	0.42				
Symbolic Mean	Male	24	3.67	0.68	53	-0.52	0.63	0.08
	Female	31	3.75	0.42				

* $p < 0.01$.

The differences between school leaders with less than 20 years of professional experience and school leaders with 20 or more years of professional experience on orientation levels (means) are presented in Table 15. A two-tailed t test for independent samples was computed. No significant differences were found between school leaders with less than 20 years of professional experience ($M=3.93$, $SD=0.39$) and school leaders with 20 or more years of professional experience ($M=3.95$, $SD=0.49$) for the structural mean ($t = -0.18$, $df=54$, $p=0.86$); and between school leaders with less than 20 years of experience ($M=4.21$, $SD=0.40$) and school leaders with 20 or more years of professional experience ($M=4.15$, $SD=0.36$) for the human resource mean ($t=0.65$, $df=54$, $p=0.52$); and between school leaders with less than 20 years of experience ($M=3.71$, $SD=0.49$) and school leaders with 20 or more years of professional experience ($M=3.51$, $SD=.53$) for the

political mean ($t=1.52$, $df=54$, $p=0.14$); and between school leaders with less than 20 years of experience ($M=3.83$, $SD=0.47$) and school leaders with 20 or more years of professional experience ($M=3.62$, $SD=0.61$) for the symbolic mean ($t=1.42$, $df=54$, $p=0.21$). The effect sizes were small for all four orientations suggesting that professional experience does not play a significant role on orientation levels (see Table 15).

Table 15

Orientation Levels and Professional Experience

Orientation Mean	Professional Experience	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>ES</i>
Structural	< 20 yrs	29	3.93	0.39	54	-0.18	0.86	0.02
	≥ 20 yrs	27	3.95	0.49				
Human Resource	< 20 yrs	29	4.21	0.40	54	0.65	0.52	0.09
	≥ 20 yrs	27	4.15	0.36				
Political	< 20 yrs	29	3.71	0.49	54	1.52	0.14	0.20
	≥ 20 yrs	27	3.51	0.53				
Symbolic	< 20 yrs	29	3.83	0.47	54	1.42	0.21	0.19
	> 20 yrs	27	3.62	0.61				

* $p < 0.01$.

The differences between school leaders with less than 10 years of school leadership experience, between 10 and 20 years of school leadership experience, and school leaders with more than 20 years of school leadership experience, on orientation levels (mean) are presented in Table 16. A one-way ANOVA was computed. No significant differences were found between school leaders with less than 10 years of school leadership experience ($M=3.89$, $SD=0.36$), 10 to 20 years of school leadership experience ($M=3.89$, $SD=0.43$),

and school leaders with more than 20 years of school leadership experience ($M=4.00$, $SD=0.57$) for the structural orientation level, $F(2,54)=3.93$, $p=0.39$. No significant differences were found between school leaders with less than 10 years of school leadership experience ($M=4.25$, $SD=0.32$), 10 to 20 years of school leadership experience ($M=4.06$, $SD=0.34$), and school leaders with more than 20 years of school leadership experience ($M=4.09$, $SD=0.43$) for the human resource orientation level, $F(2,54)=1.57$, $p=0.22$. No significant differences were found between school leaders with less than 10 years of school leadership experience ($M=3.71$, $SD=0.46$), 10 to 20 years of school leadership experience ($M=3.45$, $SD=0.34$), and school leaders with more than 20 years of school leadership experience ($M=3.46$, $SD=0.63$) for the political orientation level, $F(2,54)=1.97$, $p=0.15$. No significant differences were found between school leaders with less than 10 years of school leadership experience ($M=3.87$, $SD=0.42$), 10 to 20 years of school leadership experience ($M=3.48$, $SD=0.41$), and school leaders with more than 20 years of school leadership experience ($M=3.65$, $SD=0.74$) for the symbolic orientation level, $F(2,54)=2.94$, $p=0.6$. These results suggest school leadership experience does not play a significant role on orientation levels (see Table 16).

The differences between school leaders with less than 10 years of current job (tenure) experience and school leaders with 10 or more years of current job experience on orientation levels (mean) are presented in Table 17. A two-tailed t test for independent samples was computed; no significant differences were found between school leaders with less than 10 years of experience at their current job ($M=3.93$, $SD=0.39$) and school leaders with 10 or more years of experience at their current job ($M=3.92$, $SD=0.55$) for the

structural mean ($t=0.04$, $df=54$, $p=0.97$).

Table 16

Orientation Levels and School Leadership Experience

Orientation Mean	School Leadership Experience	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>p</i>
Structural	< 10 yrs	25	3.89	0.36	2,51	0.35	0.71
	10-20 yrs	16	3.89	0.43			
	> 20 yrs	13	4.00	0.57			
Human Resource	< 10 yrs	25	4.25	0.32	2,51	1.57	0.22
	10-20 yrs	16	4.06	0.34			
	> 20 yrs	13	4.09	0.43			
Political	< 10 yrs	25	3.71	0.46	2,51	1.97	0.15
	10-20 yrs	16	3.45	0.34			
	> 20 yrs	13	3.46	0.63			
Symbolic	< 10 yrs	25	3.87	0.42	2,51	2.94	0.06
	10-20 yrs	16	3.48	0.41			
	> 20 yrs	13	3.65	0.74			

* $p < 0.01$.

There was no significant difference between school leaders with less than 10 years of experience at their current job ($M=4.23$, $SD=0.35$) and school leaders with 10 or more years of experience at their current job ($M=3.99$, $SD=0.39$) for the human resource mean ($t=2.15$, $df=54$, $p=0.04$). There was no significant difference between school leaders with less than 10 years of experience at their current job ($M=3.66$, $SD=0.50$) and school leaders with 10 or more years of experience at their current job ($M=3.43$, $SD=0.50$) for the political mean ($t=1.48$, $df=54$, $p=0.15$); and between school leaders with less than 10 years of experience at their current job ($M=3.67$, $SD=0.68$) and school leaders with 10 or more

years of experience at their current job ($M=3.56$, $SD=0.52$) for the symbolic mean ($t=1.29$, $df=54$, $p=0.20$). The effect sizes were small for all four orientations suggesting that experience in current job does not play a significant role in orientation levels (see Table 17).

Table 17

Orientation Levels and Experience at Current Job

Orientation Mean	Current Experience	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>ES</i>
Structural	< 10 yrs	41	3.93	0.39	53	0.04	0.97	0.01
	≥ 10 yrs	14	3.92	0.55				
Human Resource	< 10 yrs	41	4.23	0.35	53	2.15	0.04	0.28
	≥ 10 yrs	14	3.99	0.39				
Political	< 10 yrs	41	3.66	0.50	53	1.48	0.15	0.20
	≥ 10 yrs	14	3.43	0.50				
Symbolic	< 10 yrs	41	3.67	0.68	53	1.29	0.20	0.17
	≥ 10 yrs	14	3.56	0.52				

* $p < 0.01$.

To summarize the results for the null hypotheses generated from Research Question 2, there were no significant relationships between orientation use or levels and the personal variables of age, gender, and experience. Thus, the null hypotheses were retained for these variables.

Research Question 3

Research Questions 3 asked: Are there statistically significant relationships between these orientations—*structural, human resource, political, and symbolic* (use and levels)—as measured by the Organizational Orientations Survey and the professional variables of grade levels served, highest educational attainment, enrollment, parental support, faculty support, school board support, peer support, pastoral support, and conference support? The following null hypotheses were tested:

1. There is no relationship between orientation and grade levels served.
2. There is no relationship between orientation and educational attainment.
3. There is no relationship between orientation and enrollment.
4. There is no relationship between orientation and parental support.
5. There is no relationship between orientation and faculty support.
6. There is no relationship between orientation and school board support.
7. There is no relationship between orientation and peer support.
8. There is no relationship between orientation and pastoral support.
9. There is no relationship between orientation and conference support.

The relationship between orientation use and the professional variables of grade levels served, education level, and current enrollment was examined by using Chi-Square tests of association. Coding for grade levels served was 1.00 for Grade 8 configured schools (K-8, 1-8) and 2.00 for high-school-configured schools (K-12, K-10, and 9-12). Coding for education level was 1.00 for Bachelor's or higher, and 2.00 for graduate degrees. Coding for current enrollment was 1.00 for less than or equal to 40 students, and

2.00 for less than 40 students. A level of significance was set at $\alpha=0.05$ concerning orientation use and $\alpha=0.01$ concerning orientation levels, except for the support variables, where a level of significance was set at $\alpha=0.05$ for orientation levels and support.

Orientation Use and Professional Variables

Table 18 presents frequency distribution by orientation use, professional variables of grade levels served, education level, and current enrollment, as well as the Chi-Square analysis between orientation use and the professional variables.

Grade Levels Served. There were 37 (67%) school leaders who served Grade 8 configured schools. Of those, 12 (32.4%) were paired-oriented, 11 (29.7%) single-oriented, and 5 (13.5%) were classified as undefined. There were 19 (35%) high-school-configured school leaders. Of those, 7 (36.8%) multi-oriented, 5 (26.3%) were classified and undefined, 4 (21.2%) were paired-oriented, and 3 (15.8%) were single-oriented. However, these apparent differences between orientations among leaders in Grade 8 configured and high-school-configured schools were not statistically significant ($\chi^2=0.00$, $p=0.98$).

Highest Educational Attainment. Twenty-five (45%) school leaders had a Bachelor's degree. Of those, 8 (32%) were paired-oriented, 7 (28%) were multi-oriented, and 10 (40%) were either single-oriented or classified as undefined. Thirty (55%) school leader had graduate degrees. Of those, 18 (60%) were either multi- or single-oriented, 8 (26.7%) were paired-oriented, and 4 (13.3%) were classified as undefined. The relationship between orientation use and educational attainment was not statistically significant ($\chi^2=0.034$, $p=0.85$).

Current Enrollment. There were 27 (49%) school leaders in schools with less than 40 students. Of those, 9 (33.3%) were multi-oriented, 8 (29.6%) were paired-oriented, 7 (25.9%) were single-oriented, and 3 (11.1%) were classified as multi-oriented. In regard to the school leaders of large schools (>40), 8 (28.6%) were paired-oriented, 6 (21.4%) were multi-oriented, and 14 (50%) were classified as either single-oriented or undefined. The relationship between orientation use and current enrollment was not statistically significant ($\chi^2=1.79$, $p=0.18$).

Table 18

Orientation Use and Professional Variables

	Undefined orientation		Single orientation		Paired orientation		Multiple orientation	
	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%
Grade levels served (<i>n</i>=55)								
Grade 8 Configuration	5	13.5	11	29.7	12	32.4	9	24.3
High-School Configuration	5	26.3	3	15.8	4	21.1	7	36.8
$(\chi^2=3.39, df=3, p=0.34)$								
Education Level (<i>n</i>=55)								
Bachelor's +	5	20.0	5	20.0	8	32.0	7	28.0
Graduate Degrees	4	13.3	9	30.0	8	26.7	9	30.0
$(\chi^2=1.06, df=3, p=0.79)$								
Current Enrollment (<i>n</i>=55)								
< or = to 40 students	3	11.1	7	25.9	8	29.6	9	33.3
> 40 students	7	25.0	7	25.0	8	28.6	6	21.4
$(\chi^2=2.18, df=3, p=0.54)$								

* $p < 0.05$.

Orientation Use and Support

Tables 19-21 present results from the statistical analysis in examining the relationships between orientation use and the professional variables of support. Table 19 presents the percentage of respondents with undefined, single, paired, and multiple orientation. Table 20 presents means and standard deviations of the different types of support. Table 21 presents the Spearman Rho correlations between support and orientation use.

There were 10 (17.90%) respondents identified as undefined in orientation use. Fourteen (25.00%) respondents were identified as single orientation use. Fifteen (26.79%) respondents were identified as paired in their orientation use, and 17 (30.36%) respondents were identified as multiple in their orientation use.

Table 19

Percentage of Respondents by Orientation Use

Number of Orientations Used	<i>n</i>	%
Undefined	10	17.90
Single	14	25.00
Paired	15	26.79
Multiple	17	30.36

The conference support variable (mean) rated the highest ($M=4.46$, $SD=0.69$). The faculty support variable rated the second highest ($M=4.40$, $SD=0.66$). The peer support variable rated third ($M=4.20$, $SD=0.80$). The school board support variable rated fourth

($M=4.07$, $SD=0.89$). The parental support variable rated fifth ($M=3.89$, $SD=0.76$), and the pastoral support variable rated sixth ($M=3.56$, $SD=1.07$). The standard deviations for the school leaders did not vary much, except with the pastoral support variable. This suggests that our population was relatively homogeneous in five of the support variables (see Table 19). The high standard deviation on the pastoral score indicates that some school leaders felt very supported by their pastors and some school leaders felt no support from their pastors. The scores reveal that school leaders feel least supported by their pastors and most supported by their conference personnel (see Table 20).

Table 20

Mean Score, Mean Score Range, and Standard Deviation of Support

Support	Mean score	Mean score range	Standard Deviation
Parental ($n=56$)	3.89	2.00-5.00	0.76
Faculty ($n=55$)	4.40	3.00-5.00	0.66
School Board ($n=56$)	4.07	2.00-5.00	0.89
Peers ($n=51$)	4.20	2.00-5.00	0.80
Pastoral ($n=56$)	3.56	1.00-5.00	1.07
Conference ($n=56$)	4.46	2.00-5.00	0.69

Spearman Rho correlations between orientation use and feelings of support are shown in Table 21. Correlations among the support variables range from 0.04 to 0.50 suggesting that these variables are somewhat related to each other. There was no significant statistical correlation between any of the support variables to orientation use except for support from conference personnel ($r=0.30$, $p<0.05$). School leaders who

reported using multiple orientations also reported more conference personnel support.

This analysis examined the relationships between professional variables to orientation use (patterns). There was a statistically significant relationship between conference support and orientation use (see Table 21).

Table 21

Spearman Rho Correlation Between Support and Orientation Use

Support/Orientations	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Type of Support							
1. Parent	--						
2. Faculty	0.21	--					
3. School Board	0.45**	0.33*	--				
4. Peers	0.31*	0.50**	0.23	--			
5. Pastor(s)	0.14	0.23	0.38**	0.04	--		
6. Conference	0.26	0.26	0.42**	0.28*	0.26	--	
7. Orientation use (Patterns)	0.15	-0.03	0.24	-0.04	0.07	0.30*	--

* $p < 0.05$. ** $p < 0.01$.

Orientation Levels and Professional Variables

The following section compares the orientation levels (means) to the professional variables of grade levels served, highest educational attainment, and enrollment. A level of significance was set at $\alpha=0.01$.

Means, standard deviations, and effect sizes by grade configurations for each of the four types of orientations are presented in Table 22. Two-tailed independent t tests were used to examine differences between the two grade configurations for each

Table 22

Orientation Levels and Grade Levels Served

Orientation Mean	Grade Levels Served	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>ES</i>
Structural	K-8, 1-8	37	3.96	0.43	54	0.62	0.54	0.09
	K-12, K-10, 9-12	19	3.88	0.45				
Human Resource	K-8, 1-8	37	4.13	0.36	54	-1.34	0.19	0.18
	K-12, K-10, 9-12	19	4.27	0.40				
Political	K-8, 1-8	37	3.48	0.49	54	-2.89	0.01*	0.38
	K-12, K-10, 9-12	19	3.87	0.46				
Symbolic	K-8, 1-8	37	3.70	0.52	54	-0.53	0.61	0.08
	K-12, K-10, 9-12	19	3.79	0.61				

* $p < 0.01$.

orientation level. No significant differences were found between school leaders of Grade 8 configured schools ($M=3.96$, $SD=0.43$) and school leaders of high-school-configured schools ($M=3.88$, $SD=0.45$) for the structural level $t=0.62$, $df=54$, $p=0.54$. No significant differences were found between school leaders of Grade 8 configured schools ($M=4.13$, $SD=0.36$) and school leaders of high-school-configured schools ($M=4.27$, $SD=0.40$) for the human resource level $t=-1.34$, $df=54$, $p=0.19$. There were significant differences found between school leaders of Grade 8 configured schools ($M=3.48$, $SD=0.49$) and school leaders of high-school-configured schools ($M=3.87$, $SD=0.46$) for the political level $t=-2.89$, $df=54$, $p=0.01$.

These two groups were significantly different with high-school-configured schools posting significantly higher ($M=3.87$) in the political orientation level than those in Grade

8 configured schools ($M=3.48$). No significant differences were found between school leaders of Grade 8 configured schools ($M=3.70$, $SD=0.52$) and school leaders of high-school-configured schools ($M=3.79$, $SD=0.61$) for the symbolic level $t=-0.53$, $df=54$, $p=0.61$. There were no statistically significant differences between Grade 8 configured and high-school-configured schools in the levels of the other three types of orientations ($p>0.01$). Effect sizes were small or negligible for the structural, human resource, and symbolic orientations, ranging from 0.08 and 0.38 (see Table 22).

Relationships were examined between orientations and the professional variables of educational attainment and orientation levels (mean) and the results are presented in Table 23. A two-tailed t test for independent samples was computed. No significant differences were found between non-graduate-degreed school leaders ($M=3.97$, $SD=0.44$) and graduate-degreed school leaders ($M=3.92$, $SD=0.43$) for the structural mean, $t=0.41$, $df=53$, $p=0.68$; no significant differences were found between non-graduate-degreed school leaders ($M=4.21$, $SD=0.39$) and graduate-degreed school leaders ($M=4.18$, $SD=0.36$) for the human resource mean, $t=0.24$, $df=53$, $p=0.81$. No significant differences were found between non-graduate-degreed school leaders ($M=3.66$, $SD=0.49$) and graduate-degreed school leaders ($M=3.59$, $SD=0.54$) for the political mean, $t=0.53$, $df=53$, $p=0.60$; no significant differences were found between non-graduate-degreed school leaders ($M=3.79$, $SD=0.55$) and graduate-degreed school leaders ($M=3.70$, $SD=0.54$) for the symbolic mean, $t=0.56$, $df=53$, $p=0.58$. The effect sizes were small for all four orientations suggesting that educational attainment does not play a significant role in orientation levels (means) (see Table 23).

Table 23

Orientation Levels and Highest Educational Attainment

Orientation Means	Highest Educational Attainment	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>ES</i>
Structural	BA or Other	25	3.97	0.44	53	0.41	0.68	0.06
	(MA, EdD, PhD)	30	3.92	0.43				
Human Resource	BA or Other	25	4.21	0.39	53	0.24	0.81	0.04
	(MA, EdD, PhD)	30	4.18	0.36				
Political	BA or Other	25	3.66	0.49	53	0.53	0.60	0.07
	(MA, EdD, PhD)	30	3.59	0.54				
Symbolic	BA or Other	25	3.79	0.55	53	0.56	0.58	0.08
	(MA, EdD, PhD)	30	3.70	0.54				

* $p < 0.01$.

The relationship between orientation levels (mean) and the professional variable of current enrollment is presented in Table 24. A two-tailed t test for independent samples was computed. There was a significant difference between school leaders who served less than or equal to 40 students ($M=4.08$, $SD=0.34$) and school leaders who served more than 40 students ($M=3.78$, $SD=0.46$) for the structural mean, $t=2.77$, $df=53$, $p=0.01$. These two groups were significantly different, school leaders who served less than or equal to 40 students posted a significantly higher mean ($M=4.08$) on the structural orientation than did those school leaders who served more than 40 students ($M=3.48$). There was no difference between school leaders who served less than or equal to 40 students ($M=4.23$, $SD=0.36$) and school leaders who served more than 40 students ($M=4.12$, $SD=0.38$) for the human resource mean, $t=0.94$, $df=53$, $p=0.35$; there was no difference between school

leaders who served less than or equal to 40 students ($M=3.59$, $SD=0.40$) and school leaders who served more than 40 students ($M=3.60$, $SD=0.59$) for the political mean, $t=-0.06$, $df=53$, $p=0.95$; there was no difference between school leaders who served less than or equal to 40 students ($M=3.81$, $SD=0.42$) and school leaders who served more than 40 students ($M=3.63$, $SD=0.64$) for the symbolic mean, $t=1.21$, $df=53$, $p=0.23$.

Table 24

Orientation Levels and Current Enrollment

Orientation Mean	Current Student Enrollment	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>ES</i>
Structural	< or = 40	27	4.08	0.34	53	2.77	0.01*	0.35
	> 40	28	3.78	0.46				
Human Resource	< or = 40	27	4.23	0.36	53	0.94	0.35	0.15
	> 40	28	4.12	0.38				
Political	< or = 40	27	3.59	0.40	53	-0.061	0.95	0.01
	> 40	28	3.60	0.59				
Symbolic	< or = 40	27	3.81	0.42	53	1.21	0.23	0.16
	> 40	28	3.63	0.64				

* $p < 0.01$.

The effect sizes were small for the human resource, political, and symbolic orientations suggesting that enrollment does not play a significant role for these orientation levels (see Table 24).

The previous analysis examined the relationship between professional variables of grade levels served, highest educational attainment, and current enrollment to orientation levels (means). There were two statistically significant relationships.

1. There was a significant difference found between school leaders of Grade 8 configured schools and high-school-configured schools. School leaders of high-school-configured schools rated significantly higher on the political orientation level.

2. And there was a significant difference between school leaders who served less than or equal to 40 students and those who served more than 40 students. Those who served smaller schools (≤ 40 students) rated higher on the structural orientation level than did those who served larger schools (> 40 students).

Orientation Levels and Support

A multivariate technique was also used to consider the dependent variables of orientation and independent variables of support in the hope that this would produce results honoring the way in which all the variables presumably interrelated. A level of significance was set at $\alpha=0.05$.

Inter-correlations between orientation levels and feelings of support are shown in Table 25. Correlations among orientation levels range from 0.11 to 0.61 suggesting that these variables are somewhat independent of each other. Correlations among support variables range from 0.04 to 0.50. Correlations between orientation levels and the support variables range between -0.01 to 0.36. There were significant correlations between the structural level, school board support (0.31) and pastoral support (0.35). There was also a significant correlation between the conference personnel support and the human resource orientation level (0.36) and the symbolic orientation level (0.34).

To examine the relationship between orientation levels and the support variables, a canonical correlation analysis was also performed.

Table 25

Inter-correlations Between Orientation Levels and Support

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Support										
1. Parental	--									
2. Faculty	0.21	--								
3. School Board	0.45**	0.33*	--							
4. Peer	0.31*	0.50**	0.23	--						
5. Pastoral	0.14	0.23	0.38**	0.04	--					
6. Conference	0.29	0.26	0.42**	0.28*	0.26	--				
Orientations										
7. Structure	-0.07	0.19	0.31*	-0.12	0.35**	0.23	--			
8. Human Resource	0.09	0.02	0.08	-0.01	0.09	0.36**	0.44**	--		
9. Political	0.04	-0.14	0.07	0.04	-0.10	-0.03	0.11	0.28*	--	
10. Symbolic	0.11	-0.40	0.20	0.05	0.05	0.34*	0.28*	0.58**	0.61**	--

* $p < 0.05$. ** $p < 0.01$.

The results of the canonical correlation (0.56), Wilks' Lambda (0.44), Chi-Square (35.87), degrees of freedom (28), and the *p* value (0.15) indicate that there are no relationships between the linear combination of orientation levels and linear combination of support variables (see Table 26).

To summarize the results for the null hypotheses generated from Research Question 3, which stated there were no statistically significant relationships between organizational orientations (use or levels) and the professional variables, there was a statistical significant relationship between orientation use and conference support. The null hypothesis was rejected for that support variable.

Concerning orientation levels, there were a number of statistically significant relationships. There was a statistically significant relationship between the structural orientation level and enrollment, school board support, and pastoral support; the null hypotheses were rejected for these variables. There was also a statistically significant relationship between the political orientation level and grade levels served; the null hypothesis was rejected for this variable. And there were statistically significant relationships between the human resource orientation level and symbolic orientation level both in relationship to conference support. The null hypothesis for this variable was rejected.

There was also a statistically significant relationships between the political orientation level and grade levels served; the null hypothesis was rejected for this variable. And there were statistically significant relationships between conference support and both of human resource orientation level and symbolic orientation level.

Table 26

Canonical Correlations Analysis for Orientation Levels and Support

Set 1 Variables	Canonical Loadings 1	Standardized Canonical Coefficients 1
Structure	0.55	0.90
Human Resource	-0.40	-0.52
Political	-0.27	0.12
Symbolic	-0.55	-0.60
% of Variance	0.21	
Redundancy	0.07	
<u>Set 2 Variables</u>		
Parental	-0.40	-0.52
Faculty	0.31	0.51
Sch Board	0.39	0.56
Peer	-0.37	-0.46
Pastoral	0.40	0.25
Conference	-0.42	-0.36
% of Variance	0.13	
Redundancy	0.40	
Canonical Correlation	0.56	
Wilk's Lambda	0.44	
Chi-Square	35.87	
<i>df</i>	28	
<i>p</i>	0.15	
* $p < 0.05$. ** $p < 0.01$.		

There were no statistically significant relationships between orientation use or levels for the professional variables of educational attainment, parental support, faculty support, peer support, and the null hypothesis was retained for these.

Research Question 4

Research Question 4 asked: Are there statistically significant relationships between orientations—*structure, human resource, political, and symbolic* (use and levels)—as measured by the Organizational Orientations Survey and the feelings of success and overall job satisfaction. The following null hypotheses were tested:

1. There is no relationship between orientation and feelings of success.
2. There is no relationship between orientation and overall job satisfaction.

The organizational orientations and overall feelings of success and job satisfaction were examined through descriptive statistics, Spearman Rho, and canonical correlation analyses. Coding for feelings of success was, 1.00 = never successful, 2.00 = occasionally successful, 3.00 = sometimes successful, 4.00 = often successful, and 5.00 = always successful. Coding for overall job satisfaction was, 1.00 = never satisfied, 2.00 = occasionally satisfied, 3.00 = sometimes satisfied, 4.00 = often satisfied, and 5.00 = always satisfied. Spearman Rho correlation was used to examine the relationship between orientation use and the success and job satisfaction variables. A level of significance was set at $\alpha=0.05$ for orientation use and a level of significance was set at $\alpha=0.01$ for orientation levels. (Refer back to Table 19, which presents percentage of respondents with undefined, single, paired, and multiple orientations.)

Table 27 reports the means and standard deviations for the success and job

satisfaction variables. The job satisfaction variable rated the highest ($M=4.04$, $SD=0.65$). The feelings of success variable rated high as well ($M=3.93$, $SD=0.42$). These ratings indicate that the school leaders in the Columbia Union Conference generally feel successful and satisfied with their job.

Table 27

Mean Score, Mean Score Range, and Standard Deviation of Success/Satisfaction

Variables	Mean score	Mean Score Range	Standard Deviation
Feelings of Success ($n=52$)	3.93	3.00-5.00	0.42
Overall Job Satisfaction ($n=55$)	4.04	2.20-5.00	0.65

Orientation Use and Success and Satisfaction

Spearman Rho correlations between orientation use and the variables of feelings of success and job satisfaction are presented in Table 28. There were statistically significant correlations between both variables (success and satisfaction) and orientation use. This suggests that the more orientations school leaders use, the more they feel successful at their job and the greater their job satisfaction (see Table 28).

Table 28

Spearman Rho Correlation Between Orientation Use and Success/Satisfaction

Success/Orientations	1	2	3
Variables of			
1. Feelings of Success	--		
2. Job Satisfaction	0.34*	--	
3. Orientations	0.28*	0.44**	--

* $p < 0.05$. ** $p < 0.01$.

Orientation Levels and Success and Satisfaction

Zero-order correlations between orientation levels and the variables of feelings of success and job satisfaction are presented in Table 29. Correlations among the orientation variables range from 0.11 to 0.61. The correlation between feelings of success and job satisfaction is 0.34. Correlations between orientation levels and feelings of success and job satisfaction are all positive and ranged from 0.02 to 0.47. There is a statistically significant correlation among the feelings of success variable and the human resource orientation level (0.29) and the symbolic orientation level (0.28). The null hypotheses for the feelings of success variable were rejected. There were statistically significant correlations among the job satisfaction variable and the structural orientation level (0.23), human resource orientation level (0.47), and the symbolic orientation level (0.41). The null hypothesis for the job satisfaction variable was rejected (see Table 29). To further examine the relationship between orientation levels and feelings of success and job satisfaction, a canonical correlation analysis was performed (see Table 30).

Table 29

Inter-correlations Between Orientation Levels and Success/Satisfaction

Variable	1	2	3	4	5	6
<u>Orientation Variables</u>						
1. Structure	--					
2. Human Resource	0.41**	--				
3. Political	0.11	0.28*	--			
4. Symbolic	0.28*	0.58**	0.61**	--		
<u>Variables of</u>						
5. Feelings of Success	0.24	0.29*	0.02	0.28*	--	
6. Job Satisfaction	0.23**	0.47**	0.21	0.41*	0.34*	--

* $p < 0.05$. ** $p < 0.01$.

Canonical loadings, standardized coefficients, canonical correlation, and within-set variance (% of variance) are shown in Table 30. The first canonical correlation is 0.61 (37.21% overlapping variance), the second canonical correlation is 0.13 (1.69% overlapping variance). With both canonical correlations included, $\chi^2(8)=22.56$, $p<0.001$ and with the first canonical correlation removed, $\chi^2(3)=0.84$, $p>0.01$. The first pair of canonical variate accounted for the significant relationships between orientation levels and feelings of support and job satisfaction.

Canonical loadings of 0.3 (absolute value) are interpretable (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2001). All of the orientations (structure, human resource, political, and symbolic) were correlated with the first canonical variate. Both feelings of success and job satisfaction were also correlated to the first canonical variate. The first canonical variate indicated that low scores in structure (-0.73), human resource (-0.90), political (-0.43), and symbolic

(-0.74) are associated with low scores in feelings of success (-0.54) and job satisfaction (-0.98). This would suggest that low orientation levels also result in low levels of feeling successful or job satisfaction.

To summarize the findings from Research Question 4, respondents rated highest in job satisfaction and then feelings of success; there were statistically significant relationships between orientation use and feelings of success and job satisfaction. There were statistically significant relationships between feelings of success and two orientation (human resource, and symbolic) levels. There were statistically significant relationships between job satisfaction and three orientations—structure, human resource, and symbolic.

To further examine the relationship between orientation levels and feelings of success and job satisfaction, a canonical correlation analysis was performed. The canonical variate indicated that low scores in the structure, human resource, political, and symbolic orientations were associated with low scores in feelings of success and job satisfaction (see Table 30). The null hypothesis was rejected for both variables. There are significant relationships between orientations (use and levels) and feelings of success and job satisfaction.

Table 30

Canonical Correlation Analysis for Orientations and Success/Satisfaction

	Canonical Loadings	Standardized Canonical Coefficients
<u>Set 1 Variables</u>		
Structure	-0.73	-0.37
Human Resource	-0.90	-0.55
Political	-0.43	0.10
Symbolic	-0.74	-0.38
% of Variance	0.52	
Redundancy	0.19	
<u>Set 2 Variables</u>		
Feelings of Success	-0.54	-0.20
Job Satisfaction	-0.98	-0.91
% of Variance	0.63	
Redundancy	0.23	
Canonical Correlation	0.61	
Wilk's Lambda	0.62	
Chi-Square	22.56	
<i>df</i>	8	
<i>p</i>	0.004**	
** $p < 0.01$.		

Categorizing of the Quantitative and Qualitative Data Findings

In contrast to Research Questions 1-4, Research Question 5 was a qualitative approach to understanding leadership orientations from the school leaders' comments. This qualitative inquiry was designed to explore leadership orientations beyond what could be quantified or discovered through sections I and II of the Organizational Orientations Survey. The school leaders were simply asked to give comments, suggestions, or concerns regarding their experience as a school leader. The comments for this open-ended question were analyzed independently by myself and two field experts. The field experts were selected based on their extensive knowledge and experience in research methods and the Adventist educational organization. The use of several different researchers, or investigator triangulation, helped ensure appropriate objectivity (Creswell, 2003; Patton, 1990).

Research Question 5 examined the organizational leadership comments as described by the Columbia Union Conference school leaders in section III of the Organizational Orientations Survey, and compared these comments to the statistical analysis of Research Questions 1-4.

Table 31 presents a synopsis of my analyses and the analyses of the two field experts. Comments for which there was agreement by these experts were organized into a content matrix (see Appendix D). The content matrix summarized school leaders' comments for the open-ended question to the orientation as identified in the previous section (II) of the Organizational Orientations Survey. The content matrix was analyzed for similarities and differences between the self-identified orientations and the comments

Table 31

Content Matrix

Orientation <i>n</i>	Orientation Related Issues	Orientation Related Response Sample
Structural <i>n</i> =13	Coordination and control; clarity or lack of clarity about goals, roles, or expectations; references to planning, budgeting, and evaluation; discussion of analysis or its absence; issues around policies and procedures.	"Adventist education needs a revitalization, from the level of the GC/Division and filtered down through the ranks."
Human Resource <i>n</i> =32	Discussion of individuals' feelings, needs, preferences, or abilities (for example, problems of individual performance or staff quality); references to the importance of participation, listening, open communications, involvement in decision making, morale; discussion of interpersonal relationships; emphasis on collaboration, win-win, and a sense of family or community.	"Opportunities for professional development within the Adventist school system is hard to come by." "My experience is good because of the support I have received from the union, conference, and board of trustees."
Political <i>n</i> =25	Focus on conflict or tension among different constituencies, interest groups, or organizations; competing interests and agendas; disputes over allocation of scarce resources games of power and self-interest	"Lots of work with no money to have in-house help." "Pastors tend to be against the principal."
Symbolic <i>n</i> =27	Discussions of institutional identity, culture, or symbols; discussion of the image that will be projected to different audiences, discussion of the symbolic important of existing practices, rituals, or artifacts (for example, symbolic attachment to an old building on campus); emphasis on influencing how different audiences will interpret an activity or decision.	"I very much enjoy my job and believe that God has led me to be a Christian educator and administrator." "The biggest reason for school growth is because of prayer."

from the open-ended question. Each comment was categorized into one or more orientations, according to the orientation descriptors and indicates the number of participants whose comments were classified by that orientation, a description of that orientation, and samples of actual comments that illustrate those orientations.

Eighty-eight percent ($n=49$) of the respondents answered the open-ended question. Many of these respondents addressed more than one orientation in their comments. Twenty-three percent ($n=13$) of the respondents addressed issues that were categorized as structural, 57% ($n=32$) of the respondents addressed issues that were categorized as human resource, 44% ($n=25$) of the respondents addressed issues that were categorized as political, and 48% ($n=27$) of the respondents addressed issues that were categorized as symbolic.

From the content analysis, certain themes emerged. The comments somewhat mirrored the school leaders' orientation scores, which were identified in section II of the survey, with the exception of the symbolic orientation. Participants often referred to "prayer and God's leading in their lives," although the respondents had seemed hesitant to acknowledge that "they inspired others" in section II of the survey. Comments categorized as the human resource orientation were prevailing, similar to the survey scores. Comments indicated that the school leaders grapple with issues that could be described as the political orientation.

Another overarching insight was that the comments were often expressed in a way that conveyed the complexity and multidimensional nature of leadership. For example, one school leader referred to "my abilities as a team player to keep funding at a level to meet

the challenges of a growing school.” This response described the context of a school leader’s job in that it demonstrated an understanding that (a) teamwork (human resource orientation), (b) continued funding (structural and political orientations) may determine future success in (c) accomplishing a goal (symbolic orientation) (see Table 31).

To summarize the results from Research Question 5: The comments described by the Columbia Union school leaders reflected all four organizational orientations. Content analysis of all the comments revealed that the human resource orientation was reported as used most often, followed equally by the symbolic (expressed as faith in God) and political orientations (expressed as concerns), and last the structural orientation. Examples of school leaders’ comments, suggestions, and concerns appeared to confirm their section II survey scores, except in the area of symbolic orientation. Respondents appeared to be more symbolically oriented than their survey scores reflected. This qualitative portion of the research validated the findings from the survey instrument.

Summary of Findings

This study explored the organizational orientations of Adventist school leaders in the Columbia Union Conference. Participants in the study were 56 school leaders located throughout the Columbia Union Conference. The following five research questions guided this study:

1. What organizational orientations—*structure, human resource, political, and symbolic*—in terms of use (patterns) and levels (means) do the Columbia Union school leaders function in, as measured by the Organizational Orientations (Self) Survey?

Descriptive analysis was used to analyze these data in terms of use (patterns). School

leader scores revealed the actual use of nine different orientation patterns out of 16 possible patterns or combinations of orientations. These nine patterns were categorized as undefined, single, paired, and multi. The human resource orientation was the most predominant single orientation. The structural-human resource orientation was the most predominant paired orientation. And the structural-human resource-political-symbolic was the most predominant multi-orientation. Ten respondents scored low enough to be classified as undefined. The levels (means) of orientation were also examined. School leaders rated the human resource orientation more than other orientations. In contrast, they rated the political orientation less often than any other orientation. The standard deviations for the school leaders did not vary much, which suggests that my sample was relatively homogeneous in the four organizational orientations.

2. Are there statistically significant relationships between these orientations—*structural, human resource, political, and symbolic* use (patterns) and levels (means)—as measured by the Organizational Orientations Survey and the personal variables of age, gender, professional experience, leadership experience, and experience at current job? Relationships between orientation patterns of use and personal variables were examined using Chi-Square analyses. No significant relationships were discovered. The differences between personal variables and orientation levels (means) were also examined using *t* tests for independent samples and effect size. There were no significant differences between the personal variables and orientation levels. The effect sizes were small suggesting that these personal variables do not impact orientation levels. The null hypotheses for Research Question 2 were retained (see Table 32).

Table 32

Summary of Hypotheses Testing for Research Question 2

Null Hypotheses	Probability	Retained	Rejected
1. There are no relationships between orientation and age.			
Use	0.880	X	
Levels			
Structural	0.260	X	
Human Resource	0.805	X	
Political	0.048	X	
Symbolic	0.629	X	
2. There are no relationships between orientation and gender.			
Use	0.942	X	
Levels			
Structural	0.928	X	
Human Resource	0.928	X	
Political	0.996	X	
Symbolic	0.629	X	
3. There are no relationships between orientation and professional experience.			
Use	0.149	X	
Levels			
Structural	0.855	X	
Human Resource	0.521	X	
Political	0.136	X	
Symbolic	0.210	X	

Table 32—*Continued.*

Null Hypotheses	Probability	Retained	Rejected
4. There are no relationships between orientation and school leadership experience.			
Use	0.428	X	
Levels			
Structural	0.710	X	
Human Resource	0.218	X	
Political	0.150	X	
Symbolic	0.062	X	
5. There are no relationships between orientation and experience in current job.			
Use	0.682	X	
Levels			
Structural	0.965	X	
Human Resource	0.037	X	
Political	0.146	X	
Symbolic	0.202	X	

* $p < 0.05$. ** $p < 0.01$.

3. Are there statistically significant relationships between these orientations—*structural, human resource, political, and symbolic* (use and levels)—as measured by the Organizational Orientations Survey and the professional variables of grade levels served, highest educational attainment, enrollment, parental support, faculty support, school board support, peer support, pastoral support, and conference support? Relationships between orientation patterns of use and the professional variables of grade levels served, highest educational attainment, and enrollment were examined using Chi-Square analyses. No significant relationships existed. Relationships between orientation patterns of use and the professional variables of levels of support were examined using Spearman Rho correlation

analyses. A significant relationship existed between orientation use and conference support. The null hypothesis for the conference support variable was rejected. School leaders who reported feeling supported by conference personnel also reported using multi-orientations.

The differences between the professional variables of grade levels served, highest educational attainment, and enrollment to orientation levels (means) were examined using *t* tests for independent samples, and effect size was calculated. There was a significant difference between Grade 8 configured school leaders and high-school-configured school leaders. High-school-configured school leaders scored significantly higher in the political orientation level than those who worked in Grade 8 configured schools. The null hypothesis for the variable of grade levels served was rejected. There was a significant difference between school leaders who served less than or equal to 40 students and school leaders who served more than 40 students for the structural orientation level. The school leaders of the smaller schools rated significantly higher in the structural orientation level. The null hypothesis for the enrollment variable was rejected.

Spearman's Rho was used to examine the orientation levels and the support variables. There were statistically significant correlations to the support variables of school board support and pastoral support for those respondents who rated high on the structural orientation level. There was a significant correlation between human resource and symbolic orientation levels and conference support. The null hypotheses for these variables were rejected. There is a relationship between orientation levels and school board, pastoral, and conference support (see Table 33). Structurally oriented school leaders felt

more supported by their school boards and pastors. Human resource and symbolically oriented school leaders felt more supported by conference personnel.

4. Are there statistically significant relationships between these orientations—*structure, human resource, political, and symbolic* (use and levels)—as measured by the Organizational Orientations Survey and the feelings of success and overall job satisfaction? Relationships between orientation patterns of use and the professional variables of feelings of success and job satisfaction were determined by computing Spearman Rho correlation coefficients. There were significant statistical correlations concerning both variables (success and satisfaction). Inter-correlations between orientation levels and feelings of success and job satisfaction were examined. There were statistically significant correlations between the human resource orientation levels and feelings of success and job satisfaction. This indicates that those school leaders who rated the human resource orientation level high, also felt successful and experienced a great deal of job satisfaction. There were statistically significant correlations between symbolic orientation levels and feelings of success and job satisfaction. There were statistically significant correlations between the structural orientations and job satisfaction. To further examine the relationships between orientation levels and feelings of success and job satisfaction, a canonical correlation analysis was performed. The results showed that low orientation levels also result in low levels of feelings of success or job satisfaction.

Table 33

Summary of Hypotheses Testing for Research Question 3

Null Hypotheses	Probability	Retained	Rejected
1. There are no relationships between orientations and grade levels served.			
Use Levels	0.340	X	
Structural	0.538	X	
Human Resource	0.187	X	
Political	0.006*		X
Symbolic	0.607	X	
2. There are no relationships between orientations and educational attainment.			
Use Levels	0.790	X	
Structural	0.680	X	
Human Resource	0.809	X	
Political	0.596	X	
Symbolic	0.577	X	
3. There are no relationships between orientations and enrollment.			
Use Levels	0.540	X	
Structural	0.008*		X
Human Resource	0.349	X	
Political	0.951	X	
Symbolic	0.231	X	
4. There are no relationships between orientations and parental support.			
Use Levels	0.265	X	
Structural	0.628	X	
Human Resource	0.526	X	
Political	0.785	X	
Symbolic	0.439	X	

Table 33—*Continued.*

Null Hypotheses	Probability	Retained	Rejected
5. There are no relationships between orientations and faculty support.			
Use	0.830	X	
Levels			
Structural	0.162	X	
Human Resource	0.869	X	
Political	0.307	X	
Symbolic	0.799	X	
6. There are no relationships between orientations and school board support.			
Use	0.244	X	
Levels			
Structural	0.020*		X
Human Resource	0.575	X	
Political	0.603	X	
Symbolic	0.132	X	
7. There are no relationships between orientations and peer support.			
Use	0.796	X	
Levels			
Structural	0.407	X	
Human Resource	0.942	X	
Political	0.780	X	
Symbolic	0.700	X	
8. There are no relationships between orientations and pastoral support.			
Use	0.587	X	
Levels			
Structural	0.008**		X
Human Resource	0.535	X	
Political	0.478	X	
Symbolic	0.726	X	

Table 33–*Continued*.

Null Hypotheses	Probability	Retained	Rejected
9. There are no relationships between orientations and conference support.			
Use Levels	0.027*		X
Structural	0.089	X	
Human Resource	0.006**		X
Political	0.805	X	
Symbolic	0.011**		X

* $p < 0.05$. ** $p < 0.01$.

It could logically then be concluded that high orientation levels would result in high levels of feelings of success and job satisfaction. The null hypotheses for these two variables of Research Question 4 were rejected. There is a relationship between orientation and feelings of success and job satisfaction (see Table 34).

5. This was an open-ended qualitative question; the participants were simply asked to give comments, suggestions, or concerns regarding their experience as a school leader. A content analysis process was performed to first identify and categorize the comments as to their orientation. In some aspects the comments were consistent with the organizational orientations derived from the survey scores. Human resource incidents and skills were the comments most frequently expressed and was the highest rated orientation on the survey. These comments related to internal human relationship issues as well as external relationships with committees, churches, and communities.

Table 34

Summary of Hypotheses Testing for Research Question 4

Null Hypotheses	Probability	Retained	Rejected
1. There are no relationships between orientations and feelings of success.			
Use Levels	0.045*		X
Structural	0.090	X	
Human Resource	0.036*		X
Political	0.902	X	
Symbolic	0.043*		X
2. There are no relationships between orientations and overall job satisfaction.			
Use Levels	0.001**		X
Structural	0.001**		X
Human Resource	0.000**		X
Political	0.126	X	
Symbolic	0.002**		X

* $p < 0.05$. ** $p < 0.01$.

In regard to the other orientations the comments were not consistent with the survey scores. The participants ranked the comments in the following way: (a) human resource, (b) symbolic, (c) political and (d) structural. The survey ranking was: (a) human resource, (b) structural, (c) symbolic and (d) political. A possible explanation will be explored in chapter 5.

The major findings of this study revealed a consistency of organizational orientations among Adventist school leaders in the Columbia Union Conference. There were no significant relationships between school leaders' organizational orientations use

or levels and their personal variables. Among the professional variables, statistically significant correlations existed between orientation use and conference support, feelings of success, and job satisfaction. Significant correlations also existed between orientation levels and school board support, pastoral support, conference support, feelings of success, and job satisfaction. In spite of the many challenges these school leaders faced, they expressed a satisfaction in the job they were doing and their descriptions exemplified the complex and personal nature of the leadership experiences within their school organizations.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Introduction

The purpose of this study was to examine the organizational orientations and their relationship to personal and professional variables of K-12 school leaders in the Columbia Union Conference of Seventh-day Adventists.

This study sought to (a) identify the organizational orientations of the school leaders in the Columbia Union Conference, and (b) examine the relationships between these leadership organizational orientations and personal and professional variables.

This chapter presents a summary of the methodology, discussion of the major findings, conclusions, recommendations for practice, recommendations for research, and an endnote.

Summary of Methodology

This survey research was descriptive and correlational in nature. A three-part survey instrument, developed from Bolman and Deal's (1990) Leadership Orientations (Self) Survey, Dr. Thomas Harvey's Professional Vitality Scale (see Appendix A) and personal and professional demographics, was administered to the K-12 Columbia Union school leaders between the months of March and May 2006, at regularly scheduled

principal councils.

This survey instrument was designed to measure the organizational orientations of K-12 school leaders in the Columbia Union Conference and the relationship to the personal variables of age, gender, professional experience (teaching), school leadership experience (administration), experience at current job (tenure), and professional variables of grade levels served, highest educational attainment, current enrollment, support from parents, faculty, school board, peers, pastor(s), conference personnel, feelings of success, and job satisfaction.

The first part of the survey instrument identified the personal and professional demographic characteristics of the school leaders. The second part consisted of 38 Likert-type statements. The rating scale contained five response choices: never, occasionally, sometimes, often, and always, with assigned numerical values ranging from 1 for *Never*, to 5 for *Always*. Responses to section II (orientations and job satisfaction) with means of 4.00 or higher were considered oriented as such, and any mean below 4.00 was considered undefined. The third part of the survey was an opened-ended question asking the participants to give comments, suggestions, or concerns regarding their experience as a school leader.

The target population was all the school leaders in the Columbia Union Conference of Seventh-day Adventists as identified in the educational system directory for the 2005-2006 school year. A total of 83 school leaders were given the survey by their superintendents. Fifty-seven completed surveys were returned. One survey had two missing values in the political orientation section and was excluded, leaving 56 usable

surveys (67%). These 56 school leaders reported serving a total of 4,553 students.

For the purpose of follow-up, each survey was given a number, identifying the conference location of its origin. The data obtained from the returned surveys were processed by using the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) 14.0 for Windows and analyzed by the use of descriptive statistics (mean scores, standard deviations, frequencies, crosstabs), *t* test, analysis of variance (ANOVA), canonical analyses, and the test of correlation coefficient. Null hypotheses were tested at an alpha level of 0.05 for orientation use and 0.01 for orientation levels when comparing groups within each orientation. This was done in order to control for a Type 1 error.

The data generated by the comments on the last part of the survey were analyzed by a qualitative procedure called Content Analysis and organized in the following way:

1. The material was read independently by two experts other than the researcher. These experts highlighted phrases or themes that indicated a specific orientation based on the analysis descriptors. If there were differences of opinion, the researcher made the decision as to orientation classification.
2. The information was then coordinated into a table. This table gave the following information: Survey number (for tracking purposes), orientation score based on survey data, the actual comments, and the orientation based on the comments. Emerging themes were noted.
3. Themes that are specific to leadership orientations were documented and compared to the orientation profile for each participant (see Appendix E).

Discussion of Major Findings

The major findings are discussed here, providing a basis for conclusions of the research and recommendations for practice and further study.

Research Question 1

Research Question 1 explored the degree to which the Columbia Union K-12 school leaders were organizationally oriented. Scores from the Organizational Orientations Survey illustrated these orientations. The human resource mean score for all school leaders rated the highest ($M=4.18$, $SD=0.38$); the structural orientation mean score rated the second highest ($M=3.94$, $SD=0.44$); the symbolic orientation mean score rated third ($M=3.73$, $SD=0.55$); and the political orientation mean scored least ($M=3.61$, $SD=0.51$). School leaders reported that they used the symbolic and political orientations less often than the other two orientations. This corresponds with the early research of Bolman and Deal (1984, 1991), Pavan and Reid (1991), Redman (1991), Peasley (1992), Meade (1992), Strickland (1992), Yerkes et al. (1992), and Miro (1993), indicating that educators typically do not view their organization from a political orientation and often neglect the power of the symbolic orientation.

From a structural orientation a leader might further examine the forces that affect the design of the Adventist educational organization: its size, core technology, environment, goals or strategy, information technology, and the characteristics of its people. A redesigned map may provide the support needed to create a climate of continuous improvement (Brantley, 1999). "Adventist education needs a revitalization,

from the level of the General Conference/North American Division and filtered down through the ranks. There seems to be little concern for the success of the educational process below the college/university levels. It is underfunded and its overall administrative process is archaic,” responded one participant.

From a human resource orientation the leader might recognize that the fit between the school leader and the organization needs to be adjusted for growth. “The financial and the political ramifications of being so closely associated with and controlled by the local church make any Adventist administrator’s job stressful and at times difficult,” stated one participant. Educational organizations often focus on the structural and human resource orientations, to the neglect of other orientations (Bolman & Deal, 1991).

From a political orientation many organizational theorists believe that the only realistic portrayal of organizations is political—the ability to influence. Study should be given regarding how to equip school leaders in this political arena. Theorists say that power and politics are key elements and should not be swept under the rug (Bolman & Deal, 1991). Power is often gained in the Adventist educational organization just like the public organizations, through education, money, and status. The Adventist educational organizational structure may not provide the support needed for political maneuvering. “There is a need to develop and maintain an ‘Adventist Education System’—governed in clusters—all responsible to the same board (authority) such as the K-12 board. Local boards, as presently constructed, seem to do more harm than good to the leadership process of the local school,” commented one participant.

From the symbolic orientation a leader may observe that the Adventist education

organization has sincere school leaders who would have left long ago if it had not been for their faith in God. "There's no way that I would have remained in Christian education (Adventist) without my faith, God, and family support. . . . After all 'Education and Redemption are one.'" The content analysis supported the survey results in the following way: Both indicated that the human resource orientation is most often used by Columbia Union school leaders. The survey results were also supported in regard to the structural orientation in that the school leaders mentioned few structural comments, or concerns, but they did give a few suggestions that they wished their governing boards would do. The impression was that they felt secure in the structural orientation of their position. The symbolic-oriented comments, concerns, and suggestions suggested a total dependence upon God for some very trying experiences. Many of those experiences were related to the political orientation.

Following the initial orientation analysis for the group, each participant's organizational orientation use pattern was determined. A school leader with a mean score of 4.0 or higher was categorized as oriented as such. Of the 56 participating school leaders, 10 (17.86%) school leaders scored less than 4.0 on all orientations and were categorized as *undefined*. This finding is comparable to an organizational orientation study of 206 Adventist K-12 school leaders conducted by Shee (2001); 39 (18.93%) of those school leaders scored less than 4.0 on all orientations.

The remaining 46 school leaders scored 4.0 or higher in at least one orientation. School leader scores revealed the actual use of 9 different patterns out of 16 possible patterns or combinations of orientation use. In the multiple orientations (3 or more

orientations) the greatest use was reported as structural-human resource-political-symbolic (12.5%). Almost 43% of the Columbia Union school leaders reported single orientation or undefined use. In contrast, more than half (57.15%) of the Columbia Union school leaders reported using two or more orientations. This compares favorably with recent studies conducted using Bolman and Deal's (1990) survey. The participants of these studies reported frequently using more than one orientation (Borden, 2000). The central tenet of Bolman and Deal's organizational orientation theory is that "effective organizational leaders are multi-oriented" (Bolman & Deal, 1997). Other studies contend that organizational climate (Mosser, 2000), organizational effectiveness (Bedore, 1998; Bethel, 1998), role conflict, job stress, job satisfaction (Russell, 2000), and work ethic (Hollingsworth, 1995) all have significant relationships with orientation use.

The Columbia Union school leaders in this study exhibited similar organizational orientation patterns and levels—based on their reported data—as compared to similar organizational orientation studies.

Research Question 2

Research Question 2 inquired if there were statistically significant relationships between the organizational orientations as measured by the Organizational Orientations Survey and the personal variables of age, gender, professional experience (teaching), school leadership experience (administrative), and experience at current job (tenure).

Age ($M=49$, $SD=8.67$): Those respondents 45 years of age or younger ($n=18$) were compared to those respondents older than 45 years of age ($n=36$). Those

respondents 45 years of age or younger ($n=18$) rated highest in multiple and paired orientation use. Those respondents older than 45 years of age ($n=36$) rated highest in paired orientation use. When comparing age to orientation levels (means) no significant differences were found. The effect sizes were small for all four orientations suggesting that age does not play a significant role in orientation levels. There were no statistically significant relationships among the age groups to either use or levels. This was in contrast to the findings of Chang (2004) who determined that older leaders were more likely to be more multi-oriented.

Gender: The male respondents ($n=24$) reported themselves as paired-oriented most frequently. The female respondents ($n=31$) reported themselves as multi-oriented most frequently. These findings are substantiated in studies conducted by Bolman and Deal and others (Davis, 1996, Durocher, 1996; Eckley, 1997; Flak, 1998; Suzuki, 1994), which indicated that women reported using all four orientations more often than men, who reported using only one or two orientations. When comparing gender to orientation levels (means) no significant differences were found. The effect sizes were small for all four orientations suggesting that gender does not play a significant role on orientation levels. There were no statistically significant relationships between gender for either use or levels.

Years of professional (teaching) experience ($M=22$, $SD=10.23$): Those respondents with 20 or less years of professional experience ($n=29$) were compared with those who had more than 20 years of experience ($n=27$). The less (professional) experienced respondents rated highest in paired orientations; the more (professional) experienced respondents rated equally highest in multiple and single orientations. These

findings were supported by research that indicate that less-experienced principals approach and experience their work challenges different from more experienced principals (Greller & Stroh, 1995; Roberts, 1991; Sarros, 1998). This may be particularly true when examining the impact teaching experience may have on organizational leadership. First of all, those who enter the field of education are supportive and believe in fostering participation and involvement and come to the discipline predisposed for a single orientation, usually human resource or structural. Second, their teacher preparation may possibly have emphasized one orientation over the other, for example, training them in classroom management but not leadership (Durocher, 1996; Kotter, 1990, 1996). When comparing professional experience to orientation levels (means) no significant differences were found. The effect sizes were small for all four orientations, suggesting that professional experience does not play a significant role on orientation levels. There were no statistically significant relationships between professional experience and orientation use or levels.

School leadership experience ($M=14$, $SD=11.07$): Those respondents with less than 10 years of school leadership experience ($n=25$), between 10 and 20 years of school leadership experience ($n=16$), and more than 20 years of school leadership experience ($n=13$) were compared to orientation use. The less (school leadership) experienced respondents rated highest in multiple and paired orientation use, those with 10 to 20 years of school leadership experience rated paired orientation use the highest. Those with 20 or more years of professional experience ($n=13$) rated multiple orientation use the highest. These findings are supported by research indicating that long-term school leadership

requires a multifaceted approach (Greller & Stroh, 1995; Roberts, 1991; Sarros, 1998). When comparing school leadership experience to orientation levels (means) no significant differences were found. The effect sizes were small for all four orientations suggesting that school leadership experience does not play a significant role on orientation levels. There were no statistically significant relationships between school leadership experience and orientation use or levels.

Experience at current job ($M=7.65$, $SD=7.09$): The average length of experience at current job (tenure) is 7.65 years, which is an increase from past findings. In 2002 the average length of term for a Grade 8 school leader was 5 years, and the average length of term for a high-school principal was 3.2 years in the Columbia Union (Canosa, 2002). According to a nationwide study among independent school heads, school leaders have been staying longer at their schools. Some of the reasons for this change in tenure statistics, according to Bassett (2002), current President of NAIS, is that there are fewer people who have the training to become school leaders. Because more heads of independent schools and principals of public schools are nearing retirement in the next few years, school boards are motivated to making “it” work with the existing school leadership (Bassett, 2002). Those respondents with 20 years or less of current job experience ($n=41$) were compared with those who had more than 20 years of current job experience ($n=14$) on orientation use. The less (current job) experienced respondents rated highest in paired orientations, the more (current job) experienced respondents rated highest in single orientation use. When comparing current job experience to orientation levels (means), no significant differences were found. The effect sizes were small for all four orientations

suggesting that current job experience does not play a significant role on orientation levels. Even though there are no statistically significant relationships between current job experience (tenure) and orientation use or levels for the Columbia Union school leaders, other studies clearly indicate that school leaders can effect change only after the fifth year of tenure (Farkas et al., 2001).

For this study there were no statistically significant relationships between experience and orientation use or levels. This was in contrast to the majority of research that demonstrates that there is a significant difference between experience and leaders who function in multiple orientations and those who do not (Bensimon, 1989; Chang, 2004; Neumann, 1989). These findings do compare favorably to the studies by Harlow (1994) and Berman (2003), whose results indicated that experience did not directly affect orientations.

It is concluded that the self-reported data concerning orientation and personal variables are consistent with the results found in the literature.

Research Question 3

Research Question 3 inquired whether there were statistically significant relationships between the organizational orientations as measured by the Organizational Orientations Survey and the professional variables of grade levels served, highest educational attainment, enrollment, and support from parents, faculty, school board, peers, pastor(s), and conference personnel.

Grade levels served: Those respondents who served Grade 8 configured schools

($n=37$) and those who served high-school-configured schools ($n=19$) were compared to orientation use. The respondents who served Grade 8 configured schools ($n=37$) rated highest in paired orientation use. The respondents who served high-school-configured schools ($n=19$) rated highest in multiple orientation use. When comparing grade levels served to orientation use, no statistically significant differences were found.

When comparing grade levels served to orientation levels (means), these two groups were significantly different, with high-school-configured schools posting higher ($M=3.87$) in the political orientation level than those in Grade 8 configured schools ($M=3.48$). This difference may be explained for multiple reasons:

1. Elementary school leaders are trained differently than secondary school leaders.
2. Elementary school leaders may serve one or more churches, but secondary school leaders often serve multiple churches and conferences.
3. There are different professional development opportunities.
4. The elementary school organization is overseen by the local conference, but the secondary system is overseen by the union conferences (Columbia Union Conference, 2005). There are no studies on the differences between Grade 8 configured school leadership and high-school-configured school leadership in the Adventist school system to orientations.

Highest educational attainment: Twenty-five (45%) non-graduate-degreed respondents were compared to 30 (54%) graduate-degreed respondents on orientation use. Non-graduate-degreed school leaders rated highest in paired orientation use, graduate-degreed school leaders rated equally highest in multiple and single orientation

use. An interesting side bar for this study was: All school leaders who were still working on their Bachelor's ($n=4$) reported pair or multiple use of orientation patterns. The success of these less educated school leaders may be explained in part by their natural ability to function, using multiple orientations (Bolman & Deal, 1991). The descriptive findings indicate that educational levels among Adventist school leaders have not changed since the Benson and Donahue (1990) study, in which they reported that only 54% of the Adventist school leaders had a master's degree or higher as compared to the 69% in other private education and 97% in public education.

Relationships were also examined between educational attainment and orientation levels. No significant differences were found, and the effect sizes were small for all four orientations, suggesting that educational attainment does not play a significant role on orientation levels. This finding does not negate the need to look at the professional development opportunities for Adventist school leaders. "With money usually tight, there never seems to be enough money for professional growth activities," said one respondent.

Current enrollment: School leaders who served schools with 40 students or less ($n=27$) were compared to school leaders who served schools with more than 40 students ($n=28$) to orientation use. School leaders who served schools with forty students or less ($n=27$) rated highest in multiple orientation use. School leaders who served schools with more than 40 students ($n=28$) rated highest in paired orientation use. When comparing current enrollment to orientation use, no statistically significant differences were found. This compares favorably to a study conducted by Durocher (1996), who found no significant correlation between district enrollment and school leader orientation use.

When comparing current enrollment to orientation levels (means) there was a significant difference on the structural orientation level. This difference indicates that school leaders with 40 students or less are more structurally oriented than school leaders with more than 40 students. This means that in the multiple orientation use of the school leaders who served less than 40 students, the structural orientation was part of that pattern. This calls for further examination because the structural orientation indicates effectiveness as a manager not a leader (Durocher, 1996). This statistical difference could be a result of what small church school communities value, and is supported by organizational theory. For example:

1. Churches may believe that schools exist primarily to accomplish established goals.
 2. A structural form can be designed and implemented to fit the school's particular set of circumstances.
 3. Schools and churches work most effectively when environmental turbulence and personal preferences are constrained by norms of rationality.
 4. Specialization permits higher levels of individual expertise and performance.
 5. Coordination and control are essential to effectiveness.
 6. Organizational problems typically originate from inappropriate structures or inadequate systems and can be resolved through restructuring or developing new systems.
- The structural orientation is often used as a predictor for effective management, but not effective leadership (Bolman & Deal, 2002; Kotter, 1990, 1996; Rost, 1993).

Parental support variable: The respondents ($n=56$) rated the parental support

variable as fifth ($M=3.89$, $SD=0.76$) in the list of six support variables. This is in contrast to the 1993 Valuegenesis IV study that indicated that 84% of the school leaders rated parental support as good or excellent (Rice & Gillespie, 1993). Spearman Rho correlations between orientation use and parental support were examined. There was no correlation between parental support and orientation use. Inter-correlations between orientation levels and all the support variables were examined. There were no correlations between parental support and orientation levels.

Faculty support variable: The respondents ($n=55$) rated the faculty support variable second highest ($M=4.40$, $SD=0.66$) in a list of six support variables. At least one respondent commented that “I do not see the need nor have the information to comment on this question.” Spearman Rho correlations between orientation use and faculty support were examined. There was no correlation between faculty support and orientation use. Inter-correlations between orientation levels and all the support variables were examined. There were no correlations between faculty support and orientation levels. There are no other studies with regard to faculty support and orientations.

School board support variable: The respondents ($n=56$) rated the school board support variable as fourth of the six support variables. Spearman Rho correlations between orientation use and school board support were examined. There was no correlation between school board support and orientation use.

Inter-correlation between orientation levels and all the support variables were examined. There was a statistically significant relationship between school board support and the structural orientation level. This might indicate that school boards tend to support

and hire school leaders who are effective managers but not necessarily visionary leaders (Bolman & Deal, 2002; Kotter, 1990, 1996; Rost, 1993). There were no correlations between school board support and human resource, political, and symbolic orientation levels.

Peer support variable: The respondents ($n=51$) rated the peer support variable as third of the six support variables. Spearman Rho correlations between orientation use and peer support were examined. There were no significant correlations between peer support and orientation use. Inter-correlations between orientation levels and all the support variables were examined. There was no significant relationship between peer support and orientation level. This finding does not compare to the existing studies on the impact of peer and supervisor support on stress and burnout among school leaders (Gmelch et al., 1994). It probably was best stated by one of the school leader's comments written beside a question concerning support from peers, "What peers?" she or he queried.

Pastoral support variable: The respondents ($n=56$) rated the pastoral support variable as sixth (last) of the six support variables, indicating that from the listed avenues of support, the school leaders felt least supported by their pastors. This finding mirrors a 1987 finding in which Adventist school leaders perceived pastoral support for the Adventist schools to be very low, as compared to other constituent groups (Rice, 1987). In a recent study conducted by Stanley Patterson (2007) of 143 pastors and 191 K-10 educators, significant negative correlations existed between role tension and the quality of relationship between pastors and educators. Spearman Rho correlations between orientation use and pastoral support were also examined. There was no correlation

between pastoral support and orientation use. Inter-correlations between orientation levels and all the support variables were examined. There was a significant relationship between pastoral support and the structural orientation level. Since pastoral leadership plays an important role in the hiring and support of school leaders, they may be recruiting effective managers but not necessarily visionary leaders. There were no correlations between pastoral support and human resource, political, and symbolic orientation levels.

Conference personnel support variable: The respondents ($n=56$) rated the conference support variable as first (highest amount of support) in the list of the six support variables. This indicates that the school leaders feel most supported by their conference personnel. Spearman Rho correlations between orientation use and conference personnel support were also examined. There was a significant correlation between conference support and orientation use. The more supported by their conference personnel, the more orientations the school leaders used.

Inter-correlations between orientation levels and all the support variables were also examined. There were significant relationships between conference personnel support, human resource, and symbolic orientation levels. A couple of possible explanations for the results of this finding are: (a) Conference personnel recognize the effectiveness of these multi-oriented school leaders and consequently affirm them more, and (b) multi-oriented leaders tend to relate better to their superiors and develop positive relationships with them (Gmelch et al., 1994). There were no other studies concerning conference support and orientations.

In examining all the support variables I had hoped to discover that multi-oriented

school leaders feel more support or visa versa. Instead, a rather interesting finding emerged. School leaders of smaller schools (low enrollment) were more structurally oriented, school leaders who were structurally oriented felt more supported from school boards and pastors. And, yet, school leaders who were multi-oriented felt more supported by their conference personnel, especially in the areas of human resource and symbolic orientations. It appeared that conferences were encouraging leadership and local churches were encouraging management (Bolman & Deal, 2002; Kotter, 1990, 1996; Rost, 1993). Some of the comments from the content analysis spoke directly to the support variable. "My experience is actually as good as it is because of the support I have received from the union, conference, and board of trustees. Since I have their support I can be more courageous." The counterpart for this comment was, "I have had a very difficult year as a school leader. My pastor and some board members did not support me in this new position." It is concluded that the self-reported data, concerning orientation and the professional variables of grade levels served, educational attainment, enrollment and support, are consistent with the results found in the literature.

Research Question 4

Research Question 4 inquired whether there were statistically significant relationships between the organizational orientations as measured by the Organizational Orientations Survey and the overall feelings of success and job satisfaction.

Feelings of success: 86.54% of the respondents reported that they often or always felt successful. These findings are in agreement with the findings of Donaldson and

Hausman (1998), who discovered that the majority of principals felt successful in their jobs despite the stressful conditions they encountered. Of the Adventist school leaders who felt successful, they reported highest in multiple orientations, followed by paired orientation patterns. There were significant relationships between orientation use and feelings of success. Simply stated, the more orientations the school leader used, the greater the feelings of success.

With regard to feelings of success and orientation levels, there was a significant relationship between success, the human resource orientation level, and the symbolic orientation level. This compares favorably with other studies on what makes a school leader feel successful (Donaldson & Hausman, 1998; Harvey, 2002; Stemple, 2004).

Overall job satisfaction: 67.86% of the respondents reported that they often or always felt satisfied with their job. Concerning the relationship to orientation use and job satisfaction, there was a significant relationship between job satisfaction and orientation use. With regard to orientation levels there were three statistically significant relationships concerning job satisfaction, which were the structural, human resource, and symbolic. There was not a significant relationship between job satisfaction and the political orientation level. Some possible explanations for the results of these findings are:

1. Conference education departments appear to be encouraging multiple orientation school leadership, when the school leaders respond to this encouragement, it provides an affirming relationship between school leader and conference personnel .

2. Those school leaders who are multi-oriented actually experience a greater degree of success. That, in turn, gives them a great deal of satisfaction. School leaders

often commented about their satisfaction: “Personally, I feel that teaching is the most satisfying and rewarding work (other than parenting) that can be done,” responded one participant.

It is concluded that the self-reported data concerning orientation, and the professional variables of feelings of success and job satisfaction, are consistent with the results found in the literature.

Research Question 5

In contrast to Research Questions 1-4, Research Question 5 was a qualitative approach to understanding leadership orientations from the school leaders’ comments. This qualitative inquiry was designed to explore leadership orientations beyond what could be quantified or discovered through sections I and II of the Organizational Orientations Survey. The school leaders were simply asked to give comments, suggestions, or concerns regarding their experience as a school leader. The comments from this open-ended question were analyzed by myself and two field experts. The use of several different researchers, or investigator triangulation, helped ensure appropriate objectivity (Patton, 1990). The field experts were selected based on their knowledge and experience in research methods and the Adventist educational organization. I used the descriptors listed in Table 33 to conduct the content analysis. Here follows the discussion.

Even though the participants scored low on the symbolic questions on the Organizational Orientations Survey, their comments reflected a strong symbolic orientation. “Have a clear vision/goal and make sure your team knows what it is.” “I want

to be more of a leader regarding visioning.” And, “God has blessed our school over the past 4 years.” There was an overwhelming belief among participants that only faith in God made them effective leaders. Many reported that their love for the children and God is what motivates them during challenging times. They expressed appreciation for the support of pastors, parents, and the love of their students. The overreaching theme expressed in the qualitative portion of this research was the deep appreciation and satisfaction these leaders gained from their jobs (see Appendix D).

The suggestions for aspiring school leaders reflected the human resource and symbolic orientations in that they believed effective school leaders should hold to certain principles of discretion and honesty. Issues should be dealt with. Effective leaders should have courage, consistency, and fairness with no favorites. In dealing with conflict, the Matt 18 principle should be followed. These leaders talked of team building, communication, affirmation, and clear visioning (see Appendix D). One respondent added, “Be sure to communicate on a regular basis with your church family.” And, “We need to figure out a way to educate our young people with learning disabilities so they can have the opportunity of church school.”

The concerns expressed by these school leaders encompassed all four orientations. The most pressing structural oriented challenge that school leaders expressed was that of finances. “Lots of work with no money to have in-house help.” “I also feel that the pay scale doesn’t help. They don’t pay me enough to help me recover from my nervous breakdown.” School leaders expressed a need for more funding to accomplish their mission. Some felt that the educational system, starting with the General Conference,

needed to be restructured. The human resource concerns included: Insufficient leadership training, lack of respect for school leadership, and the work load—teaching and leading. For example, one participant stated, “People are so busy these days that it’s hard to find people who are willing and able to serve. . . . The number of hats, we as teaching principals have to balance, can be overwhelming and lead to great frustration.” By far the greatest challenge expressed by the school leaders was in the political orientation. This included conflict with their pastors, school boards, and parents. “The pastor recently told me that I had won the battle but that I’m going to lose the war.” “Pastors tend to be against the principal.” “Board members fill seats and push their agendas.” “I’m sick and tired of infighting, ‘control-freaks,’ and the overall politics.” This challenge is understandable since the self-reported survey data indicated that the Columbia Union school leaders were not politically oriented (see Appendix D).

The participants’ comments were ranked in the following way, (a) human resource, (b) symbolic, (c) political, and (d) structural. The survey ranking was, (a) human resource, (b) structural, (c) symbolic, and (d) political. The human resource orientation ranked the highest on both the qualitative and quantitative portions of the study. On the survey, the participants did not feel that they were an inspiration to their constituents, but spirituality was constantly mentioned in the comments: “I couldn’t do it without God.” “Prayer is what has kept me going.” Even though these are *symbolic* statements, they are not comments expressing confidence in the ability to empower and motivate others. An overarching concern expressed by many of the participants was all the political problems. Structural issues were also commented on but were not predominant. The impression was

that the participants had abilities to manage in the structural arena.

Several conclusions may be drawn from the results of Research Question 5:

1. The responses only partially mirrored the orientation choices from the survey.
2. From the qualitative data it was impossible to know the pattern of orientations—undefined, single, paired, or multiple.
3. The qualitative data exposed the personal dimension of leadership that would otherwise be missed. While the Organizational Orientations Survey generated numerical scores and patterns and categorized leaders into distinct types, the open-ended qualitative question provided responses that showed the reason why multiple oriented leadership is needed. Other research studies that used Bolman and Deal's (1990) Leadership Orientations (Self) Survey endorsed the need for the research process to include qualitative data (Borden, 2000; Chang, 2004; Hollingsworth, 1995; Mosser, 2000). The political and symbolic orientations emerged more from the qualitative question than in the quantitative survey questions. It is determined that the qualitative research included in this study reveals that the Columbia Union school leaders actually struggle in their roles as leaders because they do not use the range of organizational orientations, particularly the political and symbolic orientations.

Conclusions

The major conclusions are based on the analyses of the five research questions and are addressed in the following section:

1. Those school leaders ($M=3.87$, $SD=0.61$) of high-school-configured schools

were significantly more politically oriented ($t=-2.89$, $df=54$, $p=0.01$) than those school leaders ($M=3.48$, $SD=0.49$) of Grade 8 configured school. Apart from the differences in leadership and instructional training, these leaders also serve different constituencies, and governing boards, each of the governing boards select the leaders that best reflect the organization's values.

2. School leaders ($M=4.08$, $SD=0.34$) with low enrollments (≤ 40) were more structurally oriented ($t=2.77$, $df=53$, $p=0.01$) than school leaders with higher enrollments (>40). This corresponds with the significant relationship between school board support and the structural orientation level, and pastoral support and the structural orientation level. Structurally oriented school leaders felt more supported by their school boards (0.31) and pastors (0.35) than did nonstructurally oriented school leaders. Local school boards of small schools may unconsciously perpetuate the cycle of management rather than leadership (Cameron & Quinn, 1999).

4. Human resource (0.36), symbolic (0.34), and multi-oriented (0.30) school leaders felt more supported by their conference personnel. This could be because (a) Conference personnel recognize the effectiveness of these multi-oriented school leaders and consequently affirm them more, or (b) multi-oriented leaders tend to relate better to their superiors and develop positive relationships with them (Gmelch et al., 1994).

5. Multi-oriented school leaders felt successful (0.28), and were human resource (0.29), symbolically (0.28), and structurally (0.23) oriented. Multi-oriented school leaders also experienced job satisfaction (0.44) and were human resource (0.47), symbolically (0.41), and structurally (0.23) oriented. It appears that multi-oriented school leaders

experience more success and job satisfaction.

6. The content analysis supported the survey results in the following way: Both indicated that the human resource was the primary orientation for Columbia Union school leaders. The survey results were also supported in regard to the structural orientation in that the school leaders appeared to be confident in that orientation, providing comments and concerns that they wished their governing boards would or would not do. The impression was that they felt secure in the structural orientation of their position. The symbolically oriented comments, concerns, and suggestions denoted a total dependence upon God through some very trying experiences. Many of those trying experiences were related to the political orientation.

Recommendations for Practice

To be effective across a variety of critical leadership challenges, school leaders need to understand and possess skills—or surround themselves with people who have them—in the structural, human resource, political, and symbolic organizational orientations. The following statements are recommendations for practice:

1. Seek to understand the political challenges facing school leaders and provide them with the structure in policies, procedures, and professional development in order for them to be dynamic change agents and to grow schools.

2. Develop leadership at all levels. Teachers are often thrust into school leadership positions, especially of small schools. If the goal is to increase enrollment, then attention to small school leadership development is essential.

3. Provide training for pastors and school boards in school leadership, with the intent of encouraging visionary leadership and not just management. This type of pastor and school board training may serve to assure collaboration rather than competition between church and school.

4. The findings of this research indicate that conference personnel support multi-oriented leadership. Make sure this is intentional; put policies and human resources in place that will encourage and develop multi-orientation leadership at all levels. And explore reasons why this multi-orientation leadership is not supported at the local level.

5. Since this research indicates that multi-oriented leaders feel more successful and satisfied with their jobs, it is important to develop this type of leadership to ensure long-term and effective school programs.

6. Conferences and local governing boards may intentionally recruit multi-oriented school leadership by developing pre-screening instruments that would rate the leadership orientations of the applicants, such as is done with the Bolman and Deal leadership orientation's survey. Or these hiring entities could incorporate questions into the existing interview process that would identify multi-oriented leaders.

Recommendations for Research

This study explored the school leadership of one union conference in the North American Division. Therefore, the results are limited by the scope and methodology used in the study. The following topics which are recommended for further study:

1. Expand the study to include more participants, such as school leaders and

pastors of other conferences. A larger sample would enable more powerful analyses to be made, and results may be generalized with greater confidence.

2. Gather additional data from subordinates, board members, and superiors. This would give a broader, 360-degree perspective.

3. More in-depth study is needed on the political orientation use (or lack of use) among school leaders. This research may reveal why leaders are less likely to function in this orientation, and strategies may be developed for the use of all orientations.

4. Further study is needed to determine exactly what factors impact leadership orientations. Other variables may be time, race, and family background.

5. Revise and pilot test the Organizational Orientations Survey so that it is in harmony with Seventh-day Adventist cultural norms. For example, instead of *political*, use the word *negotiating* or *influence*. Instead of *symbolic*, use the word *spiritual*.

6. A longitudinal study of Columbia Union school leaders would be beneficial to help demonstrate how organizational leadership development has impacted enrollment.

7. A study with organizational orientations as the independent variable may help explore or identify underlying factors related to Adventist school leadership.

8. Additional qualitative research should be undertaken to further explore the ideas expressed by the school leaders in the qualitative portion of this study. Interviews and focus groups may be effective approaches to gathering ideas about current problems and future strategies.

9. Replicate this study in other unions of the world church educational organization.

10. Study the organizational orientations of recognized effective school leaders (i.e., principals whose enrollment has increased during their tenure) in the North American Division.

This chapter endeavored to show that the following objectives of this research have been accomplished: To identify (a) the orientations of school leaders in the Columbia Union Conference of Seventh-day Adventists, (b) the relationships between these orientations and personal variables of age, gender, and experience, (c) the relationships between these orientations and professional variables of grade levels served, highest educational attainment, enrollment, support from parents, faculty, school board, peers, pastor(s), and conference personnel, and (d) feelings of success and job satisfaction.

Endnote

Adventist education is one of the gifts God has given to bring humanity back to Him. "Education and redemption are one" (White, 1952, p. 31). In spite of this fact, Seventh-day Adventist K-12 enrollment continues to decline in North America. Many reasons are given for this declining enrollment.

1. There is lack of parental support for Christian education.
2. The costs of supplies, facilities, and salaries are escalating.
3. The tuition is too expensive.
4. Some schools are not academically challenging.
5. Some teachers and principals are poorly trained.
6. The schools are too conservative.

7. The schools are too liberal.
8. School boards do not know what they are doing.
9. The schools are not spiritual enough (Canosa, 2002; Haakmat, 1995; Hunt, 1996; Lekic, 2005; Metcalfe, 1969, Patterson, 2007). What really is the problem?

From a structural orientation, one might inquire as to what are the forces that affect the design of the Adventist educational organization—its size, core technology, environment, goals or strategy, information technology, and the characteristics of its people. A redesigned map may provide the support needed to create a climate of continuous improvement (Brantley, 1999).

From a human resource orientation, the organization might recognize that the fit between the school leader and the organization needs to be adjusted for growth. Educational organizations often focus on the structural and human resource orientations, to the neglect of other orientations.

Many organizational theorists believe that the only realistic portrayal of organizations is political—the ability to influence. They say that power and politics are key elements and should not be swept under the rug (Bolman & Deal, 1991). Power is often gained in the Adventist educational organization just like the public organizations, through education, money, and status. The Adventist educational organizational structure may not provide the support needed for political maneuvering. That aspect of organizational orientations may have been swept under the rug. School leaders weather “these storms” clinging to the promises of God (the symbolic orientation).

From the symbolic orientation, one can observe that the organization has sincere

school leaders who would have left long ago if it had not been for their faith in God. But many school leaders do not believe that they have the power to inspire, or that they are an inspiration to others.

The results of this study have implications for leadership practices within the North American Division of Seventh-day Adventists educational organization in terms of realizing its leadership capacity. Four major points realized from the research would indicate that:

1. School leaders must gain an understanding of organizational leadership. The research results suggest that those currently leading schools are human resource or structurally oriented more than politically or symbolically oriented.
2. A succession plan—providing training for young school leaders—should be established. The results indicate that the school leader population is aging. The sample of younger school leaders ($n=4$) responded on the survey paired or multi-oriented. This is a positive finding and suggests that younger school leaders are prepared to grapple with the many facets of their organization.
3. The findings from this study would suggest that it is important to develop pastoral school leadership. The disconnect between pastors and school leadership was apparent on both the quantitative and qualitative portions of the study.
4. The results also indicated the need for school leadership development with teachers, since teachers tend to become the school leaders.

Yes, enrollment maybe declining because of many reasons, but as the Adventist educational organization consciously develops and supports multi-organizational

leadership among principals, teachers, school boards, and pastors, and frames this understanding of organizational dynamics with the gospel commission, “Go ye into all the world,” the problem will not be declining enrollment, but how to provide for all those who want to enroll.

APPENDIX A

ORGANIZATIONAL ORIENTATIONS SURVEY

Organizational Orientations Survey

Research conducted by Rose Gamblin
Doctoral student in Leadership, Andrews University
Dr. Loretta Johns, Advisor (909)558-7619 or (909)558-1189

By completing and returning this survey you are consenting to participate in this research. Please do not put your name or school's name anywhere on this survey, by complying with this request we can assure total anonymity.

I. Demographics

_____ A) grade levels served (K-8, 1-8, K-12, K-10, 9-12).

_____ B) age

_____ C) gender

_____ D) highest level of educational attainment: (1) Working on a Bachelors (2) Bachelors (3) Working on a Masters (4) Masters of Teaching (5) Masters of Administration (6) Ed.D (7) Ph.D

_____ E) total years of experience as a school leader (head teacher, assistant principal, principal)

_____ F) total years of experience in current job

_____ G) total years of professional experience in the field of education

_____ H) total enrollment served in current job

I) Please indicate, by circling the appropriate level, the support you feel you receive from each of the following groups.

Parents: 1==Never; 2==Occasionally; 3==Sometimes; 4==Often; 5==Always

Faculty: 1==Never; 2==Occasionally; 3==Sometimes; 4==Often; 5==Always

Local School Board: 1==Never; 2==Occasionally; 3==Sometimes; 4==Often; 5==Always

Fellow Head teachers/Principals: 1==Never; 2==Occasionally; 3==Sometimes; 4==Often; 5==Always

Pastor(s): 1==Never; 2==Occasionally; 3==Sometimes; 4==Often; 5==Always

Conference Personnel: 1==Never; 2==Occasionally; 3==Sometimes; 4==Often; 5==Always

J) Circle the phrase that describes the level of success you are feeling about your work as a school leader.

1=Never successful ; 2=Occasionally successful; 3=Sometimes successful ; 4=Often successful ; 5=Always successful

This portion of the survey instrument adapted from the
Lee G. Bolman and Terrence E. Deal Leadership Orientations Survey
and the Thomas A. Harvey Principal Vitality Scale
used by permission.

II. Orientations

You are asked to indicate *how often* each of the items below is true of you.
Please use the following scale in answering each item.

1==Never; 2==Occasionally; 3==Sometimes; 4==Often; 5==Always

Be discriminating! Your results will be more helpful if you think about each item and distinguish the things that you really believe and do from the things that you do seldom or never.

1. ____ I think very clearly and logically.
2. ____ I show high levels of support and concern for others.
3. ____ I have exceptional ability to mobilize people and resources to get things done.
4. ____ I inspire others to do their best.
5. ____ I find my work to be gratifying.
6. ____ I strongly emphasize careful planning and clear time lines.
7. ____ I build trust through open and collaborative relationships.
8. ____ I am a very skillful and shrewd negotiator.
9. ____ I am highly charismatic.
10. ____ The challenges and shortcomings of my job cause me to doubt if it is all worth it.
11. ____ I approach problems through logical analysis and careful thinking.
12. ____ I show high sensitivity and concern for others' needs and feelings.
13. ____ I am unusually persuasive and influential.
14. ____ I am able to be an inspirations to others.
15. ____ I am satisfied with my job.
16. ____ I develop and implement clear, logical policies and procedures.
17. ____ I foster high levels of participation and involvement in decisions.

18. ____ I anticipate and deal adroitly with organizational conflict.
19. ____ I am highly imaginative and creative.
20. ____ I am satisfied with my choice to pursue a career in Christian education.
21. ____ I approach problems with facts and logic.
22. ____ I am consistently helpful and responsive to others.
23. ____ I am very effective in getting support from people with influence and power.
24. ____ I communicate a strong and challenging sense of vision and mission.
25. ____ If I had it to do over again I would choose the same profession.
26. ____ I set specific, measurable goals and hold people accountable for results.
27. ____ I listen well and am unusually receptive to other people's ideas and input.
28. ____ I am politically very sensitive and skillful.
29. ____ I see beyond current realities to generate exciting new opportunities.
30. ____ I pay extraordinary attention to detail.
31. ____ I give personal recognition for work well done.
32. ____ I develop alliances to build a strong base of support.
33. ____ I generate loyalty and enthusiasm.
34. ____ I strongly believe in clear structure and a chain of command.
35. ____ I am a highly participative manager.
36. ____ I succeed in the face of conflict and opposition.
37. ____ I serve as an influential model of organizational aspirations and values.

**The last task on this form is very important. Your comments may help future school leaders.
Please turn the page over!**

Please give comments, suggestions, or concerns regarding your experience as a school leader.

If you have any questions you may contact Rose Gamblin at any of these numbers.

Home: 301-824-3162

Cell # 301-988-0335

Fax 301-824-6869

MRGamblin2@aol.com

APPENDIX B
CORRESPONDENCE

Andrews University

School of Education

A platform for service

February 28, 2006

Dissertation Title: The Organizational Orientations of School Leaders in the Columbia Union Conference of Seventh-day Adventists

Dear School Leader:

You are invited to participate in a research study concerning the organizational orientations of school leaders. The purpose is to determine the organizational orientations of the school leaders in the Columbia Union Conference and the relationship, if any, to personal and professional variables. This survey should take between 20 and 30 minutes.

The results of this study may benefit school leaders by giving them a rationale for why the unexplainable often occurs in their organizations. These findings may benefit school leader training programs by offering insights into needed professional growth areas, and into the hiring practices of school organizations, ultimately helping schools be more successful.

Important findings and new insights will be included in a doctoral dissertation and may be shared or published in professional meetings or journals. An executive summary of the results will be made available to all the superintendents, principals and head teachers in the Columbia Union Conference of Seventh-day Adventists at the conclusion of this study, and at the discretion of your educational superintendent.

By completing the survey you are giving consent for use of the information as stated above. You or your school will not be identified in any way. You should not give any information that you don't feel comfortable sharing. You may refuse to participate at anytime without fear of penalty or loss of benefit to which you are entitled.

After completing (please make sure all questions have been answered) the survey, please enclose and seal it in the envelope provided. All sealed envelopes will be mailed to Andrews University for processing.

Sincerely,

Rose Gamblin, Principal Investigator
Andrews University Ph.D Candidate
E-mail: MRGamblin2@aol.com

Dr. Loretta Johns
Dissertation Committee Chairperson
E-mail: johns@andrews.edu

Leadership * Andrews University School of Education * Mid-Atlantic Regional Group

Andrews A University

February 13, 2006

Rose Gamblin
3 W. Douglas Court
Smithsburg
MD21783

Dear Rose

RE: APPLICATION FOR EXTENSION OF RESEARCH INVOLVING HUMAN SUBJECTS
IRB Protocol #: 02-G-081 Application Type: Extension Dept: Leadership
Review Category: Exempt Action Taken: Approved Advisor: Loretta Johns
Protocol Title: The Organizational Orientations of School Leaders in the Columbia Union Conference of
Seventh-day Adventists

On behalf of the Institutional Review Board (IRB) I want to advise you that your proposal has been extended for a further twelve months. You have been given clearance to continue with your research plans.

All changes made to the study design and/or consent form, after initiation of the project, require prior approval from the IRB before such changes can be implemented. Feel free to contact our office if you have any questions.

The duration of the present approval is for an additional year. If your research is going to extend beyond February 13, 2007, you must apply for an extension of your approval in order to be authorized to continue with this project.

Some proposal and research design designs may be of such a nature that participation in the project may involve certain risks to human subjects. If your project is one of this nature and in the implementation of your project an incidence occurs which results in a research-related adverse reaction and/or physical injury, such an occurrence must be reported immediately in writing to the Institutional Review Board. Any project-related physical injury must also be reported immediately to the I.R.B. physician, Dr. Herald Habernicht, by calling (269) 471-3940.

Sincerely,

Michael D Pearson Graduate Assistant Office of Scholarly Research

We wish you success as you implement the research project as outlined in the approved protocol.

Office of Research
Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI 49104-0355
Tel: (269) 471-6361 Fax: (269) 471-6801
E-mail: mpearson@andrews.edu

Subj: RE: (no subject)
Date: 09/02/2002 11:17:24 PM Eastern Daylight Time
From: bojmanjj^ujrikc,eclu
To: MRCaamblin2@aol.com
Sent from the Internet (Details!)

To: Ms. Rosalee Ann

Gamblin

Dear Ms. Gamblin:

We would be happy to provide your permission to use the Leadership Orientations Survey Instrument in your thesis subject to the conditions that are stated on my web site: "On request, we routinely grant permission for non-commercial, research use of the Bolman and Deal Leadership Orientations Survey Instruments. We do ask that users agree to provide us with copies of any research reports that they produce using data from the Instruments, and that they submit to us, if we request it, a copy of their data file."

You can find further information about the instrument and its use at the site: http://bsbpa.umn.edu/classes/bolman/new_page_1.htm

Best wishes on your research.

Lee Bolman

Subj: Re: Response: Re: Dissertation Survey (Ham, 8/20)
Date: 08/25/2002 8:23:42 AM Eastern Daylight Time From:
104474.76@compuserve.com (Hamlet Canosa) Sender: 1044
74.76@compuserve.com (Hamlet Canosa) To:
MRGamblin2@aol.com (INTERNET:MRGamblin2@aol.com)

Greetings, Rose!

Our CUOE gave an approval to your survey and approach. Will now mean that we will pursue formal approval by CUSAC and CUBOE. However, you can proceed with your plans.

I will ask Jennifer, our CUOE administrative secretary, to e-mail to you the names and addresses of our school principals within the next week.

Wish you every success and will keep in touch.

Headers •

Return-Path: <104474.76@compuserve.com>
Received: from rty-xb01.mx.aol.com (rty-xb01.mail.aol.com [172.20.105.102]) by air-xb04.mail.aol.com (v87.22) with ESMTP
id MAILINXB43-0825082342; Sun, 25 Aug 2002 08:23:42 -0400
Received: from siaag1ab.compuserve.com (siaag1ab.compuserve.com [149.174.40.4]) by rty-xb01.mx.aol.com (v87.22) with
ESMTP id MAILRELAYINXB14-0825082326; Sun, 25 Aug 2002 08:23:26 -0400
Received: (from root@localhost)
by siaag1ab.compuserve.com (8.9.3/8.9.3/SUN-1.14) id IAA14048;
Sun, 25 Aug 2002 08:18:19 -0400 (EOT) Date: Sun, 25 Aug 2002
08:18:05 -0400 From: Hamlet Canosa
<104474.76@compuserve.com> Subject: Re: Response: Re:
Dissertation Survey (Ham, 8/20) Sender Hamlet Canosa
<104474.76@compuserve.com> To:
"INTERNET:MRGamblin2@aol.com" <MRGamblin2@aol.com>
Message-ID: <200208250818_MC3-1-CD6-
199F@compuserve.com> MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable
Content-Type: text/plain;
charset=ISO-8859-1
Content-Disposition:
inline

Subj: Research Permission
Date: 12/20/2005 10:00:00 AM Eastern Standard Time
From: professionalvitality@tds.net
To: MRGamblin2@aol.com
Sent from the Internet (Details)

12/20/05

TO: Rose Gamblin and/or Dissertation Committee

It is with pleasure that I grant you permission to use the job satisfaction subset from my Professional Vitality Scale under the provisions that its use is for non-commercial research and that you will agree to provide me with copies of any research reports that are produced using data from the subset."

Good luck with your research.

Thomas A. Harvey

APPENDIX C
PILOT STUDY ORGANIZATIONAL PROFILE

An Organizational Profile

Structural

Political

Symbolic

Human Resource

- Leader Orientations
- Perception of Governing Organization's Orientations
- Leaders' Leadership Style (Forced-Choice)

APPENDIX D
CONTENT ANALYSIS

Content Analysis

#	Orientation based on Survey	Participant Comments	Orientation based on Content Analysis
1-8	Orientation=2 Human Resource	The rating of "always" is difficult for me to use because I take the word literally and know that exceptions often occur making "always" really "almost always." Had #5 been "almost always" I would have used it more.	NA
2-8	Orientation=2 Human Resource	It's challenging in the role of principal because people look to this position to make decisions, often on the fly (S). Once that decision has been made your employees want that to be written in stone (HR). Many times we as leaders need to be flexible when the need arises. Paper work and meetings that are not pertinent to creating a successful school climate(S).	Human Resource and Structural
3-8	Orientation=1 None	It is a thankless job many times (P).	Political
4-8	Orientation=3	<p>It's great to see kids grow through the years (HR). Insufficient training for job from up-line (HR).</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Did not at first enjoy the transition from teacher to principal but now immensely do (HR). 2. Holding to certain principles of discretion, honesty, clear-as-glass, Matthew 18, dealing head-on with issues, courage, consistency and fairness, follow-through, no favorites; all these saves a leader from many a pitfall (S, HR, P, Sy). <p>P.S. Your survey, I am concerned, may suffer from non-response and self-select biases. A true random sampling would have actually provided an accurate rendering--actually more accurate.</p>	Human Resource and S, HR, P, Sy.
5-8	Orientation=4	No Comments	

#	Orientation based on Survey	Participant Comments	Orientation based on Content Analysis
6-8	Orientation=1 None	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Build a strong team-be willing to do anything you may ask someone else to do (HR). 2. Have a clear vision/goal and make sure your team knows what it is (Sy). 3. Be open to multiple ideas, input, inspiration (Sy). 4. <u>Do</u> what needs to be done (S, HR, P). 	Human Resource, Symbolic
7-8	Orientation=2 Human Resource	<p>Be sure to communicate on a very regular basis with your church family. Let them know what's going on with/at the school. Thank them for all the ways they show support of the school. Be sure to have the students involved in the church service on a regular basis, including 1-2 Education Sabbaths where the children lead out in the service and the upper grades present the sermon or sermonettes (HR, P, Sy). Keep the lines of communication open with your staff and school parents (HR). Let them know they can talk with you (HR). Be proactive rather than reactive.</p>	Human Resource, Political, and Symbolic
8-8	Orientation=2 Structural	<p>The SDA system has given me no training as a principal (HR). Everything I know, I learned in the school of hard knocks—and some have been very hard indeed. If I could go back 27 years (actually 36 years to college) I would never have been an educator, but I took what my father offered (I will <u>only</u> pay for . . .) And did the best I could. I do have leadership skills, but the SDA community has all sorts of people with “agendas” who look at our schools as if the principal and staff do not have the expertise to make decisions. I am sick and tired of in-fighting, “control-freaks,” and the overall politics (P). Next year is my last year even though I am a very fine administrator.</p>	Human Resource, Political

Content Analysis—Continued page 3

#	Orientation based on Survey	Participant Comments	Orientation based on Content Analysis
9-8	Orientation= 3 Structural, Human Resource	I have found it very rewarding, but tremendously challenging. I was principal 10 years ago and found the politics very difficult to bear and did not have the superintendents support (P). This time it is totally different. We are dealing with financial issues and low student enrollments (P, HR). That is what makes it tremendously challenging.	Political, Human Resource
10-8	Orientation= 1 None	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Want to be more of a leader regarding visioning (Sy). • Need to recognize staff members on a more consistent basis for jobs/duties well done (HR). • Need to promote accountability more effectively (S). 	Symbolic, Human Resource, Structural
11-8	Orientation= 5 Structural, Human Resource, Political, Symbolic	I love what I do! I am grateful for <u>(conference name)</u> for taking a chance with me. God has blessed our school over the past 4 years (Sy). We had 23 students 4 years ago, today we have 67 students and are looking to have near 80 students next year (HR, P)! The biggest reason for school growth is because of prayer (Sy). The teachers pray, the students pray, the church prays, the parents pray and I pray(Sy)!	Symbolic, Human Resource, Political
12-8	Orientation= 2 Human Resource	From the questionnaire, in my experience, with very few exceptions “always” and “never” don’t exist.	NA
13-7	Orientation= 2 Structural	I have always seen our own church members show more respect for public school teachers, like church schools are somehow inferior (but just the opposite) and if you can’t get a job with the public sector, then the church will hire you (P). Educating our constituents about the quality of the school and staff has been ongoing (HR, S, P).	Political, Human Resource, Structural

Content Analysis—Continued page 4

#	Orientation based on Survey	Participant Comments	Orientation based on Content Analysis
14-7	Orientation=3 Structural, Human Resource	No comments	NA
15-7	Orientation=2 Human Resource	It is a challenge to be full time teacher/principal and try to cover everything. We have a very strong pastor who helps us with promoting the school (HR).	Human Resource
16-7	Orientation=1 None	I found a big difference in being a head teacher in a small country school and then going to a city school and being principal with 3 teachers (HR).	Human Resource
17-7	Orientation=5 Structural, Human Resource, Political, Symbolic	I am concerned about the lack of attracting young families to our churches. Services and outreach efforts need to be designed to meet non-Adventist and Adventist needs (HR, Sy). I am very curious how many students, attending our secondary schools, are coming from public schools versus our small little church schools.	Human Resource, Symbolic
18-7	Orientation=2 Human Resource	No Comments	
19-7	Orientation=3 Structural, Human Resource	I love my job—sometimes I wish the parents cared more (HR, P). I have a hard time getting committees to move to do what they need to do (Sy). I wish there was a class on how to move them along! But teaching and leading teachers along is great fun (HR). I feel guilty getting a pay check most of the time.	Human Resource, Political, Symbolic

#	Orientation based on Survey	Participant Comments	Orientation based on Content Analysis
20-7	Orientation=3 Structural, Human Resource	Time is too divided to be as effective as one could be (S). Immediate needs/concerns take precedence over important ones (S). Structure of school boards (parents, pastors, even employees) make innovation and forward thinking difficult (P, S, Sy). Board members fill seats and push their agendas (P).	Structural, Political
21-7	Orientation=1 None	The worse part about being a principal in an Adventist school is that you also have to be a teacher (HR). I don't feel that I can do either of my jobs adequately (P). It has given me a sense of unfulfillment because I feel I can never get the job done (P). There is always something that has to be neglected. I'm a very resourceful person, but what I would really like is to get someone to teach for me so that I can be the administrator(HR). I also feel that the pay scale doesn't help (P). They don't pay me enough to help me recover from my nervous breakdown. In fact, this is my last year of teaching.	Human Resource, Political
22-7	Orientation=2 Human Resource	I very much enjoy my job and believe that God has led me to be a Christian educator and administrator (Sy). I am not always pleased with my results as a leader, but I continue to depend and trust in God for His leadership, and pray daily that He will keep me faithful to Him (Sy).	Symbolic
23-7	Orientation=3 Structural, Human Resource	My biggest concern is the long hours necessary to run a small school. My work week is often approaching 60 hours. That leave little time for "refueling" and recreation (HR, P). After 16 years I still don't know how to balance my time in a more reasonable schedule.	Human Resource, Political

#	Orientation based on Survey	Participant Comments	Orientation based on Content Analysis
24-7	Orientation=4 Structural, Human Resource, Symbolic	Personally, I feel that teaching is the most satisfying and rewarding work (other than parenting) that can be done. I have enjoyed working with children and helping them develop (HR). The most important skill a teacher needs is to recognize that each child—especially the problem child—is a gift from God and he is worth more than life to Jesus (Sy).	Human Resource, Symbolic
25-7	Orientation=1 None	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Lots of work with no money to have in-house help (P). 2) When program goes well, others are given the credit (HR, P). 3) When programs fail the leader is now responsible (P). 4) Pastors tend to be against the principal (P). 5) Leading student to Jesus makes the job worthwhile (Sy). 6) No money—therefore creativity is a must. However if the principal leads out—others accuse. If the principal gets someone else to take the credit—many things can happen (HR, P). 7) More work with no time—students are the priority, but with administration work after school (S)—how does one get everything done (HR, P)? 8) I believe that Jesus is the only one who walked on water(Sy):) 	Political, Human Resource, Symbolic
26-6	Orientation=5 Structural, Human Resource, Political, and Symbolic	In my personal experience I found I learnt all the practical skills on the job (S). Training was more theory of leadership. Would have liked to have had more hands-on in training in the office/conference procedures (HR), etc	Structural, Human Resource

#	Orientation based on Survey	Participant Comments	Orientation based on Content Analysis
27-6	Orientation=3 Structural, Human Resource	No comment	
28-6	Orientation=3 Structural, Human Resource	Concern that I am growing too old for the job (HR, P).	Human Resource, Political
29-6	Orientation=2 Structural	Putting ideas forth for educational improvement is much easier than: Finding people to commit time to help implement the ideas (HR, P). 1) Getting funding to pay for and to support the ideas (P, Sy). It is so important to connect with God in order to accomplish the goals one wants to attain and to have the emotional strength to keep going forward with enthusiasm (Sy).	Human Resource, Political, Symbolic
30-6	Orientation=4 Human Resource, Political, Symbolic	Perfectionism is the downfall of many small school teachers (HR). To teach successfully in a small school, one must be flexible and pragmatic. Confidence in the belief that small schools offer an educational environment superior to large schools is another key to finding satisfaction in this calling (Sy).	Human Resource, Symbolic
31-6	Orientation=4 Human Resource, Political, Symbolic	No comment	

#	Orientation based on Survey	Participant Comments	Orientation based on Content Analysis
32-6	Orientation=5 Structural, Human Resource, Political, Symbolic	Things are going well for me because I love Christian education. While it is challenging and the tough parts are based on undoing what I have inherited(HR, P), my experience is actually as good as it is because of the support I have received from the union, conference, and board of trustees (HR, P). Since I have their support I can be more courageous.	Human Resource, Political
33-6	Orientation=5 Structural, Human Resource, Political, Symbolic	I love it!	Political, Symbolic
34-5	Orientation=2 Human Resource	I have served in the same building for over 20 years. I teach a multigrade classroom and have to come up with new and exciting ideas, programs and activities each and every year (P)! This is a challenge I enjoy and find great success in! Creativity is the key to my longevity. Faith has maintained me thus far(Sy)!!	Human Resource, Structural, Symbolic
35-5	Orientation=3 Human Resource, Political	Teaching has been rewarding, however conference administration has proven to be unsupportive of Adventist education except for lip service (HR, S). I teach because I love Jesus, and I love the children (Sy).	Symbolic, Human Resource, Political
36-5	Orientation=5 Structural, Human Resource, Political, Symbolic	I served for five years as a vice-principal before becoming a principal. This is my first year as a principal/teacher and I am having a great experience with the help of God (Sy). I am a spiritual leader, friend, and collaborator(Sy, HR, P). The parents and teachers are very pleased with my work. The community support that I've received thus far is very encouraging (HR).	

Content Analysis--Continued page 9

#	Orientation based on Survey	Participant Comments	Orientation based on Content Analysis
37-5	Orientation=1 None	It has been a walk of faith (Sy)!	Symbolic
38-5	Orientation=4 Structural, Human Resource, Symbolic	As an administrator/teacher, I enjoy my position, but it is EXTREMELY challenging, difficult and frustrating. I look beyond these challenges however, to the future rewards of my students as leaders, and eventually to their salvation and as members of God's eternal kingdom (Sy).	Symbolic
39-5	Orientation=1 None	It is a lot of work with little reward here. Thank God for heaven (Sy).	Symbolic
40-4	Orientation=4 Structural, Human Resource, Symbolic	The Holy Spirit of God and the love of Jesus Christ are our daily sources of wisdom and strength (Sy).	Symbolic
41-4	Orientation=3 Structural, Human Resource	No Comment	

Content Analysis–Continued page 10

#	Orientation based on Survey	Participant Comments	Orientation based on Content Analysis
42-3	Orientation=2 Human Resource	I have had a very difficult year as a school leader. My pastor and some board members did not support me in this new position (P). As a result of that, they undermined me in every way (P). The secretary told me that nobody liked me, not even the people who I thought liked me (HR, P). The pastor told me that the secretary didn't have to do anything I asked her to because the church paid her wages not the school (St). I resigned but later took back my resignation because of the tremendous outpouring of support from staff, parents, and students (HR). It has been difficult, but I believe God wants me there (Sy). The pastor recently told me that I had won the battle but I'm going to lose the war (P). I pray constantly (Sy).	Political, Human Resource, Structural, Symbolic

#	Orientation based on Survey	Participant Comments	Orientation based on Content Analysis
43-3	Orientation=4 Human Resource, Political, and Symbolic	<p>My job as a principal in an Adventist school is my ministry for God (Sy). If I looked at my job from the standpoint of my own fulfillment and enjoyment, I would at times feel unrewarded and at times unsuccessful.</p> <p>The financial and the political ramifications of being so closely associated with and controlled by the local church make any Adventist administrator's job stressful and at times difficult (S, HR, P). Most church members expect the school to maintain conservative Adventist standards while the church makes no effort to do so (S).</p> <p>Opportunities for professional development within the Adventist school system is hard to come by (HR). With money usually tight, there never seems to be enough money for professional growth activities (P). At the conference level, there always seems to be funds for taking care of the pastors, but even when funds are made available for the teaching staff there is always a bit of guilt that accompanies the professional perks. We are always told that we should really appreciate what we have because funds are so tight (P) . . .</p> <p>It is difficult to see progress in the educational system of a conference when the education leadership is not really providing leadership (HR). Our superintendent is a kind person and a dear friend, but there is lack of enthusiasm, lack of drive, and lack of vision for where our conference could/should be going educationally. My enthusiasm comes from collaborations with other administrators (HR) in the conference who feel like I do and are not contented to "wait to be led."</p>	Structural, Human Resource, Political, Symbolic

#	Orientation based on Survey	Participant Comments	Orientation based on Content Analysis
44-3	Orientation=1 None	I found this very difficult to complete. I don't think my answers would probably match what people see me do. I don't tend to see what I accomplish. I was not comfortable with this survey.	NA
45-3	Orientation=3 Structural, Human Resource	Keeping up with what is new is a formidable task at times. Discarding what works from the past for the new (since you can't keep adding without subtracting from the work load/curriculum) seems a waste at times. Sometimes we think new is better. When much of what is new (new studies that show . . . , new programs that are developed, etc) show little if any consideration for the element of success, or progress, stemming from a vibrant/live connection with the leading of the Lord in a person's/teacher's life (Sy), then the value of that research/product is another glorified earthly piece of wisdom. There is great need for more building up of the connection with God than for more human finding, or programs (Sy). I found no reference to God's blessings and empowerment questioned or referenced to in this study, either. I am not critical of Rose. I am only expressing my concerns that I see in educational trends. God Bless You, Rose	Symbolic

#	Orientation based on Survey	Participant Comments	Orientation based on Content Analysis
46-3	Orientation=3 Structural, Human Resource	My experience in Christian education began long before I became a teacher, as I started out as an instructional aide and have, at this point, spent most of my career in that capacity. Since becoming a teaching principal, I have found the work to be long, challenging, trying, and rewarding. For the most part I have felt supported by board, churches, staff and parents (HR, P). There are always special challenges every year that can leave one feeling alone on an island. The biggest challenge is trying to inspire the churches (members) to serve in any capacity at school (Sy). People are so busy these days that it's hard to find people (especially qualified individuals) who are willing and able to serve on the board, as Home and School leaders, or as volunteers at school. Because of this, the number of hats we as teaching principals have to balance, can be overwhelming and lead to great frustration (HR). Often I can best describe my feelings as, "my heart aches."	Human Resource, Political, Symbolic
47-3	Orientation=4 Human Resource, Political, Symbolic	No Comment	
48-3	Orientation=1 None	No Comment	

#	Orientation based on Survey	Participant Comments	Orientation based on Content Analysis
49-1	Orientation=3 Structural, Human Resource	It has been a continual learning process. My concern as Christian educators and leaders, is the goal to lead every student that crosses our path to Jesus (Sy)? Are we demonstrating that, regardless as to what the world around us is demonstrating?	Symbolic, Human Resource, Political
50-1	Orientation=4 Structural, Human Resource, Symbolic	<p>We need to figure out a way to educate our young people with learning disabilities so they can have the opportunity of church school (HR, P, Sy).</p> <p>I feel I could be more successful if I had the support of all the local pastors (HR, P, S). I don't feel our parents realize the importance of Christian education (Sy).</p>	
51-1	Orientation=3 Human Resource, Symbolic	<p>Adventist education needs a revitalization, from the level of the GC/Division and filtered down through the ranks. There seems to be little concern for the success of the educational process below the college/university levels. It is underfunded and its overall administrative process is archaic.</p> <p>There is need to develop and maintain an "Adventist Education System"—governed in clusters—all responsible to the same board (authority) such as the K-12 board. Local boards, as presently constructed, seem to do more harm than good to the leadership process of the local school.</p> <p>Further, local schools within conferences, but in close proximity, create an atmosphere of rivalry rather than cooperation. One talks about the "Catholic School System" but not the "Adventist School System". Instead, one speaks of John Doe or Mary Jane Adventist school, as if they have no connection or relation.</p>	Human Resource, Political, Structural

#	Orientation based on Survey	Participant Comments	Orientation based on Content Analysis
52-1	Orientation=2 Human Resource	I find that I am humbled by the fact that I was asked to be a school leader; that others felt that I was capable and suited for the job, but I didn't even have aspiration to this end. However, now that I've done it, through total dependence on God (Sy), I believe that the job I have done is suitable. Being in this position of leadership has awakened a new desire to learn, to improve myself professionally, to maintain . . . even more determinedly, my Christian standards – not only students depend on me . . . but now, the entire school family—parents, pastors, constituents, and community leaders (HR). It has been an eye opening experience to a service oriented job. I love it. I have a very dependable support staff (HR) and the experience as principal is one that is exciting, rewarding and tiring. ☺	Symbolic, Human Resource
53-1	Orientation=5 Structural, Human Resource, Political, Symbolic	As a school leader I believe that the job requires dedication, vision, and personal sacrifice. I don't want to forget to mention that it also requires total dependence on God (Sy). There's no way that I would have remained in Christian education (Adventist) without my faith, God, and family support. Adventist education requires money (P), and it doesn't matter if your school is large or small, money or lack of finances can be stressful. I desire for Adventist education to become more affordable (cost effective). Many children miss the opportunity of receiving an Adventist education all because they can't afford one (P). I will also like to see pastors a little more proactive when it comes to Adventist Education and make it a priority with their church members (new and old) (HR). After all "Education and Redemption are one" (Sy).	Symbolic, Political, Human Resource

#	Orientation based on Survey	Participant Comments	Orientation based on Content Analysis
54-1	Orientation=4 Structural, Human Resource, Symbolic	1) Feedback from board is sometimes affected by duplicity in task and focus (P). Overlapping functions as church members and Church board members (P, S). 2) Lack of separation or differentiation of role of church member and professional responsibilities towards school matters (P, S). Too frequent crossings of professional/ethical behaviors (S).	Structural, Political
55-1	Orientation=3 Human Resource, Symbolic	I suggest that clear lines be established in schools and churches to meet demands placed on schools for properly educating church school students (S).	Structural
56-1	Orientation=2 Human Resource	Being a school leader is a very challenging and enjoyable experience most of the time. I have found that the Lord (Sy) has been and is my constant help to accomplish the myriads of tasks that are thrust upon me. One of my concerns is in regards to the amount of support given to school leadership by incoming or outgoing pastors whose connection with the school is crucial (HR, P, S). If we could tie this in with the dedication of the faculty and staff (HR) the job of the education leader would be more enjoyable and rewarding. All in all, Christian education is close to my heart and I wouldn't trade it.	Symbolic, Human Resource, Political, Structural

REFERENCE LIST

REFERENCE LIST

- Adams, A. M. (2002). How to keep your head: Great schools and long-term headship. *Independent School*, 62(1), 12-16, 18, 20.
- Aiken, L. R. (1997). *Questionnaires & inventories: Surveying opinions and assessing personality*. New York: John Wiley.
- Aiken, L. R. (2002). *Attitudes and related psycho-social constructs: Theories, assessment, and research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Argyris, C. (1957). *Personality and organization*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Argyris, C. (1964). *Integrating the individual and the organization*. New York: John Wiley.
- Babbie, E. (1973). *Survey research methods*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Publishing.
- Bacharach, S. B., & Mitchell, S. M. (1983). The sources of dissatisfaction in educational administration: A role specific analysis. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 19(1), 101-128.
- Baldrige, V. (1971). *Power and conflict in the university: Research in the sociology of complex organizations*. New York: John Wiley.
- Barnett, B. G. (1992). Using alternative assessment measures in education leadership preparation programs: Educational platforms and portfolios. *Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education*, 6(2), 141-151.
- Barth, R. S. (1990). *Improving schools from within*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Bass, B.M. (1990). *Bass & Stogdill's handbook of leadership*. New York: Free Press.
- Bassett, P. F. (2002, Summer). Rethinking independent school governance. *Independent Schools*, 61(4), 7-8.
- Bates, R. J. (1980). Educational administration, the sociology of science and the management of knowledge. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 16, 1-20.

- Bates, R. J. (1981, April 13-17). *Educational administration, the technologization of reason and the management of knowledge: Towards a critical theory*. Paper presented to the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Los Angeles.
- Beck, L. G. (1994). *Reclaiming educational leadership as a caring profession*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Bedore, M. R. (1998). A multi-frame analysis of leadership orientation and its relationship to the leadership effectiveness and management effectiveness of human resource executives (Doctoral dissertation, Nova Southeastern University, 1999). Retrieved from ProQuest Digital Dissertations. (AAT 9926656)
- Bennis, W. G. (1961). Revisionist theory of leadership. *Harvard Business Review*, 39(1), 26-36; 146-150.
- Bennis, W. G., & Nanus, B. (1997). *Leaders: Strategies for taking charge*. New York: Harper Collins.
- Bensimon, E. M. (1989, November). *The meaning of good presidential leadership: A frame analysis*. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Association for the Study of Higher Education, Baltimore, MD. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 292 416)
- Benson, P., & Donahue, M. (1990). *Valuegenesis: Report I*. Minneapolis, MN: Search Institute, 2.
- Bergquist, W. H. (1992). *The four cultures of the academy: Insights and strategies for improving leadership in collegiate organizations*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Berman, N. S. (2003). *Longevity in independent school heads: From organizational change, educational beliefs, and leadership styles perspectives*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Indiana University of Pennsylvania, Indiana, PA.
- Bernard, L. L. (1926). *An introduction to social psychology*. New York: Holt.
- Bethel, C. N. (1998). A study of the relationship between presidential leadership orientation and organizational effectiveness in Bible colleges (Doctoral dissertation, West Virginia University, 1998). Retrieved from ProQuest Digital Dissertations. (AAT 9926656)
- Bingham, L. V. (1927). Leadership. In H. C. Metcalf (Ed.), *The psychological foundations of management*. New York: Shaw.

- Birnbaum, R. (1988). *How colleges work: The cybernetics of academic organizations and leadership*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Blanchard, K. H. (1998). *Situational leadership*. San Francisco: Pfeiffer Wiley.
- Boldt, L. G. (1996). *How to find the work you love*. New York: Penguin Group.
- Bolman, L. G., & Deal, T. E. (1984). *Modern approaches to understanding and managing organizations*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Bolman, L. G., & Deal, T. E. (1990). *Leadership orientations (Self)*. Brookline, MA: Leadership Frameworks.
- Bolman, L. G., & Deal, T. E. (1991). Leadership and management effectiveness: A multi-frame, multi-sector analysis. *Human Resource Management*, 30, 509-534.
- Bolman, L. G., & Deal, T. E. (1992, August). Leading and managing: Effects of context, culture, and gender. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 28, 314-329.
- Bolman, L. G., & Deal, T. E. (1997). *Reframing organizations: Artistry, choice, and leadership*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Bolman, L. G., & Deal, T. E. (2002). *Reframing the path to school leadership*. Thousand Oaks: CA: Corwin Press.
- Borden, M. P. (2000). Leadership orientations of area campus administrators in Florida's state university and community college systems: A frame analysis. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 61(10A), 3913.
- Bowen, E. P. (2004). *Perspectives on the leadership styles of West Virginia University extension service county program coordinators*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, West Virginia University, Morgantown.
- Brantley, P. (1999, Summer). Can education be Adventist and excellent, too? *Journal of Adventist Education*, 61(5), 4-8.
- Burns, J. M. (1978). *Leadership*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Caldwell, B. J., & Spinks, J. (1992). *Leading the self-managing school*. London: Flamer.
- Cameron, K. S., & Quinn, R. E. (1999). *Diagnosing and changing organizational culture*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

- Canosa, H. (2002, May). *Education: Examining the realities, and opportunity for creative solutions*. Principals' Council presentation conducted at the Chesapeake Conference of Seventh-day Adventists, Columbia, MD.
- Canosa, H. (2006, May). A ministry for children and families. *Visitor*, 111(5), 18-22.
- Carlyle, T. (1907). *Heroes and hero worship*. Boston: Adams. (Original work published 1841)
- Cattell, R. B. (1951). New concepts for measuring leadership in terms of group syntality. *Human Relations*, 4, 161-184.
- Chang, T. (2004). *Leadership styles of department chairs and faculty utilization of instructional technology*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, West Virginia University, Morgantown.
- Columbia Union Conference. (1999). *Education code for Columbia Union Conference*. Columbia, MD: Author.
- Columbia Union Conference. (2005-2006). *Columbia Union Conference directory of educators and schools*. Columbia, MD: Author.
- Covey, S. R. (1999). *Living the 7 habits*. New York: Simon & Schuster.
- Creswell, J. W. (2003). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Crist, B. E. (1999). A study of the relationship of the job satisfaction of chief academic officers of institutions of higher education and the perceived leadership style of the institution's president (Doctoral dissertation, West Virginia University, 1999). Retrieved from ProQuest Digital Dissertations. (AAT 9967224)
- Davis, T. I. (1996). *The ways administrators work: A study of the theoretical frames of leadership used by female and male secondary school principals in Pennsylvania (men, women)*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Temple University, Philadelphia, PA.
- Dawis, R. V., & Lofquist, L. H. (1984). *A psychological theory of work adjustment*. Minneapolis: Minnesota Press.
- Deal, T. E., & Kennedy, A. A. (1982). *Corporate cultures: The rights and rituals of corporate life*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

- Dillman, D. A. (2000). *Mail and Internet surveys: The tailored design method*. New York: John Wiley.
- Donaldson, G. A., & Hausman, C. (1998). *What makes principals feel successful?* Paper presented at the annual convention of the University Council for Education Administration, St. Louis, MO.
- Dowd, J. (1936). *Control in human societies*. New York: Appleton-Centruy.
- Drake, T. L., & Roe, W. H. (2002). *The principalship* (6th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Education.
- Drucker, P. F. (1999). *Management challenges for the 21st century*. New York: Harper Collins.
- Durocher, E. A. (1996). *Leadership orientations of school administrators: A survey of nationally recognized school leaders*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Teachers College, Columbia University, New York.
- Eckley, M. E. (1997). *The relationship between teacher empowerment and principal leadership styles (school organization)*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Pennsylvania State University, Malvern, PA.
- Erickson, E. H. (1950). *Childhood and society*. New York: Norton.
- Erickson, E. H. (1968). *Identity, youth and crisis*. New York: Norton.
- Farkas, S., Johnson, J., Duffett, A., & Foleno, T. (2001). *Trying to stay ahead of the game: Superintendents and principals talk about school leadership*. New York: Retrieved on June 20, 2004, from <http://www.publicagenda.org>
- Fayol, H. (1949). *General and industrial management* (C. Storrs, Trans.). London: Pitman. (Original work published in 1916)
- Fiedler, F. E., & Chemers, M. M. (1974). *Leadership and effective management*. Glenview, IL: Scott, Foresman.
- Figart, D. M., Mutari, E., & Power, M. (2002). *Living wages, equal wages: Gender and labor market policies in the United States*. New York: Routledge.
- Flak, T. M. (1998). *An inquiry into the leadership orientations of selected women school superintendents* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Maryland College Park, 1998). Retrieved from ProQuest Digital Dissertations. (AAT 9920823)

- Follett, M. P. (1918). *The new state: Group organization and the solution of popular government*. London: Longmans, Green, and Co.
- Foster, W. P. (1980). Administration and the crisis of legitimacy: A review of Habermasian thought. *Harvard Education Review*, 50, 496-505.
- Fullan, M. (1993). *Change forces: Probing the depth of education reform*. London: Falmer.
- Galton, F. (1879). *Hereditary genius*. New York: Appleton.
- Gamson, W.A. (1990). *The strategy of social protest* (2nd ed.). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Press.
- Gardner, J. (1990). *On leadership*. New York: Simon & Schuster.
- Garmston, R. J., & Wellman, B. M. (1999). *The adaptive school: A sourcebook for developing collaborative groups*. Norwood, MA: Christopher-Gordon.
- General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists. (2002). *Seventh-day Adventist yearbook*. Hagerstown, MD: Review and Herald.
- General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists. (2003). *Policy manual*. Hagerstown, MD: Review and Herald.
- Gerth, H., & Mills, C. W. (1952). A sociological note on leadership. In J. E. Hulett & R. Stagner (Eds.), *Problems in social psychology*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.
- Gibb, C. A. (1954). Leadership. In G. Lindzey (Ed.), *Handbook of social psychology*. Cambridge, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Gilson, J. T. (1994). *A leadership study: Public higher education administrators in Missouri compared with the Bolman-Deal database on multi-frame, multi-sector leadership (Bolman Deal database on multi-frame, multi-sector leadership)*. Kansas City: University of Missouri.
- Giroux, H. A. (1981). *Ideology, culture and the process of schooling*. London: Falmer Press.
- Glickman, C. D., Gordon, S. P., & Ross-Gordon, J. M. (2001). *Supervision and instructional leadership: A developmental approach*. Needham Heights, MA: Allyn & Bacon.

- Gmelch, W. H., Gates, G., Parkay, F. W., & Torelli, J. A. (1994). *The impact of personal, professional, and organizational characteristics on administrator burnout*. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 373 451)
- Gould, R. L. (1978). *Transformations: Growth and change in adult life*. New York: Simon and Schuster.
- Granel, E. (1999, December). *Versatile leadership: A comparative analysis of reframing in Venezuelan managers*. Paper presented to Ibero American Academy of Management, World Wide Bilingual Conference, Universidad Carols III, Madrid.
- Greene, K. (1992). Models for school board policy making. *Educational Administrative Quarterly*, 28(2), 220-236.
- Greenfield, T. B. (1979). Organizational theory & ideology. *Curriculum Inquiry*, 9, 97-112.
- Greenfield, T. B. (1980). The man who comes back through the door in the wall. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 16, 26-59.
- Greenleaf, R. (2003). *Servant leadership*. Prabhadevi, Mumbai India: Magna Grahpics.
- Greller, M. M., & Stroh, L. K. (1995). Careers in midlife and beyond: A fallow field in need of sustenance. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 47, 232-247.
- Griffiths, V. (1990, June). Adventist education encompasses the world. *Ministry*, 62(6), 4-6.
- Haakmat, J. R. (1995). *A study of the attitudes of Seventh-day Adventist parents toward the support of Seventh-day Adventist church schools in British Columbia*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI.
- Hamill, S. (2007). *Tao Te Ching: A new translation*. Boulder, CO: Shambhala Publications.
- Harlow, J. H. (1994). *Educational leadership: A frame analysis*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Seattle University.
- Harvey, T. A. (2002). *Professional vitality and the principalship: A construct validity study*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Maine, Portland.

- Hersey, P., & Blanchard, K. H. (1969). Life cycle theory of leadership. *Training and Development Journal*, 23(5), 26-34, 69. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. EJ004286)
- Herzberg, F. (1966). *Work and the nature of man*. New York: World Publishing.
- Hollander, E. P. (1964). *Leaders, groups, and influence*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Hollingsworth, C. (1995). Leadership characteristics and work ethic of Tennessee Agricultural Extension Service home economists (Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Tennessee, 1995). Retrieved from ProQuest Digital Dissertations. (AAT 9619616)
- Howell, D. C. (2004). *Fundamental statistics for the behavioral sciences* (5th ed.). Duxbury, MA: Duxbury Press.
- Hoy, W. K., & Miskel, C. G. (1996). *Educational administration, theory, research, and practice*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Hunt, W. D. (1996). *The factors that impact marketing and enrollment in Seventh-day Adventist boarding schools*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Virginia, Charlottesville.
- Isaac, S., & Michael, W. B. (1995). *Handbook in research and evaluation: A collection of principles, methods, and strategies useful in the planning, design, and evaluation of studies in education and the behavioral science* (3rd ed.). San Diego: Edits.
- Jewett, V.R. (1968). Importance of Seventh-day Adventist schools to their patrons (Doctoral dissertation, The University of Nebraska, 1968). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, AAT 6811558.
- Kegan, R. (1982). *The evolving self: Problems and process in human development*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Kilbourne, C. E. (1935). The elements of leadership. *J. Coast Artillery*, 78, 437-439.
- Knight, G. R. (1999). *A brief history of Seventh-day Adventists*. Hagerstown, MD: Review and Herald.
- Kohlberg, L. (1984). *The psychology of moral development*. San Francisco: Harper & Row.

- Kotter, J. P. (1990). *A force for change: How leadership differs from management*. New York: Simon & Schuster.
- Kotter, J. P. (1996). *Leading change*. Boston: Harvard Business School Press.
- Kroman, L. G. (1982). *A study of parental attitudes regarding boarding schools of the Mid-America Union of Seventh-day Adventists*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI.
- Lambert, L. (1995). *The constructivist leader*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Lambert, L. (1998). *Building leadership capacity in schools*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Lee, J. (1998). *The Health of Schools Project: Understanding factors that influence parents' choice to send their children to SDA school in the Southeastern California Conference of Seventh-day Adventists*. Loma Linda, CA: Loma Linda University School of Public Health, John Hancock Center for Youth Ministry.
- Lekic, M. M. (2005). *Perceptions and attitudes of selected Adventist and non-Adventist parents of school-age children toward Adventist school in Canada*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI.
- Levinson, D. (1986). A conception of adult development. *American Psychologist*, 41(1), 27.
- Lewin, K., & Cartwright, D. (Ed.). (1951). *Field theory in social science: Selected theoretical papers*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Lieberman, A., & Miller, L. (2004). *Teacher leadership*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Likert, R. (1932). A technique for the measurement of attitudes. *Archives of Psychology*, 22, 1-55.
- Lovevinger, J. (1966). The meaning and measurement of ego development. *The American Psychologist*, 21, 220.
- Martinez, R. S. (1996). *Self and administrative designee perceptions of leadership orientations of elementary principals who have and have not completed the California school leadership academy*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of La Verne, La Verne, CA.
- Maslow, A. H. (1954). *Motivation and personality*. New York: Harper & Row.

- Mathis, S. G. (1999). The relationship of leadership frame use of departmental chairs to faculty job satisfaction as perceived by selected departmental faculty members. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 60(06A), 1936.
- McGregor, D. (1960). *The human side of enterprise*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- McKinlay, A., & Starky, K. (1998). *Foucault, management and organization theory: From panopticon to technologies of self*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- McMillan, J. H., & Schumacher, S. (2001). *Research in education: A conceptual introduction* (5th ed.). New York: Longman.
- Meade, R. (1992). *The California school leadership academy: Its effect on the leadership orientations of California elementary school principals*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of La Verne, CA.
- Merriam, S. B. (1998). *Qualitative research and case study applications in education*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Metcalfe, H. K. (1969). *A survey of the attitudes of parents toward Seventh-day Adventist education in the Columbia Union Conference*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, The Catholic University of America, Washington, DC.
- Miller, J. P. (2000). *Education and the soul: Toward a spiritual curriculum*. New York: State University of New York Press.
- Miro, A. (1993). *A comparative study of leadership orientation frames between public high school principals serving in schools that applied and did not apply for California Senate Bill 1274 restructuring grants*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of La Verne, CA.
- Moll, L. C. (Ed.). (1990). *Vygotsky and education: Instructional implications and applications of sociohistorical psychology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Morehead, P. D. (Ed.). (1995). *The new American Webster handy college dictionary* (3rd ed.). New York: Penguin Putnam.
- Murphy, J., & Louis, K. (1994). *Reshaping the principalship: Insights from transformational reform efforts*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

- National Association of Elementary School Principals. (1998, January). *Is there a shortage of qualified candidates for openings in the principalship?* Retrieved on June 20, 2004, from <http://www.naesp.org/>
- National Association of Secondary School Principals. (1998, April). *The principal, keystone of a high-achieving school: Attracting and keeping the leaders we need.* Retrieved on June 20, 2004, from <http://www.nassp.org/>
- Neumann, A. (1989). Strategic leadership: The changing orientations of college presidents. *The Review of Higher Education*, 12(2), 137-151.
- North American Division Office of Education. (1997). *135th annual statistical report-1997*. Silver Spring, MD: Office of Archives and Statistics.
- North American Division Office of Education. (2003). *Journey to excellence*. Silver Spring, MD: Bond Design.
- North American Division of the General Conference Working Policy. (2001-2002). Washington, DC: General Conference of Seventh-day Adventist.
- Northouse, P. G. (1997). *Leadership: Theory and practice*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Odden, A. R. (1995). *Educational leadership for American's schools*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Oppenheim, A. N. (1992). *Questionnaire design, interviewing and attitude measurement*. New York: Printer Publishers.
- Osborn, R. (2000). Taking a systems approach to Adventist education, 1995-2000 Report. *Adventist Education, General Conference Report 2000*, 34-38.
- Ouchi, W. G. (1981). *Theory Z: How American businesses can meet the Japanese challenge*. Reading, MA: Jossey-Bass.
- Owens, R. G. (1970). *Organizational behavior in schools*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Pascale, R., & Athos, A. (1981). *The art of Japanese management*. New York: Simon & Schuster.

- Patterson, S. E. (2007). *Organizational expectations and role clarification of pastors and educators serving K-10 schools operated by the Georgia-Cumberland Conference of Seventh-day Adventists*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI.
- Patton, M. Q. (1990). *Qualitative evaluation and research methods* (2nd ed.). London: Sage.
- Pavan, B. N., & Reid, N. A. (1991, April). *Espoused theoretical frameworks and the leadership behaviors of principals in achieving urban elementary schools*. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 337 533)
- Peasley, R. (1992). *The California school leadership academy: Its effect on the leadership orientations of California secondary school principals*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of La Verne, La Verne, CA.
- Pedhazur, E. J., & Schmelkin, L. P. (1991). *Measurement, design, and analysis: An integral approach*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Peters, T., & Waterman, R. (1982). *In search of excellence*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Pinkney-Maynard, B. G. (1986). *The influence of the tenured principalship upon leadership performance in the District of Columbia public school system*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, George Washington University, Washington, DC.
- Redman, M. (1991). *A comparative study of the leadership orientation frames of administrators in private Japanese and American institutions of higher education*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of La Verne, La Verne, CA.
- Rice, G. (1987). *Marketing Seventh-day Adventist Education in the Pacific Union*. Unpublished paper presented at the Spring Education Council, Pacific Union Conference of Seventh-day Adventists, Angwin, CA.
- Rice, G. T., & Gillespie, V. B. (1993). *Valuegenesis: (Report 4) A study of the influence of family, church and school on the faith, values, and commitment of Adventist youth*. Loma Linda, CA: Loma Linda University School of Public Health, John Hancock Center for Youth Ministry.
- Rivers, P. G. (1996). *A frame analysis of principals' leadership orientations (multiframe thinking)*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Central Florida, Orlando, FL.

- Roberts, G. F. (1991). *The relationship of role overload to job satisfaction and job effectiveness of elementary school principals in Connecticut* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Bridgeport, 1990). *Digital Dissertations*, No. AAT 9103508.
- Rossi, P. H., Wright, J. D., & Anderson, A. B. (1983). *Handbook of survey research*. San Diego: Academic Press.
- Rost, J. C. (1993). *Leadership for the twenty-first century*. Westport, CT: Praeger.
- Russell, C. A. (2000). Community college academic deans: Leadership frames and stress. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 61(10A).
- Sarason, S. D. (1971). *The culture of the school and the problem of change*. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
- Sarros, J. C. (1998). Administrator burnout: Findings and future directions. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 26, 184-196.
- Sarros, J. C., & Sarros, A. M. (1992). Social support and teacher burnout. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 30(1), 55-69.
- Sax, G. (1997). *Principles of educational and psychological measurement and evaluation*. San Francisco: Phoenix.
- Schein, E. H. (1985). *Organizational culture and leadership*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Schein, E. H. (1992). *Organizational culture and leadership* (2nd ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Senge, P., Kleiner, A., Roberts, C., Ross, R., Roth, G., & Smith, B. (1999). *The dance of change: The challenges of sustaining momentum in learning organizations*. New York: Doubleday/Currency.
- Sergiovanni, T. J. (1984). *Handbook for effective department leadership* (2nd ed.). Newton, MA: Allyn Bacon.
- Sergiovanni, T. J. (1994). Organizations or communities: Changing the metaphor changes the theory. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 30, 214-226.
- Sernak, K. (1998). *School leadership: Balancing power with caring*. New York: Teachers College Press.

- Shakeshaft, C. (1989). *Women in educational leadership*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Shee, S. C. (2001). *Leadership and religiosity: A study of Seventh-day Adventist K-12 school leaders*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, La Sierra University, Riverside, CA.
- Simon, H. A. (1945). *Administrative behavior*. New York: Macmillan.
- Smulyan, L. (2000). *Balancing acts: Women principals at work*. New York: State University of New York Press.
- Stemple, J. D. (2004). *Job satisfaction of high school principals in Virginia*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, Blacksburg, VA.
- Stogdill, R. M. (1974). *Handbook of leadership: A survey of theory and research*. New York: Free Press.
- Stogdill, R. M., & Shartle, C. L. (1955). *Patterns of administrative performance*. Columbus: Ohio State University, Bureau of Business Research.
- Strickland, J. S. (1992). *Leadership perspectives of Tennessee school leaders (organizational frames)*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, East Tennessee State University, Johnson City, TN.
- Suzuki, Y. C. (1994). *A comparative study of the leadership orientation frames of California Asian and other public school principals*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. University of La Verne, La Verne, CA.
- Tannenbaum, A. S. (1962). Control in organizations: Individual adjustment and organizational performance. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 7, 236-257.
- Tabachnick, B. G., & Fidell, L. S. (2001). *Using multivariate statistics* (4th ed.). Needham, MA: Allyn and Bacon.
- Taylor, F. W. (1911). *The principles of scientific management*. New York: Harper.
- Tead, O. (1951). *The art of administration*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Thomas, S. J. (1999). *Designing surveys that work*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.
- Tolstoy, L. (1933). *War and peace* (L. Maude & A. Maude, Trans.). New York: Oxford University Press.

- U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics. (2002). *The condition of education 2002*. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- Vygotsky, L. S. (1962). *Thought and language*. Cambridge, MA: The M.I.T. Press.
- Weber, M. (1949). *The methodology of the social sciences* (Edward Shils and Henry Finch, Eds.). New York: Free Press.
- Wheatley, M. J. (1994). *Leadership and the new science: Learning about organization from an orderly universe*. San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler.
- White, E. G. (1952). *Education*. Mountain View, CA: Pacific Press.
- White, J. (1862, December). In search of proper education. *The Advent Review and Sabbath Herald*, 6-7.
- Wiersma, W. (1995). *Research methods in education* (6th ed.). Needham Heights, MA: Allyn and Bacon.
- Wilkie, A. F. (1993, April). *Lessons on corporate intervention into school-based management*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of American Education Research Association, Atlanta. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 359 648)
- Winans, D. P. (1995). *School board/superintendent frames of reference from school districts engaged in systemic change*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Kansas, Lawrence, KS.
- Woods, F. A. (1913). *The influence of monarchs*. New York: Macmillan.
- Wren, J. T. (1995). *The leader's companion: Insights on leadership through the ages*. New York: Free Press.
- Yerkes, D., Cuellar, M. F., & Cuellar, A. (1992, April). *Towards an understanding of organizational culture in schools of education: Implications for leadership development*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 348 768)
- Yukl, G. A., & Van Fleet, D. D. (1982). Cross-situational, multimethod research on military leader effectiveness. *Organizational Behavior and Performance*, 30, 87-108.

Zohar, D., & Marshall, I. (1994). *The quantum society: Mind, physics, and a new social vision*. New York: William Morrow.

Vita

Personal Information

Rose Gamblin

3 W. Douglas Ct.
Smithsburg, MD 21783
301-824-3162
MRGamblin2@aol.com

Education

Ph.D.	2007	Leadership	Andrews University, Berrien Springs, Mich.
M. Ed.	2002	Administration and Supervision	Frostburg State University, MD
B.S.	1979	Elementary Education, Math and Music Minor	Southwestern Adventist University, TX.
A.S.	1976	Liberal Studies	Bismarck State College, ND

**Completed a Maryland approved licensure program using NASDTEC recognized state standards:
Certificate: Administration (Supervisor/Principal) K-6; 7-12**

Employment History

Education Specialist Review & Herald Publishing Association 2006-Present
Research and Development of Educational Products

Math Professor Frederick Community College 2005-2006
Teaching *Mathematics of Finance* 115 and *Foundations of Mathematics* 103

Principal/Teacher 7-10 Berkeley Springs SDA Academy 1999-2005
Responsible for both the financial and academic success of the K-10 school program.

Principal/Teacher 7-8	Simi Valley Adventist School	1993-1995
Responsible for both the financial and academic success of the 1-8 school.		

Skills

- Public Speaking
- Budget planning and implementation
- Community involvement
- Organizational skills
- Musical
- Promotion and Marketing

Scholastic Distinctions

- Who's Who in American Junior Colleges
- Member of Phi Theta Kappa
- Outstanding Pianist Award
- Graduated Summa Cum Laude
- Member of Pi Lambda Theta