University of San Diego

Digital USD

Dissertations

Theses and Dissertations

2010-05-01

Balancing Act: A Study of International School Heads' efforts to Manage the Professional and Personal Aspects of their Lives

Christiane PJ Sorenson EdD
University of San Diego

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digital.sandiego.edu/dissertations>

Part of the [Leadership Studies Commons](#)

Digital USD Citation

Sorenson, Christiane PJ EdD, "Balancing Act: A Study of International School Heads' efforts to Manage the Professional and Personal Aspects of their Lives" (2010). *Dissertations*. 818.
<https://digital.sandiego.edu/dissertations/818>

This Dissertation: Open Access is brought to you for free and open access by the Theses and Dissertations at Digital USD. It has been accepted for inclusion in Dissertations by an authorized administrator of Digital USD. For more information, please contact digital@sandiego.edu.

**BALANCING ACT: A STUDY OF INTERNATIONAL SCHOOL HEADS' EFFORTS
TO MANAGE THE PROFESSIONAL AND PERSONAL ASPECTS OF THEIR LIVES**

by

CHRISTIANE PJ SORENSON

A dissertation submitted in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree of

Doctor of Education
University of San Diego

May 2010

Dissertation Committee:

Dr. Robert Donmoyer, Ph.D. Chair
Dr. Fred Galloway, Ed.D. Member
Dr. Bobbi Hansen, Ed.D. Member
Dr. Paula Krist, Ph.D, Member

ABSTRACT

Interest in the topic of professional and personal life balance has increased exponentially over the past several decades. The topic even is listed by the current First Lady of the United States as a priority item to be addressed during her husband's first four years in office. While studies have been conducted about the professional/personal balance of corporate executives and other professionals, including government employees, there has been almost no direct study of balance in educational professionals' lives. This study investigated school heads' perceptions about the factors that impact their ability to achieve balance between their professional and personal lives. Further, the study explored whether there is a relationship between achieving a sense of balance, on the one hand, and success in both personal and professional areas, on the other.

A web-based questionnaire was distributed to both international and U. S. independent school heads through two global, one national, and 11 regional membership associations. A total of 227 school heads responded. First descriptive statistics were used to gain a general perception of school heads' sense of balance, as well as their perceptions of what contributes to or detracts from achieving balance. Next, a total of 48 regression models were used to identify the determinants of professional and personal satisfaction and the success of school heads. Finally, further inferential analysis was used to determine whether there were significant differences between international and U.S. based independent school heads.

Among other things, this study suggests that while over 85% of heads feel that balance is important at this stage in their career, less than half of those heads feel they have achieved balance in their lives. The study also identified strategies that educational

leaders in independent schools in both the United States and international settings employ to establish balance. Finally, the study suggested that there was a relationship between achieving balance, on the one hand, and both personal and professional success, on the other. On this point and most others, there was no difference between U.S. and international respondents.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES.....	iii
CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION.....	1
Background to the Study/Statement of the Problem.....	1
Purpose of the Study and the Study's Research Questions	6
Organization.....	7
CHAPTER 2: REVIEW OF LITERATURE.....	9
Overview.....	9
History/Definition of Work/Life Balance.....	9
Existing Research on Work/Life Balance.....	13
Theoretical Models	15
International Studies	17
Literature Specific to Educational Leadership.....	18
CHAPTER 3: METHODOLOGY	22
Introduction.....	22
Prior Study	22
Current Study	24
Respondents and access.....	24
Instrument development.....	25
Data collection methods.....	28
Data analysis methods.....	30
Limitations of the Study.....	32
Sample.....	32
Individual Interpretation	33
Potential Significance of this Study.....	33
Conclusion	35
CHAPTER 4: RESULTS.....	36
Introduction.....	36
Sample Characteristics.....	36
Demographics	36
International vs. U.S.	40
Research Question # 1: Do Selected Heads Value Balance in Their Personal and Professional Lives?	42
Research Question #2: What do Selected Heads Report as Factors That Impact Their Ability to Find Balance Between Their Professional and Personal Lives?	44
Research Question #3: What Strategies Do School Heads Use to Establish Balance?	46
Research Question #4: To What Extent Is There A Relationship Between Reported Balance and Measures of Professional and/or Personal Satisfaction and Success of School Heads?.....	48
Professional Satisfaction.....	49

Personal Satisfaction	50
Success of School Heads	52
Regression Models.....	54
Regression models using demographic variables	55
Regression models using demographic and role balance variables	56
Regression models using demographic, role balance and support variables	58
Regression models using all variables.	60
Summary of Regression Models.....	68
Research Question 5: Are there significant differences across demographic factors between reports from school heads working in international schools and independent schools within the United States?	71
CHAPTER 5: CONCLUSION	76
The Problem and Purpose of the Dissertation.....	76
Methods.....	77
Summary of Findings.....	78
Interpretation: The Findings and the Literature	81
Recommendations for Future Studies	85
Implications and Suggestions for Existing and Potential School Heads	88
Conclusion	90
References.....	92
Appendix A.....	101
Interview Guide	101
Appendix B	102
Email Survey Invitation	102
Appendix C	103
Survey	103
Appendix D.....	108
Specification of Variables.....	108

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1: Demographic Characteristics of the Sample.....	39
Table 2: Comparison of Demographic Characteristics between Int'l and U.S. Heads	41
Table 3: Support Descriptives.....	45
Table 4: Support by Partner/Spouse as a Percentage within Current Relationship	45
Table 5: Balance Strategy Frequencies.....	47
Table 6: Employment of Household Help as Percentage within Gender	48
Table 7: Professional Satisfaction Frequencies	50
Table 8: Distribution of Summed Professional Satisfaction Scores	50
Table 9: Personal Satisfaction Frequencies	51
Table 10: Distribution of Personal and Combined Professional and Personal Satisfaction Scores	52
Table 11: Comparison of Years in Current Position between Int'l and U.S. Heads	53
Table 12: Comparison of Satisfaction with Family Relationships and Years in Current Position as a Function of Location.....	54
Table 13: Professional Satisfaction Summation (Model 46).....	63
Table 14: Personal Satisfaction Summation (Model 47).....	65
Table 15: Professional and Personal Satisfaction Summation (Model 48).....	67
Table 16: Significance Scores of Int'l and U.S. Heads Across Demographic Factors.....	70
Table 17: Comparison of International and U.S. Heads Satisfaction Scores.....	74
Table 18: Comparison of International and U.S. Heads Balance Variables as Percentage within Location	75

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

Background to the Study/Statement of the Problem

The issue of professional and personal life balance, also referred to as work/life balance, has garnered increased attention over the past two and a half decades (Cornell University, School of Industrial and Labor Relations Research [ILR], 2002). More women entering into — and remaining and advancing in — the workforce (Bond, Thompson, Galinsky, & Prottas, 2002), the increase in divorce and single-parent households, and the immediate gratification/output expectations of today's information age, all have helped make balancing time spent on work commitments with time spent on personal life responsibilities and leisure pursuits a popular topic. While working 90 hours a week was something to be proud of in the 80's, in the 90's and the 21st century, we have entered into the age of the “well-rounded professional” (Chen, 2004).

The growing interest in the topic of work/life balance is evidenced by the number of “how to” books/articles dedicated to the topic, such as the *Harvard Business Review on Work and Life Balance* (Harvard Business Review Paperback Series, 2000), and *Inc. Magazine's* “Get a Life!” (Gruner, 1997) and “The Power of Balance” (Singer, 2000), and the American Medical Association's *The Medical Marriage* (Sotile & Sotile, 2000) and *The Resilient Physician* (Sotile & Sotile, 2001). There have also been workshops and seminars on gaining balance between one's professional and personal life provided, in the United States, by organizations like The Alliance for Work-Life Progress and BizHotline, and, internationally, by organizations such as The University of Canberra and even the Australian Government. Software programs on the topic of balancing one's professional

and personal lives have also been created. Examples include SkillSoft's six "courses" to achieving balance in your professional and personal life (plus a simulation bonus CD) to assist in balancing time and responsibilities.

A number of academic institutions (e.g., Boston College Center for Work & Family, Center for Families/Purdue University, Harvard School of Public Health), businesses (e.g., Whirlpool Foundation, Women in Cable & Telecommunications Foundation) and public organizations (e.g., the Alliance of Work/Life Professionals, the Families and Work Institute, the Public Policy Center, Society for Human Resource Management,) have begun conducting research about the challenges faced by both working individuals and families. The Center for the Ethnography of Everyday Life (CEEL) at the University of Michigan, for example, studies balance issues from the perspective of Cultural Anthropology and publishes research papers that can be downloaded (<http://ceel.psc.isr.umich.edu/>). Until very recently, most existing research into work/life balance, including the research alluded to above, has yielded mostly self-help writings and seminars; scholarly discussions of the topic are limited.

The academic scholarship that does exist on the topic of balance does not necessarily apply a single definition of balance. For example, in a study by Greenhaus, Collins & Shaw (2003) the authors define balance as equal time spent on work and personal responsibilities, although Greenhaus, et al. also indicate that they have found employees who subjectively experience a high degree of balance even if time spent at work and with family are not exactly equal. Greenhaus, et al. concluded that it would be useful to include both objective and subjective assessments of balance in the same study. They go on to suggest that including multiple assessments of balance within one study

would allow for the study of more subtle aspects of balance, such as the ability of balanced individuals to enjoy activities in one role without being preoccupied with pressures in another role. Clarke et al. (2004) and Voydanoff (2005) built upon this suggestion and studied the relationship between work-family balance and work-family *fit*, finding that the two are related yet distinct constructs. Fit is determined by structural or objective assessments, while the perception of balance appears to encompass the psychological or subjective aspects.

All of the publications on professional/personal balance, scholarly as well as popular press material, have been geared toward corporate executives and professional services. There is almost no direct study of balance for educational professionals or for most others who hold non-corporate leadership positions, for that matter. A search of four academic databases (ERIC, Academic Search Premier, PsychInfo, and Educational Administration Abstracts) came up with limited matches. Using the descriptor “work-life balance,” 1578 articles were found, with only 61 pertaining to “leadership” and 18 pertaining to “education.” Of the latter, seven targeted K-12 education and three targeted college/university department heads or presidents.

In independent schools, the counterpart to a Chief Executive Officer (CEO) of a company is the school head. This is the person with the most authority within the school and with a direct reporting line to the Board of Trustees or owner of the school. Independent schools located overseas, known as international schools, have rapidly increased in numbers over the past few years, and this increase has led to a corresponding increase in the demand for qualified leaders of these schools. International School Consultancy (ISC) Research Ltd. is an online database of the world’s international

schools, which allows users to research and analyze developments in the international school market (<http://www.isc-r.com>). ISC reports that since January 2009, 505 new international schools have been registered. It follows that 505 new heads were sought (and found) to lead these schools, qualified or otherwise. However, the pool of candidates is diminishing not only due to school leaders collapsing with stress-related illnesses or retiring early, but also through a lack of interest by possible candidates in following in the footsteps of such predecessors (Milne, 2007).

Despite the lack of attention to non-corporate populations, anecdotal evidence suggests that school heads, both inside and outside the United States, experience difficulty in achieving balance among independent school heads, much as corporate CEOs do (Academy for International School Heads Summer Seminar Philadelphia, personal communications, June 27-July 3, 2004). Although systematic studies of this group's views of work/life balance have not been conducted, balancing the array of responsibilities on just the professional side in order to increase one measure of professional success—i.e., longevity in the position as school head—has been a subtopic of some research about school heads. The average length of a head of a state-side independent school is 6.5 years; however, statistics show that it is likely that there are a lot more relatively short and relatively long headships than average-length ones (New York State Association of Independent Schools, 2003). A 10-year study of the longevity of international school heads (Hawley, 1994) found heads remained in a given position only 2.8 years on average and that this was due to a variety of factors.

The possible impact of work/life balance on longevity was not investigated. John Littleford, a former head of school for 18 years and, currently, the owner of Littleford and

Associates, a management firm providing consulting services to independent and international schools, however, makes one brief reference to the personal side of a school head's life in an article that addresses the longevity issue. Littleford writes:

It appears as though the longer term and more successful heads have stable marriages or support systems. They find support at home and not a culture of tension. This is not a simplistic explanation. It simply reveals that heads who are strong on the home front can concentrate their energies on the school, take time away when needed, and still have the support of family and friends. (Littleford, 1999, p. 29)

A recent survey study addresses the personal side of a school head's life a little further by investigating views, concerns, priorities, and stress points identified by independent school heads working both within the U.S. and internationally (Tully, 2004). The purpose of the survey was to learn about the similarities and differences between heads of U.S. independent schools and international schools. International schools are private schools with a high percentage of non-local staff and curriculum with a primarily international student population. There was a notable divergence in opinions between U.S. based and overseas heads on the question: "Overall, being a Head of School has had a positive effect on my marriage, or long-term relationship with my partner." Sixty-four percent of U.S. based heads responded positively to the statement while 36 percent disagreed. Internationally, only 51 percent of the overseas heads agreed and 49 percent disagreed. Possibly more important than the differences in responses between the two groups is the relatively large percentage of negative responses from both U.S. based and overseas heads. This suggests a perceived negative relationship between the professional demands of an independent school head and his/her personal life. Apparently, the negative relationship is even more pronounced if a head lives overseas.

Even more intriguing was the response to a second question regarding sources of professional support. Both groups reported familial support as the most significant source of support, with collegial/professional support and religious and community support cited as 2nd and 3rd most significant respectively. This signals a clear interrelationship between the professional and personal aspects of a school head's life and, more significantly, a reliance on the personal side to survive the position's professional demands. A further implication of the responses to these two questions may be that a lack of professional/personal balance causes more stress on both the personal relationship and professional success. However this possible implication has not been studied directly.

In summary, studies have been and continue to be conducted about professional/personal balance geared toward corporate executives and professional services. Although forays have been made into investigating the relationship between school heads' professional and personal lives tangentially within the study of professional success/longevity, the issue of balance between the two life areas has not been studied in an international school context. A study of whether and/or how school heads find balance between their professional and personal lives and how this relates to their success in both life areas is needed to begin to address this gap.

Purpose of the Study and the Study's Research Questions

The purpose of this study was to investigate school heads' perceptions about the factors that impact their interest in – and ability to find what they consider to be – balance between their professional and personal lives. Further, the study explored whether there is a relationship between a sense of balance between both life areas (professional and personal), on the one hand, and success in both life areas, on the other. Two indicators of

success that were used in the study were (a) longevity in headship position (to include leaving on one's own volition) and (b) survey responses indicating satisfaction, or a lack thereof, with one's personal relationship(s).

The following questions guided the inquiry:

1. Do selected school heads value balance in their personal and professional lives?
2. What do selected school heads report as factors that impact their ability to find balance between their professional and personal lives?
3. What strategies do school heads use to establish balance?
4. To what extent is there a relationship between reported balance and measures of professional and/or personal satisfaction and success of school heads?
5. Are there significant differences across demographic factors between reports from school heads working in international schools and independent schools within the United States?

Organization

This study examines the importance of work/life balance to school heads and strategies employed to establish balance as well as whether there is a relationship between work/life balance and professional and/or personal success. In order to provide a context for the research data, chapter 2 begins with a review of the history and definition of the term work/life balance and also considers the existing body of research on work/life balance, including the limited literature specific to educational leaders' work/life balance. Chapter 3 describes the methodology employed in this study in more detail. This chapter includes a description of a prior qualitative study, which this quantitative study looked to verify. Chapter 4 presents the results of the research,

answering the five research questions listed above. Finally, chapter 5 contextualizes the findings of this study within the current literature, discusses implications, provides suggestions for existing and potential school heads and makes recommendations for further research.

CHAPTER 2: REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Overview

This literature review section covers two general areas: 1) the history and definition of the term work/life balance and 2) the existing body of research on work/life balance and the very limited literature specific to educational leaders' work/life balance. The first section concentrates on the emergence of the term work/life balance, including development of definitions in the literature. The second section continues with a review of research studies on work/life balance, including consequences of imbalance and theoretical models. The section will then provide an overview of the emerging international studies of work/life balance and finally move into a specific discussion of the few studies currently available focusing on issues possibly related to work/life balance for educational leadership, for example longevity in position and shortage of new candidates for educational leadership positions.

History/Definition of Work/Life Balance

In order to better understand the term work/life balance, a look at the development of interest in the topic is needed. Studies concerning the relationship between life and job satisfaction began surfacing shortly after the end of World War II (Brayfield & Wells, 1957; Friend & Haggard, 1948; Herzberg, Mausnes, Peterson & Capwell, 1957; Iris & Barrett, 1972) restricted for the most part to the field of applied psychology. As various legal suits filed and won under the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and the women's movement gained in momentum, resulting in a marked increase of women in the workforce, particularly married women with children, the focus of research shifted to role definitions and societal norms under the umbrella of work/family research (Davidson & Cooper,

1984; Kavanagh & Halpern, 1977; Kleeman, 1992; Spain & Bianchi, 1996; Stevens, P., 1990), spanning such disciplines of study as industrial relations and labor, management, sociology, family and women's studies, business, and demography (Drago & Kashian, 2003). Terms used to describe the relationship between work and other life roles include *work/family or life conflict*, *interface*, *integration*, *spillover* and *fit*; however, the term *balance*, connoting a weighted scale, with equivalent weight on either side, first appeared in a 1989 article about fatherhood in the 1990's by the Bureau of National Affairs, Inc. in Washington, DC.

The earliest quote found regarding balance comes from the Greek tragic dramatist Euripides (484 B.C. – 406 B.C.), who said, “The best and safest thing is to keep a balance in your life, acknowledge the great powers around us and in us. If you can do that, and live that way, you are really a wise man.” A major assumption is that balance is a goal, whether for health, success or professional/personal satisfaction. The assumption can be supported by social definitions, such as a “stability of body or mind” in the physical and psychological sense (Guest, 2002) – no one desires to be seen as being psychologically imbalanced. Webster's Dictionary defines the verb balance, “to equalize, bring into harmony or proportion,” implying that people can control or manage balance. Campbell Clark (2000) defines balance as “satisfaction and good functioning at work and at home, with a minimum of role conflict” and goes on to argue that people both shape their environments and are shaped by them. Both Campbell Clark (2000) and Guest (2002) note that it is implicit in the definition, that balance is good.

While an explicit definition of balance is rarely found in scholarly literature (Frone, 2003), it has become generally accepted as a perception of equilibrium or

“maintaining an overall sense of harmony in life,” (Clarke, Koch & Hill, 2004), which is the definition used in this study. Many studies, including a quantitative study by Greenhaus, Collins & Shaw (2003), objectively assess balance, which is defined as equal levels of time, attention, involvement, or commitment spent on work and personal responsibilities. Results of this and other studies show that there is a correlation between working long hours and a reported imbalance between work and other life areas (Greenhaus et al., 2003; Guest, 2002). The weighted scale definition, however, is often not reflective of people’s perception of their own work/life balance. The concept of balance is more complex than merely keeping both sides level, implying that when one side receives, the other side loses (Guest, 2002; Halpern & Murphy, 2005; Stevens, 2000). Voydanoff (2005) attempts to conceptualize the perception of balance that is not necessarily equal, i.e. employees subjectively experience a high degree of balance, even if time spent at work and with family are not exactly equal, as long as the difference does not reach a threshold level. Furthermore, the perception of what constitutes balance may change over the course of a person’s life, based upon age, energy level, family situation, gender, and personality traits (Guest, 2002; Keene & Quadagno, 2004).

The term “work/ family fit” emerged (Pittman, 1994 as cited by Keene & Quadagno, 2004) and was used in studies by Clarke et al. (2004) and Voydanoff (2005) to begin to explore objective and subjective assessments of balance. Here the relationship between work-family balance and work-family fit was examined, with findings showing that balance and fit are related yet distinct constructs: fit is determined by structural or objective assessments, such as work hours, age, family income, household division of labor; and the perception of balance is determined by the psychological or subjective

aspects, how an individual acts, reacts, and/or copes with that fit. Since work/family fit is a relatively new concept, both studies conclude that more work on a comprehensive model of work/family fit and balance is needed.

It is important to note here that in general there is a very imprecise use of language used to describe balance between the different areas of an individual's life. Although the term work/family balance and work/life balance are often used almost interchangeably, the latter term is quickly becoming the norm, if not only politically correct. With the impact of women entering the workforce being a central instigator for much of the early research, the use of the term work/family was understandable. However, as the field of study continues to mature, and models are refined, it has become clear that the non-work domains of an individual's life are not only contained in the family domain, and must also be separately accounted for (Guest, 2002).

Simply put, "work" is usually considered paid employment and "life" includes all activities outside of work. Life therefore includes family, with wide variations in definitions, and free time. However free time, or the time where there are no commitments determined by others, needs to be distinguished from leisure time, which is the pursuit of a specific activity (Guest, 2002). A very recent study in the balance arena further delineates the domains by dividing the work domain as well (Gershuny, 2008). Gershuny notes that there has been a decline in leisure time versus work time in recent decades, when taking into account all work (paid and unpaid). While this may be due in part to a shift in the financially privileged classes, which once had more leisure time than others, now having less, his findings indicate the decline being due in large part to the distribution of work in the household (unpaid work). In any case, defining and measuring

work/life balance continue to be a challenge on the one hand, and the blurring of the borders between the domains continues to stimulate interest in the topic on the other.

Existing Research on Work/Life Balance

Research in the area of work/life balance gained momentum in the late 90's and has increased exponentially in the past decade (Drago & Kashian, 2003). This has resulted in several comprehensive bibliographies and reviews, electronic databases and newsgroups both within North America (as cited in Bowes, 2005) and internationally (as cited in Poelmans, O'Driscoll & Beham, 2005), as well as conferences, university centers for work/family research, and related practitioner organizations (as cited in Drago & Kashian, 2003). Due to the availability of these resources, this literature review does not intend to provide a comprehensive overview, but rather aims to simply grant the reader a background of this relatively new and complex area of study, including reasons for the emergence of increased attention to work/life balance.

The marked increase of interest in the topic can be traced back to three broad sets of overlapping influences: intensifying pressures of work over the last few decades; concern over a crumbling quality of home and community life; and individual attitudes, values, and commitment, or lack thereof, to their work (Guest, 2002). In an era of globalization, we have seen an increase in time pressures of our work lives due in large part to the fast-paced advances in information technology and information load and the expected speed of response and quality and availability of customer service. These demands have led to increased work hours, evening- and weekend work, as well as less 'quality' family or personal time, creating a work/life *imbalance* (Sturges, 2000 as cited in Mangels, 2008). On the other hand, with the job insecurity associated with today's

organizations, and therefore the lack of traditional career paths within one company, some employees seem less willing to commit endless hours to the organization. With work no longer a focal interest point of life, the conflict between the demands / hours of work with the decreasing status of work in one's life also results in imbalance (Guest, 2002). It is the imbalance between work and life that most studies have examined, since it seems easier to identify problems than to study the nuances that create the perception of balance.

As noted above, the assumption has been that work/life balance is a good goal, a goal worthy of pursuing. Tangible reasons for this goal exist in the literature as well. Studies begin to emerge in the late 80's, citing the negative impacts of work/life *imbalance* on corporations' bottom line (Rodgers & Rodgers, 1989, Thomas & Ganster, 1995). These studies found that when the inability to find balance between work and life responsibilities became chronic, the following occurred in the work place: higher rates of absenteeism and turnover; reduced productivity; decreased job satisfaction; lower levels of organizational commitment and loyalty; and rising healthcare costs. Similarly, personal & societal consequences of failing to meet life or family responsibilities were identified in studies (Frone, Russell & Cooper, 1993; Greenhaus & Beutell, 1985; Rice, Frone, & McFarlin, 1992). These consequences include: increased levels of stress and stress-related illness; lower life satisfaction; higher rates of family strife, violence and divorce; rising incidence of substance abuse; growing problems with parenting and supervision of children & adolescents; and escalating rates of juvenile delinquency and violence (Hobsen et al., 2001).

The study of work/family conflict continues to be widely researched in the field of organizational behavior. Studies examine the identification of major role stressors (Hobson et al., 2001; Parasuraman, Greenhaus, & Granrose, 1992), the linking of antecedents, moderators, and consequences of work/family conflict (as cited in Poelmans et al., 2001), and the positive effects of family-friendly work policies on perceived work/life balance (Ezra, & Deckman, 1996; Hill, Hawkins, Ferris, & Weitzman, 2001; Saltzstein et al., 2001). However, as Guest (2002) suggests, while many studies have examined work/life imbalance, there is not enough research done on balance, probably due in large part to the subjectivity of the perception of balance. Greenhaus et al. (2003) concluded that it would be useful to include both objective and subjective assessments of balance in the same study.

Theoretical Models

The literature describes a number of theoretical models, some dominating the field more than others, with five models typically used to describe the relationship between life at work and that outside of work. In their overview of international research on the work-family interface, Poehlman et al. list the two most influential theories as *role theory* and *spillover theory*. Role theory is arguably the longest standing model, originally derived from the 1964 Michigan study of organizational stress by Kahn, Wolfe, Quinn, Snoek, & Rosenthal (as cited in Poelmans et al., 2005), and posits that personal well-being is negatively affected by conflicting expectations associated with one's different roles. This rationale is the logical basis for the numerous studies of work-life imbalance mentioned above. Spillover theory is based on Pleck's (1977) suggestion that there are permeable boundaries between the life domains and one sphere can either

influence the other in a positive or a negative way (as cited in Poelmans et al., 2005).

While there are numerous studies to support this general statement, studies are beginning to emerge specifying the nature and consequences of spillover as well as causal relationships (Guest, 2002; Poelmans et al., 2005).

Guest (2002) describes three further models commonly used: compensation model, instrument model, and conflict model. The compensation model proposes that what is lacking in one domain can be made up for in the other. For example, work may be unsatisfying but this is compensated for by a positive social standing/relationship. In an instrument model, activities in one domain facilitate success in another. A classic example is that of an employee who will take a job working longer hours to increase income, in order to afford a house for his young family. Finally, the conflict model describes opposing demands between life domains, forcing difficult choices or trade-offs and possibly positioning the individual for overload.

While the five models listed above are the most widely used, with the recent explosion in the field of work-life study, so too has there been a marked increase in the number of alternative theories suggested: Hobfall's (1989) conservation of resources theory, Higgins, Bond, Klein, & Strauman's (1986) self-discrepancy theory, Tajfel & Turner's (1985) social identity theory, Homans' (1958, 1974) and Blau's (1964) social exchange theory, Nippert-Eng's (1996) segmentation-integration theory, Campbell Clark's (2000) border-crossing theory, Barnett and Hyde's (2001) expansionist theory, and Poelmans' (2004) decision-process theory (as cited by Poelmans et al., 2005). The large number of emerging and related yet differing models and the difficulties in defining

and measuring work/life balance not only reflect the relative infancy of the field but also the complexity of the topic.

Boundary/border theories (Campbell Clark, 2000; Desrochers & Sargent, 2003; Pleck, 1977 as cited by Poelmans et al., 2005) seem most suited to the present study. These theories contend that there are different types of borders around the various domains of one's life, not "separate spheres", rather roles that are interdependent and people pass over these boundaries, each with its own flexibility and strength (Desrochers & Sargent, 2003). Further, these roles are purposefully and/or intuitively defined, may actually intersect, and the resulting integrated space may facilitate finding work/life balance. In the case of school heads, where there is already a blurry line between work and life due to the nature of a school environment (while occupying the professional life domain for heads, for students and parents, it occupies a major role in the personal life sphere), the boundary/border theories could help illuminate how permeable the boundaries between the different domains are and how much control individuals have over issues controlling work/life balance. Exploring whether there is a correlation between the location of the school head (international or U.S.-based) and the strength and permeability of these boundaries may also explain a greater or lesser perception of school heads' work/life balance.

International Studies

Only in the past decade, have international studies begun to surface. Globalization of corporations, non-governmental organizations, and intergovernmental organizations has increased the demand for an internationally mobile and competent workforce. All of the literature reviewed thus far describes models developed in affluent countries in the

West, which operate under the assumption that the theories are universally applicable, i.e. very few theories have investigated or offered explanations for cultural differences, or international assignments/locations. The international studies that exist (Gershuny, 2008; Lyness & Kropf, 2005; Shaffer, Harrison, Gilley & Luk, 2001) focus largely upon western employees, mobile or not, using the above-referenced models. For example, Lyness' et al. sample included managers and professionals in 20 European countries, examined in their national context, while Shaffer et al, studied only expatriates. A study by Hill, Yang, Hawkins, & Ferris (2004) adapted and tested Frone's et al., (1992) work-family interface model (a role theory model) in 48 countries and found some cross-cultural validity. The sample used was IBM employees, which are, for the most part, local hires in all IBM locations. One possible explanation Hill et al. had for the similarities was the (western) corporate culture of the behemoth that is IBM. The degree to which the corporate culture, perhaps as Earley & Malikowski (2000) suggest a hybrid culture built for global organizations (as cited in Gelfand & Knight, 2005), influences work/life balance is an area of increased interest and hopefully future research. Very recently, studies such as one by Yang, Chen, Choi, & Zou (2000), have begun to explicitly address cultural differences in the perception of work-life balance, and speculations regarding other macro-socioeconomic factors and cultural values that may explain differences among people in different parts of the world (as cited by Poelmans et al., 2005).

Literature Specific to Educational Leadership

As stated in the "background to the study" in chapter 1, the most widely studied groups have included professional services, such as medical professionals, accountants,

etc. (Greenhaus et al., 2003; Sotile & Sotile, 2000 & 2001), corporate executives (Hobson, C., Delunas, L., & Kesic, D., 2001; Kimmel, 1993), government employees (Ezra & Deckman 1996; Kleeman, 1992; Salzstein, Ting, and Salzstein, 2001) and women in the workforce (Davidson, M. J., & Cooper, C. L., 1984; Schreiber, 1998; Spain & Bianchi, 1996; Tomlinson, 2006). Literature focusing on work/life balance for educational leadership is very limited, with scholarly studies concentrating on higher education (Kavanagh & Halpern, 1977; Mangels, 2008) rather than K-12. Interest in the topic for K-12 educational leadership can be gleaned from the limited literature that does exist, primarily articles written for industry periodicals such as *Thrust for Educational Leadership*, *School Administrator*, *Principal Leadership*, and *Times Educational Supplement* (Gallegos, 1999; Louis, 2006; Milne, 2007a, 2007b; Staples, & Neal, 2000; Zigler, 2007). In general, these articles describe anecdotally how difficult it is to achieve work/life balance for educational leaders, that balance must be a goal in order to successfully continue in the profession, and the strategies individuals use to achieve balance. Supporting evidence given for the need for balance includes ‘brilliant and accomplished’ school leaders collapsing with stress-related illnesses or retiring early as well as the diminishing number of candidates available for educational leadership positions. Looking at their predecessors, possible candidates ask, ‘Why would I want to do that job,’ (Milne, 2007). Examples of strategies to attain some balance vary widely from the more concrete such as honing time-management skills to the abstract trying not to worry too much.

Although scholarly studies on work/life balance of the K-12 educational leadership group have not been conducted, balancing the professional demands in order

to increase one measure of success, i.e. longevity in the position as school head, has been a subtopic of some research of international school heads. A 10-year research study on the longevity of international school heads (Hawley, 1994, 1995) was condensed and reported in the *International Schools Journal*. This study identified several factors that significantly affect the length of headship, which averaged 2.8 years in international schools. Factors included the governance structure of the school, teaching experience of the school head, the number of years in international education and characteristics specific to individual schools. Connections to the personal domain of a school heads' life were made only by a subset of the group, citing personal or family reasons for leaving the position.

Littleford (1999) also had an article published in the *International Schools Journal* related to the longevity of school heads. He also makes only a brief reference to the personal side of a school head's life, stating that there seems to be a correlation between longevity and success of a school head and a stable marriage or support system.

Lastly, Tully (2004) investigated via survey study, views, concerns, priorities, and stress points identified by independent school heads working both within the U.S. and internationally. Both groups cited familial support as the most significant source of professional support, with collegial/professional support and religious and community supported cited as 2nd and 3rd most significant respectively. However, a notable difference between the two groups was the finding that being a head of school had a positive effect on his/her marriage for 64% of the U.S. respondents, but only 51% of the international respondents. Both responses clearly signal an interrelationship between the professional and personal domains of a school head's life, and the reliance on the personal side to

succeed in the professional arena. A further implication of the responses may be that a lack of work/life balance causes more stress on personal relationships and professional success, however this has not been studied directly.

This research study begins to address the gap in scholarly literature and perhaps provides support for the suppositions cited in the professional periodicals as well as substantiation of the few studies conducted thus far.

CHAPTER 3: METHODOLOGY

Introduction

The methodology of the study is presented in this chapter. The discussion will begin with a description of a prior qualitative study and then move into an explanation of the current quantitative study, conducted to generalize the findings of the first study to a larger population, namely current international school heads. Through a depiction of the respondents and access, instrument development, data collection methods, and data analysis methods, the reader will have a clear picture of the organization of the current study. The discussion will continue with identified limitations and conclude with the potential significance of the study.

Prior Study

The current study built on an earlier qualitative investigation that employed interviewing as the method of data collection. Five current international school heads were chosen to interview using a mix of sampling strategies, which included convenience and maximum variation sampling. The sample included male and female school heads of small, medium, and large schools; married, divorced, and remarried school heads; as well as a range of years (from less than three to over 25) in headship.

Interviews were video-taped and transcribed. While categories emerged from the data, initially some a priori categories pulled from the research questions were used.

This preliminary study was framed by the following questions:

1. What do selected school heads report as factors that impact their ability to find balance between their professional and personal lives?

2. What strategies do school heads indicate they use to find balance between their professional and personal lives?
3. What do they say, if anything, about a relationship between professional/personal balance and professional and personal success?

The results of this prior study suggested that international school heads are in unique positions. Scattered all over the world, with culturally diverse populations within their schools, and placed in countries in which they are not natives, these school heads are responsible for creating and maintaining support systems for their school communities, 24 hours a day, 365 days a year. Achieving a balance for themselves between their professional and personal lives can be very difficult. Each school head interviewed described the need to feel understood, and not guilty, for not spending enough time on his/her personal life and for taking personal time when there is other work to be done.

Various factors that influence international school heads' ability to find balance between professional and personal responsibilities were reported; however, the support systems garnered through friends, colleagues and, most importantly, family, were, for them, the most important factors in establishing balance. Gender differences were reported in regard to the expectation of women heads – professionally they were expected to prove themselves worthy in a male-dominated culture and yet personally they were still to be the primary nurturer at home. A shared school experience, that is, having their children or spouses in the school, eased the imbalance by allowing glimpses into and understanding of the head's world and vice versa.

In order for heads to attain or at least move towards some sort of balance, they indicated that certain strategies must be followed. These included scheduling time for one's personal life, setting boundaries (e.g. not taking work home), pursuing interests outside of the school setting and community, and engaging in regular physical exercise. Interestingly, those heads that have been in the position longer felt less of a sense of balance.

In standard behavioral research methodology textbooks (e.g. Blalock and Blalock, 1971; Selltiz et al., 1965), students are encouraged to start with a qualitative orientation and to verify their preliminary findings quantitatively. The current study was organized to accomplish just that. The findings of the prior qualitative study influenced the survey items, which is discussed in more detail in the instrument development section below.

Current Study

While the prior qualitative study presented interesting findings that may assist international school heads in achieving a sense of balance, in order to generalize these findings to a larger population, namely current international school heads, a quantitative study was undertaken.

Respondents and access. The target population for this online questionnaire study was current international school heads. The extent of the international school head population is difficult to quantify precisely. In order to reach as many heads as possible, participation in the study was encouraged by contacting two separate professional organizations to which many heads subscribe, i.e. the Association for the Advancement of International Education (AAIE) and the Academy for International School Heads (AISH). Membership in these organizations provides automatic inclusion and access to

the organizations' professional list-serves, which were used to distribute the survey instrument. Only those members who self-selected off these lists were excluded from the list-serves. Additional access to international school heads was gained through the eleven regional membership organizations which include the Association of American Schools of Central America (AASCA), the Association of American Schools in South America (AASSA), the Association of Colombian-Caribbean American Schools (ACCAS), the Association of International Schools in Africa (AISA), the Association of American Schools in Mexico (ASOMEX), the Central and Eastern European Schools Association (CEESA), the Council of International Schools of the Americas (CISa), the East Asia Regional Council of Overseas Schools (EARCOS), the European Council of International Schools (ECIS), the Mediterranean Association of International Schools (MAIS) and the Near East South Asia Council of Overseas Schools (NESA). These organizations all have email distribution lists, to which members are automatically added upon registration. As with the list-serves of AAIE and AISH, members of these regional organizations must ask to be removed from the email distribution list. The survey instrument was also distributed through these email lists.

A group of heads of U.S. based independent schools was also studied for comparison purposes. Members of this group were contacted through the professional list-serve of the organization the National Association of Independent Schools (NAIS) to which all of its members are automatically subscribed and asked to participate in this study by responding to the survey.

Instrument development. The findings from the prior study described above guided the creation of the survey instrument (see Appendix C). For example, the

strategies cited as helping to attain or move toward balance (scheduling time for your personal life, pursuing interests outside of the school setting and community, etc.) were the response options offered (along with an opportunity to write in other responses) for questions 18 & 19 and the support systems identified in the prior interview study were incorporated into question 17 as response options.

In addition, validated instruments such as Lodahl & Kejnar's *Job Involvement Scale* (1965), Kopelman, Greenhaus & Connolly's *Work, Family & Interrole Conflict* (1984), Greenhaus, Parasuraman & Wormley's *Sponsorship Measures* (1990), *1991s Survey of Federal Employees* as cited by Ezra & Deckman (1996) and Marks & MacDermid's *Role Balance, Role Overload & Role Ease* (1996) were consulted for possible items. For example, items measuring professional satisfaction such as questions 8-11 were adapted from Greenhaus et al. (1990) career satisfaction items, and question 12 (The most important things that happen to me involve my work.) was adapted from Lodahl et al. (1965). Role balance items from Marks et al. (1996) influenced question 1 and work/life balance questions on the 1991 Survey of Federal Employees influenced questions 4, 5 and 6. Kopelman et al. (1984) measured work, family and interrole conflict and thus used negative phrasing. Therefore, this instrument served only as a check that specific areas were not missed, e.g. how non-work time could be spent.

The survey asked participants to provide information in six areas: 1) perceptions of role balance (seven questions), 2) professional satisfaction (five questions), 3) personal satisfaction (four questions), 4) support (one question) 5) balance strategies (3 questions) and 6) demographics (ten questions). The instrument included 25 close-ended and five open-ended questions. Of the 25 close-ended questions, nine used a 5-pt Likert-type

scale: 1) strongly agree, 2) agree to some extent, 3) uncertain, 4) disagree to some extent, 5) strongly disagree. Ten questions were yes/no questions. Two questions had ordered (e.g. never, 1-3 times, 4-6 times, 7-9 times, >9 times) and another two had unordered (e.g. partner/spouse, family, friends, colleagues, church) response choices. One question was partially closed, i.e. offers a write-in 'other' response, with ordered response choices and one was partially closed with unordered response choices. Three of the open-ended questions asked participants to estimate a routine behavior or asked for a precise piece of information (e.g. How long have you been in your current position?). The final two open-ended questions "Please describe any other activities that take up significant time in your week on a regular basis and estimate the number of hours spent in these activities in a typical week," and "Why or why not [do you feel that achieving balance in your life is important right now]," were asked to produce responses of time demands and perceptions of the balance goal not yet identified in my prior study or any other studies, for that matter.

The survey instrument was first pretested with a group of past and existing principals (including a California State University Monterey Bay professor). The initial pretesting used a paper version rather than an Internet version of the survey. The pretest participants were timed taking the survey uninterrupted, in order to ascertain whether the survey had an acceptable length, and, therefore, a high probability of being completed. Furthermore, the pretest participants were asked to mark any questions that were confusing or did not have an appropriate response for them to mark. This resulted in a few minor sequence changes as well as the elimination of two questions, which seemed repetitive.

The instrument was then piloted with a group of graduate students in a survey research methods class. This resulted in more minor modifications such as adding clarifying words, and ensuring that the time spans included all possible responses. The survey instrument was then standardized, i.e. put into one standard form, by the Internet survey provider (SurveyMonkey) and one final pilot was conducted with the survey instrument on line with two principals; one was technologically proficient, the other less so. No further modifications were suggested after this last pilot.

Pretesting and piloting suggested that the survey took no more than ten minutes to complete. This length of time seemed acceptable. Making the task of responding to a survey as easy as possible is the hallmark of a good questionnaire and minimizing one aspect of the respondent burden includes decreasing the actual as well as the perceived time required to complete the survey (Salant & Dillman, 1994, p. 101). Not only general negativity towards surveys cause a refusal to participate, but an increased amount of perceived or actual time pressure may also result in more refusals (Bradburn, Sudman & Wansink, 2004, p. 19). To reduce any possible resistance to taking the survey because of time constraints, prospective respondents were informed of the anticipated length in the invitation and the survey was kept fairly brief.

Data collection methods. Data were collected from an online (web-based) survey. All members of the target groups received an email from me through the professional list-serves or regional organizations' email distribution lists. In my email, I introduced my study and indicated that a summary of the findings would be available at a later date (see Appendix B). A web link to the survey administrator's website was

provided in the email; when clicked, the link sent the participant directly to the survey instrument through SurveyMonkey (<http://www.surveymonkey.com>).

Using a web-based survey had a number of advantages. First, the web-based survey did not allow identification of any individual or institution, thus keeping the respondents' answers anonymous. Second, access to a number of professional list-serves facilitated the collection of information in a quick and user-friendly format. Third, costs of distributing the survey were kept to a minimum and all participants received the survey at virtually the same time. Fourth, the issue of equal accessibility for school heads in countries where mail service is not timely or reliable was mitigated. Fifth, the web-based survey, as opposed to an email survey, guaranteed anonymity, which is important with a potentially threatening topic. However, a possible disadvantage of this method was that differing comfort and computer skills levels of the participants may have lead to an unrepresentative sample. For example, younger heads may have felt more comfortable participating in a web survey, but have less experience in balancing their professional and personal roles.

All participants' responses were coded and entered into version 17.0 of the Predictive Analytics Software (PASW) for Mac OS X from SPSS, Inc. for analysis. Of the total number of visits to the survey (286), six were eliminated due to no consent being given to take part in the survey, 47 were eliminated because although consent was given, no other questions were answered, four were eliminated after having only answered questions on role balance and two further were eliminated for having only completed role balance and satisfaction questions. By leaving out support and balance strategies, as well as demographics, (14 of 30 questions), too much information was missing to make

inferences. This left a sample size ($N=227$). For those surveys missing less than 14 items, the sample mean score was substituted for the missing value, except in the case of missing demographic data, which caused the survey to be excluded from the regression analyses nesting more than just demographic factors ($N=224$).

Data analysis methods. The research design of this quantitative study generated descriptive statistics to answer the first three research questions (Do selected school heads value balance in their personal and professional lives? What do selected school heads report as factors that impact their ability to find balance between their professional and personal lives? What strategies do school heads use to establish balance?), and inferential statistics to answer the fourth and fifth research questions (To what extent is there a relationship between reported balance and measures of professional and/or personal satisfaction and success of school heads? Are there significant differences across demographic factors between reports from school heads working in international schools and independent schools within the United States?).

Descriptive statistics, including means and standard deviations were run for all the dependent and independent variables. These results are presented in the form of tables to give the reader a good feeling for school heads' general perception of their own balance and what contributes to or detracts from school heads' feeling of balance. Then 12 multiple regression models were performed to analyze the participants' ratings of each of the five professional satisfaction areas (I am satisfied with the success I have achieved in my career, I am satisfied with the progress I have made toward meeting my expectations for income, I am satisfied with the progress I have made toward meeting my expectations for advancement, I am satisfied with the progress I have made toward meeting my

expectations for the development of new skills, The most important things that happen to me involve my work), each of the four personal satisfaction areas (I am satisfied with the relationships I have with family, I am satisfied with my level of spirituality, I am satisfied with the time I have to relax, I am satisfied with the connections I have with the community outside of school), the sum of the professional satisfaction areas, the sum of the personal satisfaction areas and the sum of both the professional and personal satisfaction areas in relation to each of the independent variables (role balance, sources of support, balance strategies, and demographics).

This analysis was followed by a series of four nested sets of regression models for each of the 12 models resulting in a total of 48 models. The first nested set of models ran satisfaction as a function of demographic variables. The second nested set of models added the time variables to the first nested set of models. The third nested set of models added the support variable to the second nested set of models. And finally, the fourth nested set of models added the balance strategy variables to the third nested set of models.

Two types of hypothesis tests were used to look at the significance of the coefficients and the effects of each independent variable on the dependent variables. F-tests were used to look at the effects of groups of variables while t-tests looked at the effects of individual variables. Goodness of fit statistics like R^2 were used to see how well each model fits the data.

Finally, inferential statistics like t-tests and chi-square tests were used to help determine to what extent the conclusions about the population based on the sample findings can be trusted. In addition to comparing the means and the standard deviations

by using these tests, it could also be ascertained if there were significant differences between reports from school heads working in international schools and independent schools within the United States.

Limitations of the Study

Sample

There are a few limitations to this study, which need to be acknowledged. Although the web-based survey distributed through professional list-serves accessed a broad base for the sample, there may be school heads that are not members of any of the professional associations accessed. This may have skewed results if heads who belong to professional associations have different perceptions of balance than those who do not belong. For example, support through the collegiality of professional organizations may result in more balance. On the other hand, it may be the case that, by not being a member of an organization, a head may be away from school and home less and this fact might result in more balance.

In short, this certainly was a convenience rather than a probability sample of school heads. It was easy and quick to access the sample frame but the limitation on who has access to the survey and perceived proficiency with technology, as stated in the discussion of data collections section above, may cause concern over how representative the sample is. Of course, bias introduced by association membership discussed in the previous paragraph adds to this concern.

On the other hand, although I am not using a probability sample, I do believe that the findings can be generalized in view of the large numbers (majority) of school heads that have access to email, are technologically proficient enough to click on a link to a

website with an online survey, and do belong to one or more of the organizations, as well as the diversity in demographics reported by all organizations. In addition, the sample did seem to be a relatively close match with the population on a number of demographic variables (e.g., gender and age), though, as noted previously, precisely defining the population is an impossible task.

Individual Interpretation

A further limitation of this study is the degree of subjectivity of each individual head's interpretation of what constitutes work/life balance. That is, one head may perceive a high degree of balance even if there is a difference between the amount of time spent on work and time spent on personal life, as long as that difference does not reach a threshold level, while another may need the time spent on work and on personal life to be equal. Additionally, the threshold may be different for each individual.

Potential Significance of this Study

Although this study, like any study has limitations, the study also has benefits, if only because so little work has been done on the topic of work/life balance in the education field. I will conclude this discussion of methods by indicating how this particular study overcomes four researcher-identified limitations of an earlier study on work/life balance by Greenhaus, Collins & Shaw (2003).

The first limitation Greenhaus, et al. (2003) identified was their use of only an objective assessment of balance, i.e. equality of time, involvement, and satisfaction. They went on to suggest that one study that measures balance both objectively and subjectively would generate data to help researchers understand how individuals interpret their lives as being balanced. My survey instrument attempted to address this limitation by

including both objective (e.g. actual time spent on different roles) and subjective (e.g. “Did you feel that things were pretty much in balance before I asked you to count up numbers?” and “If yes, do you still feel that way?”) measures of balance.

The second limitation identified in the Greenhaus, et al. (2003) study was that their assessment of the time devoted to the family role did not include time spent with a spouse/partner. This more than likely skewed their measure of family time toward tasks such as home chores and child care, which could be considered burdensome. By asking question #19 (How often in a typical week do you create time/space for yourself to spend time with spouse/partner, etc.), my survey addressed this limitation.

Greenhaus, et al. (2003) identified a third limitation that their study focused exclusively on balance between work and family, excluding broader roles such as leisure, self-development, and community membership. By limiting their focus in this way, Greenhaus and his colleagues did not give those employees with little or no family responsibilities the opportunity to participate in the study although their personal life roles may include activities outside of work. Other personal life roles, or the lack thereof, may certainly have an effect on the perception of balance in one’s life. In my survey instrument, questions specific to time spent with family do not focus on tasks (home chores and child care) and the time spent outside of work does not exclusively ask about time spent with family, but rather how the time was spent.

Lastly, the study by Greenhaus, et al. (2003) included no measures of outcomes in the work domain. While organizations may believe employees who seek balance are less committed to their employers and/or less productive, Marks & MacDermid (1996) discovered that balance enhanced performance in school and work. I included questions

about satisfaction with professional success, progress, advancement, etc. in my survey instrument.

Conclusion

By addressing the limitations of an earlier study, this study takes a step forward in investigating the issue of work/life balance. It also moves the work into the education field. More specifically, the focus is on an otherwise neglected population, school heads.

CHAPTER 4: RESULTS

Introduction

This chapter presents the results of the research. This discussion of results will be organized around the study's five research questions: (a) Do selected school heads value balance in their personal and professional lives? (b) What do selected school heads report as factors that impact their ability to find balance between their professional and personal lives? (c) What strategies do school heads use to establish balance? (d) To what extent is there a relationship between reported balance and measures of professional and/or personal satisfaction and success of school heads? (e) Are there significant differences across demographic factors between reports from school heads working in international schools and independent schools within the United States? The discussion of what the findings say about each of the research questions will be preceded by a description of the research sample.

Sample Characteristics

This section briefly summarizes data about the demographic characteristics of those who responded to the request to complete the survey in enough detail to have their responses analyzed. The section also compares the sample to the general population whenever data about the population are available.

Demographics

The target population for the study included all current international school heads. Since the extent of this population is difficult to quantify precisely and in order to reach as many heads as possible, all heads were invited and encouraged to participate through the listserves of two global professional organizations (AISH & AAIE), as well as eleven

regional membership organizations (AASCA, AASSA, ACCAS, AISA, ASOMEX, CEESA, CISTa, EARCOS, ECIS, MAIS, & NESA). In addition, school heads of U.S. based independent schools were invited to participate through the listserve of the largest national membership organization for independent school personnel, the National Association of Independent Schools (NAIS).

Although there were 286 heads that visited the online survey (total visits to the survey link), there were 227 heads who were the focus of this study (e.g. who consented to participate in the study and completed sufficient questions to run analyses). Of these heads, there were 169 males and 54 females, with four not having responded to this question. Respondents were asked to mark their age in five-year age categories. The ages reported ranged from 30 to 74, with an estimated mean of 52.8.

There seemed to be a bit of confusion on the question regarding where the respondents were currently head of school. Of the three possible responses, “internationally (outside your passport country),” “in your passport country,” and “in the United States,” respondents could check all that apply. The only combinations that should have been possible are “internationally” + “in the United States,” and “in your passport country” + “in the United States,” in addition to each being checked alone. However, there were respondents who checked both “internationally (outside your passport country)” and “in your passport country.” In addition, the majority of respondents who checked “in the United States” did not check “in your passport country.” So two new variables were created. One variable, LOCNONUS, tracked only the location internationally vs. in the U.S. Those respondents that answered “in your passport country” only were coded as internationally. The second new variable, LOCHOME,

tracked the location in the respondent's home country vs. internationally. For the latter, all those who responded only with "in the United States" or "in your passport country" combined with either of the other two responses were coded as home country. All others were coded as internationally. As a result, there were 133 respondents that were located internationally and 90 located in the U.S., however there were 121 located outside their home country and 102 located in their home country. Comparing analyses using international vs. U.S. and located inside or outside of home country yielded no significant differences, so the former, i.e. international (133) vs. U.S. (90), was used for comparisons in this study.

The response rate is difficult to determine, as the total population is almost impossible to quantify. The survey was sent to international school heads through two global member associations and 11 regional member associations. International school heads may be members of more than just one association, so merely adding up member numbers does not accurately reflect the number of international school heads. The survey was also sent to U.S. Independent school heads through the member association National Association of Independent School Heads (NAIS). With a reported membership of 1215, the response rate for U.S. based heads is 7.4%.

The length of time in current position ranged from 2 months to 25 years, with a mean length of 5.9 years, a median of 4 years and a mode of 2 years. The standard deviation was 5.1 years. For 56.1% of the respondents, this was their first headship, and 43.9% had been in a headship before. Over 93% of the respondents were in a current relationship, ranging in length from 5 months to 48 years, with a mean of 22.5 years, a

median of 23 years and a mode of 30 years. The standard deviation was 11 years. Only 6.7% of heads reported not being in a current relationship

Just over 88% percent of the heads had their partner or other family members currently living with them, while 11.7% did not. Almost one-third (32.4%) of heads reported having their partner or other family members employed at their school; furthermore, over two-thirds (67.9%) had children currently attending their school or had children who attended their school in the past. Descriptive statistics for the demographic variables can be found in Table 1.

Table 1

Demographic Characteristics of the Sample

Variable	N	Range	Mean	Std. Deviation	Frequencies
Gender	223	0-1	0.24	0.43	75.2% Male 24.8% Female
Age	224	30-74	52.80 (est.)	8.42 (est.)	N/A
Location Int'l vs. U.S.	223	0-1	0.40	0.43	59.6% Int'l 40.4% U.S.
Located in Home Country	223	0-1	0.54	0.50	54.3% Not Home 45.7% Home
Years in current position	223	0.17-25	5.87 4.77 (Int'l) 7.55 (U.S.)	5.11	N/A
First headship	223	0-1	0.44	0.50	56.1% Yes 43.9% No
Current relationship (partner/spouse)	224	0-1	0.07	0.25	93.3% Yes 6.7% No
Length of current rel.	209	0.42-48	22.50	10.98	N/A
Relative living in house	223	0-1	0.12	0.32	88.3% Yes 11.7% No
Relative employed w/ school	222	0-1	0.68	0.47	32.4% Yes 67.6% No
Child attends/ed school	224	0-1	0.32	0.47	67.9% Yes 32.1% No

International vs. U.S.

The sample reflects fairly similar demographics when comparing the location of the respondents (international vs. in the United States). Of the international respondents, 76.5% were male and 23.5% female as compared to 75.6% male and 24.4% female in the United States. As a comparison, the Academy of International School Heads (AISH) reports that in December 2009 72.5% of it's members were male and 27.5% were female. Similarly, the National Association of Independent Schools (NAIS) reports 69.1% males and 30.9% males in its 2009-2010 membership. The age distribution was also very similar in this study's sample with an estimated mean of international heads at 53.05 years and U.S. heads skewing slightly younger with an estimated mean of 52.44 years. Overall, 44% of international heads were in their 50's and 47% of U.S. heads were in the same age group. For purposes of comparison, the largest group of NAIS members in 2009-2010 was also in their 50s (37.6%). As with this study's sample, U.S. heads skewed slightly younger than international school heads.

The vast majority of both international (92.5%) and U.S. (94.4%) heads were in a current relationship, with almost 60% of international heads and over 65% of U.S. heads in that relationship for over 20 years. Not surprising, then, 86.5% of international heads and 91% of U.S. heads have a partner or other family member living with them. International heads reported slightly higher attendance of their own children in their schools (69.9%) as compared to those in the U.S. (65.6%).

There were some notable differences between international and domestic school heads, however. Less than half of the international heads who responded were in their first headship while three-quarters of the U.S. heads reported being in their first headship.

The length of the current position, however, had two-thirds (65.9%) of the international heads listing 1-6 years in the position with a mean of 4.77 years, while nearly half of the U.S. heads (49%) had been in their position for over seven years with a mean of 7.55 years. The percentage of heads who had a relative employed at their school was also much higher internationally (43.6%) vs. in the U.S. (14.8%).

As stated above, running the same demographic factors comparing respondents in their home country vs. not in their home country yielded almost identical results as with the comparison between heads located internationally vs. in the U.S.

Table 2

Comparison of Demographic Characteristics between International and U.S. Heads

Variables		Location	
		International	U.S.
Gender	Male	76.5%	75.6%
	Female	23.5%	24.4%
Age	Est. mean (years)	53.05	52.44
Years in current position	Est. mean	4.72	7.55
First headship	Yes	42.1%	76.4%
	No	57.9%	23.6%
Current relationship	Yes	92.5%	94.4%
	No	7.5%	5.6%
Length of current relationship	Est. mean (years)	21.69	23.81
Relative living in house	Yes	86.5%	91.0%
	No	13.5%	9.0%
Relative employed with the school	Yes	43.6%	14.8%
	No	56.4%	85.2%
Child attends/ed school	Yes	69.9%	65.6%
	No	30.1%	34.4%

Research Question # 1: Do Selected Heads Value Balance in Their Personal and Professional Lives?

This section focuses on what the data say about the answer to the first research question. Here, descriptive statistics (i.e., the number and percentage of respondents) for survey item 6 (Do you feel that achieving a balance in your life is important right now?) were used to answer Question 1. Open-ended responses to survey item 7 (Why or why not?) were used to help explain some reasons behind the responses to item 6.

There were 221 responses to survey item 6 coded 0 for Yes and 1 for No. Over 85% of heads responded that they feel that balance is important right now, indicating that the majority of heads do value balance between their personal and professional lives. To better understand the reasons behind some heads' negative response to survey item 6, the 33 open-ended responses (N=212) for those who gave a negative response to item 6 were analyzed. A majority (42.4%) of these 33 indicated that they knew balance would be an issue in a leadership position and that they accepted this when they chose to take on the position. Comments included:

As a school head I realized from the beginning that balance was not a 'given' in my chosen profession. This is a 24/7 job with 24/7 expectations on the head.

I realized the career path I had chosen would be time-intensive and that is exactly what I have.

The struggle to stay in balance goes with the territory, but leadership positions by definition mean that you have many more responsibilities to others beyond your family and yourself.

Another 30% of these 33 indicated that they enjoy their work, which compensates for the lack of balance to some extent. Comments included:

Work is my life and a pleasure for me!

At this point in my career, I realize work will demand a large amount of my time. However, I enjoy work and it is not to the extent that I feel other areas are suffering.

I am doing what I like to do.

In over 20% of the responses, references to the lines between personal and professional life being blurred was given, especially when their own children or partners are involved in the school community. Comments included:

No kids, challenging work situation, my wife and I work together. We travel a great deal when school's not in session.

I'm comfortable with the choices I make for work, family, etc. While my workload may represent "imbalance" in number of hours, it's important work and supports my family and myself in multiple ways.

[Sic.] I'm not sure I agree with the idea that work and pleasure are mutually exclusive ideas -- I really enjoy my work, it includes my family often, my children attend my school -- the "balance" question seems to put things in opposition -- I feel like they don't need to be.

Respondents also commented that they expected imbalance at this particular juncture in their career due to specific time-intensive projects such as building projects, their pursuit of a doctoral degree, or the short time they had spent in the position at the time they were completing the survey. Two heads who indicated that they were not concerned about balance stated that they felt they had already achieved balance and merely needed to maintain it.

Representative comments of the 179 heads who believed balance is important right now include the following:

Life is too short, and both work and family are too important, to live long without balance.

If a good balance is not achieved, it is not healthy for you, both personally and professionally.

I need to be in balance so I can be at my best over the long haul

Research Question #2: What do Selected Heads Report as Factors That Impact Their Ability to Find Balance Between Their Professional and Personal Lives?

This section focuses on what the data say about the answer to the second research question. Here, descriptive statistics (i.e. the number and percentage of respondents) for survey item 17 (I feel supported by my (check all that apply): partner/spouse, family, friends, colleagues, church, other) were used to answer Question 2. Open-ended responses to survey item 7 (Why or why not? [heads feel balance is important right now]) also revealed factors that impact school heads' ability to achieve a balance between their professional and personal lives.

Survey item 17 provided respondents with five preselected answers, which were pulled from results of the previous study (partner/spouse, family, friends, colleagues, church), along with a write-in option to catch any additional sources of support. Respondents could check all listed items which they felt were sources of support for them and, of course, write-in any other perceived sources of support. All variables were numeric and coded 0 if not checked and 1 if checked. The other responses were stored separately. Descriptive statistics including means, standard deviations, and ranges for survey item 17 are reported in Table 3.

Table 3

Support Descriptives

Variable	N	Range	Mean	Std. Deviation
Support by partner/spouse	227	0-1	0.89	0.31
Support by family	227	0-1	0.88	0.32
Support by friends	227	0-1	0.81	0.39
Support by colleagues	227	0-1	0.84	0.37
Support by church	227	0-1	0.20	0.40
Support by other	227	0-1	0.13	0.34

Clearly, support from partner/spouse, family, friends, and colleagues are perceived to be important, having been checked by over 80% of the respondents. The highest reported level of support provided was by a partner/spouse (almost 89%), which, when those who reported not being in a current relationship are eliminated from the analysis, grows to over 95% (see Table 4).

Table 4

Support by Partner/Spouse as a Percentage within Current Relationship

Variable		Current relationship	
		Yes	No
Support by partner/spouse	None	4.8%	100.0%
	Partner	95.2%	-

Just over 13% of respondents added write-in responses, which yielded a few sources that were listed by more than one respondent. The Board of Trustees was named by 1/3 of the respondents who checked *other* as a source of support (4% of the total), followed by 23% of those checking *other* naming members of the school community (3% of the total), and 13% of those checking *other* who reported former or selected colleagues (1.7% of the total), and 13% of those checking *other* reporting pets as a further source of

support (1.7% of the total).

The open-ended responses to survey item #7, “Why or why not? [heads feel balance is important right now],” also gave insight into factors that effect the ability of school heads to find balance between their professional and personal lives. As stated in the previous section, specific time-intensive projects and the difficulty in drawing clear lines between the professional and personal domains of a heads life make it difficult to achieve a sense of balance for many school heads. Imbalance is a consequence of having chosen a high-profile position with the responsibilities of leadership, it is claimed. However, the passion for the job and the ideological importance of the work compensate for the lack of perceived balance for some. One head, for example, describes this compensation in the following way:

I found out at the age of 21 the expression of "work-life-balance" is totally stupid. I chose a work that gives me lots of satisfaction and I call my method "blending": I live when I work and I work for my life, and I enjoy this! I prefer to balance the production time and the relaxing time. There are so many things at my work that I deeply enjoy and so many things at home that I hate (just think about changing diapers or doing the dishes...).

Research Question #3: What Strategies Do School Heads Use to Establish Balance?

This section focuses on what the data say about the answer to the third research question. Once again, descriptive statistics (i.e. the number and percentage of respondents) were used to answer the research question. In this case the responses were for survey items 18 (How often in a typical week do you create time/space for yourself to: spend time with spouse/partner, spend time with family, meet with friends, read a book, go for a walk, pursue sports/education, other), 19 (How often in a typical week do you participate in activities not related to your school or school community?), and 20 (Do you employ household help?).

Survey item 18 asked how many times per week respondents created time or space for six pre-selected individuals or activities. Once again, the six items listed were gleaned from the results of the prior study, and an open write in response option was added. Survey item 19 asked about the frequency of participation in activities outside of school. For both items 18 and 19 responses were coded from 0 to 4 for answers ,Never', '1-3 times', '4-6 times', '7-9 times' and '>9 times.' Survey item 20 asked whether the respondent employed household help and was coded 0 for 'Yes' and 1 for 'No'.

Frequencies are reported for survey items 18-20 in Table 5.

Table 5

Balance Strategy Frequencies

Variable	Never	1-3 times	4-6 times	7-9 times	>9 times
Create time/space for partner	9.7%	45.8%	22.5%	15.4%	6.6%
Create time/space for family	18.1%	33.5%	21.6%	21.6%	5.3%
Create time/space for friends	22.5%	71.4%	5.7%	0.4%	-
Create time/space for reading a book	8.8%	39.2%	24.2%	20.3%	7.5%
Create time/space to walk	26.9%	41.0%	21.6%	7.9%	2.6%
Create time/space for sports/recreation	17.2%	44.9%	27.8%	8.4%	1.8%%
Create time/space for other pursuits	92.0%	8.0%	-	-	-
Participate in activities not related to school	8.4%	63.0%	20.3%	4.8%	3.1%
Employ household help	33.6%	66.4%			

Creating time/space to spend with partner/spouse, family, friends, reading, walking and sports/recreation accounted for most strategies used, with only 8% reporting any other activities in addition to the ones listed. Going for a walk and time spent with

friends were the highest reported strategies never used at 26.9% and 22.5% respectively. Ninety-two percent of respondents felt this list was complete. The strategies used to establish balance were reported as most often being employed 1-3 times per week. When looking at the few open responses, additional strategies reported included time on online social networks, meditation, hobbies such as painting, gardening, playing music, watching TV, cooking, shopping, napping, other types of reading and time spent with pets. Heads also most often report participating in non-school related activities 1-3 times per week, which leads one to deduce that all the areas combined for which time/space was created include time spent within a school context. Since 66.4% of all heads employ household help, and when cut by gender, 85.2% of female heads employ household help (see Table 6), one can see that this is a widely used strategy to establish balance.

Table 6

Employment of Household Help as Percentage within Gender

Variable		Male	Female
Employ household help	Yes	61.5%	85.2%
	No	38.5%	14.8%

Research Question #4: To What Extent Is There A Relationship Between Reported Balance and Measures of Professional and/or Personal Satisfaction and Success of School Heads?

This section describes what the data say about the answer to the fourth research question. Initially, descriptive statistics (i.e. the number and percentage of respondents) for survey items 8 through 12, which measured professional satisfaction, and survey

items 13 through 16, which measured personal satisfaction, as well as survey item 24 (How long have you been in your current position?) were used to determine overall levels of professional and personal satisfaction and success. Subsequently, inferential analyses using 48 regression models were used to determine first, whether there were relationships between reported balance and measures of professional and/or personal satisfaction and success of school heads and, second, if there were relationships, the strength of these relationships. This section reports the results of this multi-stage analysis process.

Professional Satisfaction

Participants were asked to rate their satisfaction in the following four professional areas: 1) success in career, 2) progress toward income goals, 3) progress toward advancement goals, and 4) progress toward goals for the development of new skills. Participants were also asked to rank the statement “The most important things that happen to me involve my work.” All rankings were on a 5-pt. Likert scale: 1) strongly agree, 2) agree to some extent, 3) uncertain, 4) disagree to some extent, and 5) strongly disagree. These choices were coded as 4, 3, 2, 1, and 0 respectively. Over 88% of heads strongly agreed or agreed to some extent that they were satisfied with the first four indicators of professional satisfaction and almost ½ agreed to some extent that the most important things that happen to them involve their work. However, the second most often rating of the latter statement (over 20% of heads) felt that the most important things that happen to them are not connected to their work. Frequencies are reported for professional satisfaction variables in Table 7.

Table 7

Professional Satisfaction Frequencies

Variable	Strongly disagree	Disagree to some extent	Uncertain	Agree to some extent	Strongly agree
Satisfaction with professional success	-	0.9%	1.3%	26.9%	70.9%
Satisfaction with income	1.3%	6.2%	4.0%	40.7%	47.8%
Satisfaction with advancement	-	0.4%	1.8%	27.4%	70.4%
Satisfaction with skill development	-	1.8%	6.2%	48.4%	43.6%
Most important = work	6.6%	22.0%	8.4%	48.5%	14.5%

Since a scale of 4, 3, 2, 1, 0 was used as noted above, the possible range of scores for the sum of professional satisfaction areas per participant was from 0 to 20, i.e. five scores of “0” to five scores of “4”. Each score was multiplied by 5, giving each respondent an overall professional satisfaction score (on a 0 to 100 scale). The distribution of summed professional satisfaction scores can be seen in Table 8.

Table 8

Distribution of Summed Professional Satisfaction Scores

Summed professional satisfaction scores	Percentage
≤ 50	2.7
55 – 70	16.5
75 – 90	61.6
≥ 95	19.2

Personal Satisfaction

Participants were also asked about the following four areas of personal satisfaction: 1) relationships with family, 2) spiritual growth, 3) time to relax, and 4)

connections with community outside of school. Just as with the professional satisfaction variables, the personal satisfaction variables were rated on a 5-pt. Likert scale: 1) strongly agree, 2) agree to some extent, 3) uncertain, 4) disagree to some extent, and 5) strongly disagree and coded as 4, 3, 2, 1, and 0 respectively. In contrast to the professional satisfaction responses, the responses in personal satisfaction showed a far lower level of satisfaction. While relationships to family still had a high rating with over 85% of heads either strongly agreeing or agreeing to some extent with their level of satisfaction, this dropped to under 65% for satisfaction with spiritual growth, and for the two final variables (time to relax, connections outside of school) became bimodal – agreeing to some extent and disagreeing to some extent. Frequencies are reported for professional satisfaction variables in Table 9.

Table 9

Personal Satisfaction Frequencies

Variable	Strongly disagree	Disagree to some extent	Uncertain	Agree to some extent	Strongly agree
Satisfaction with family relationships	0.9%	9.7%	4.4%	43.6%	41.4%
Satisfaction with level of spirituality	1.4%	14.6%	14.2%	49.1%	20.8%
Satisfaction with time to relax	15.9%	31.3%	6.2%	35.7%	11.0%
Satisfaction with connections outside school	11.0%	26.4%	10.6%	35.2%	16.7%

Similar to the professional satisfaction scores, since a scale of 4, 3, 2, 1, 0 was used, the possible range of scores for the sum of personal satisfaction areas per participant was from 0 to 16, i.e. four scores of “0” to four scores of “4”. Each score was multiplied by 6.25, giving each respondent an overall personal satisfaction score (on a 0

to 100 scale). To extend this methodology to all professional and personal satisfaction areas, which ranged from 0 to 36, the scores were multiplied by 2.77 to achieve a 0 to 100 scale. The distribution of personal satisfaction scores and combined professional and personal satisfaction scores can be seen in Table 10.

Table 10

Distribution of Personal and Combined Professional and Personal Satisfaction Scores

Variables	Percentage
Summed personal satisfaction scores	
≤ 25	7.6
31.25 – 50	25.9
56.25 – 75	41.9
≥ 81.25	24.6
Summed Professional and personal satisfaction scores	
≤ 50	4.0
55 – 69.4	40.6
72.2 – 86.1	42.9
≥ 88.9	12.5

Success of School Heads

Two indicators of a school head's success used in this study were (a) the number of years of a school head in his/her current position (survey item 24) and (b) school head's satisfaction with personal relationships (survey item 13). As reported in Table 1, a school head's years in current position ranged from 2 months to 25 years with the mean length being 5.87 years (4.77 for international heads and 7.55 for U.S. heads). When comparing responses of international school heads with independent school heads based in the U.S., it becomes clear that U.S. school heads had held their current position longer than international school heads (nearly 50% of U.S. heads held their current position for 7 years or longer vs. 25% of international heads, see Table 11).

Table 11

Comparison of Years in Current Position between International and U.S. Heads

Variables		Location	
		International	U.S.
Years in current position	< 1	9.1%	3.3%
	1 - 3	35.6%	26.7%
	4 - 6	30.3%	21.1%
	7 - 9	16.7%	23.3%
	10+	8.3%	25.6%
Mean		4.77	7.55

The second indicator of success studied, survey item 13 (a school head's satisfaction with family relationships), showed 85% of school head's responding positively (agree strongly or agree to some extent) to their satisfaction with family relationships (see Table 9). Comparing the length of respondent school head's years in their current position and their respective responses to the level of personal satisfaction with family relationships, the highest percentage is reported by heads in their position less than 1 year (93.8%), followed closely by those school heads with 7-9 years in their current position (93%). School heads in their current position between 1-3 years report the lowest percentage of satisfaction with family relationships, which is still impressive at 78.9%. When, comparing responses of international school heads with U.S. based heads, the percentage of satisfaction with family relationships was comparable for all lengths of years in current position except when a head had held his/her current position over ten years. In the case of this longer tenure, 95.7% of U.S. heads reported satisfaction with family relationships as compared to only 63.7% of international heads reporting such

satisfaction (see Table 12).

Table 12

Comparison of Satisfaction with Family Relationships and Years in Current Position as a Function of Location

Variables			Years in current position				
			< 1	1 - 3	4 - 6	7 - 9	10+
International	Satisfaction with family relationships	Strongly agree	-	-	-	-	-
		Disagree to some extent	-	14.9%	12.5%	9.1%	18.2%
		Uncertain	8.3%	8.5%	5.0%	-	18.2%
		Agree to some extent	58.3%	46.8%	35.0%	50.0%	18.2%
		Strongly agree	33.3%	29.8%	47.5%	40.9%	45.5%
U.S.	Satisfaction with family connections	Strongly disagree	-	-	-	4.8%	-
		Disagree to some extent	-	12.5%	10.5%	-	4.3%
		Uncertain	-	4.2%	-	-	-
		Agree to some extent	66.7%	41.7%	42.1%	47.6%	43.5%
		Strongly agree	33.3%	41.7%	47.4%	47.6%	52.2%

Regression Models

In order to build best-fit regression models, bivariate correlations were computed between each demographic, role balance, support, and balance strategy variable and each of the professional and personal satisfaction variables, individually and combined. This process identified the significant correlates of each of the satisfaction variables, for example, age showed a statistically significant ($p \leq 0.01$) correlation with satisfaction with professional success and length of current relationship showed a statistically significant ($p \leq 0.01$) correlation with satisfaction with family connections. Those variables that had no statistical significance with any of the satisfaction variables were eliminated from

further analysis. These included the demographic variables first headship, child attending or attended the same school, and a relative living in the house. Relationship status was also eliminated as it had a one-to-one correlation with relationship length, and the length of the relationship variable could then describe the effect of both relationship status and length and the independent variables. The role balance variables eliminated included whether the estimate of hours was close to total hours in a week as well as whether the respondent still felt balance after having counted up the hours. Only one variable was eliminated in the support and balance strategy categories: church and other strategies respectively.

As described in chapter 3, regression analysis models were created in a multi-step process. The first model ran satisfaction as a function of the demographic variables. The second model added the time variables to the first model. The third model added the support variables to the second model. And finally, the fourth model added the balance strategy variables to the third model. This four-step process allowed for examination of the interrelationship between independent variables.

Regression models using demographic variables. The first set of 12 models included only the demographic variables and was able to explain up to 6.5% of the overall variation in heads perception of satisfaction. Only two of the 12 models showed statistical significance for the demographic variables and both in the personal satisfaction arena: model 6 showed the effects of demographic variables on satisfaction with family connections; and model 8 showed the effects of demographic variables on satisfaction with time to relax. Model 6 identified 6.5% of the overall variation in satisfaction with family connections and showed statistical significance ($p \leq .05$) with length of current

relationship the only significant determinant ($p = .020$). The estimated coefficient was positive, revealing that the longer the relationship, the greater the satisfaction with family connections. Model 8 identified 6.2% of the overall variation in satisfaction with time to relax and the ANOVA showed statistical significance ($p = .045$) with the only significant determinant being a relative employed with the school. Here, the estimated coefficient was negative, indicating that satisfaction with time to relax is increased when a relative is employed at the same school.

Regression models using demographic and role balance variables. The second set of 12 models (13-24) added the role balance variables to the first 12 models including demographics and was able to explain up to 37.4% of the overall variation in the heads perception of satisfaction. Seven models proved to show statistical significance, with only one in the professional satisfaction domain. Model 16, satisfaction with skill development as a function of demographic and role balance variables, showed statistical significance ($p \leq .00$). This model identified 14.9% of the overall variation determined by gender ($p = .018$), felt prior balance ($p = .003$), balance is important right now ($p = .046$), and hours spent on other activities ($p = .047$). Gender, balance is important right now, and hours spent on other activities all had positive coefficients, indicating the women were more satisfied with their skill development than men, and that both feeling balance is important and spending hours on other activities increased the level of satisfaction with skill development. Feeling prior balance had a negative coefficient in all seven models, revealing that the less the feeling of balance, the less the satisfaction in that domain.

All four models using personal satisfaction dependent variables as a function of demographic and role balance variables were statistically significant ($p = .000$). Model 18

identified 20.4% of the overall variation in satisfaction with family connections determined by length of current relationship ($p = .040$), hours work per week ($p = .044$), hours spent with family per week ($p = .012$) and felt prior balance ($p = .000$). Length of current relationship and hours spent with family had positive coefficients, signifying a longer relationship and more hours spent with family leading to increased satisfaction with family connections. Reversely, hours worked per week had a negative coefficient, indicating more hours worked decreased satisfaction with family connections. Model 19 identified 20.9% of the overall variation in satisfaction with spiritual growth determined by hours spent on spiritual growth ($p = .031$), felt prior balance ($p = .000$), and balance is important right now ($p = .002$). Not surprisingly, hours spent on spiritual growth had a positive coefficient, meaning more hours spent on spiritual growth increases satisfaction with spiritual growth. Consistent with model 16, feeling that balance is important right now also had a positive coefficient, again indicating that those that feel balance is important right now report an increased satisfaction with spiritual growth. Model 20 identified 37.4% of the overall variation in satisfaction with time to relax determined by years in current position ($p = .037$) and felt prior balance ($p = .000$). With a positive coefficient, the length of time in current position led to an increase in satisfaction with time to relax. Model 21 was able to explain 24.2% of the variation in satisfaction with connections outside of school determined by years in current position ($p = .003$), felt prior balance ($p = .000$), and balance is important right now ($p = .026$). Again, the coefficients of years in current position and balance is important right now were positive, and felt prior balance had a negative coefficient.

Models 23 and 24 were also both statistically significant at the $p = .000$ level. The sum of all personal satisfaction variables as a function of demographic and role balance variables (Model 23) explained 36.2% of the overall variation, with years in current position ($p = .020$), felt prior balance ($p = .000$), and balance is important right now ($p = .006$) significant determinants. Model 24 identified 29.5% of the overall variation in the sum of all professional and personal satisfaction variables. In addition to those independent variables listed as significant in model 23, hours spent on other activities ($p = .018$) was also a significant determinant in model 24. All coefficients were positive except felt prior balance.

Regression models using demographic, role balance and support variables. The third set of 12 models (25-36) added support variables to the second set of models, which included demographic and role balance variables and was able to explain up to 40.5% of the overall variation in satisfaction scores. Nine of the 12 models showed statistical significance ($p \leq .05$): two models in the professional satisfaction domain, all four personal satisfaction domain models, and all three summed satisfaction models. The seven statistically significant models described in the second set of regressions above, were all able to explain increased percentages of variation, signifying better-fit models. Logically, the significantly determinant variables were also consistent with few exceptions. Model 28, which was able to explain 19.5% of the overall variation in satisfaction with skill development, the demographic variable of location became significant ($p = .045$) and the importance of balance right now was no longer significant. None of the support variables were significant, however adding them into the model, increased the significance of living internationally or in the U.S. The estimated

coefficient was positive indicating that living in the U.S. was associated with increased satisfaction with skill development.

The second professional domain model (29) was able to explain 14.7% of the variation in the most important things that happen to a head are connected to his/her work. The significant variables were hours spent with family ($p = .018$) and support by other ($p = .044$). A negative correlation was shown with the first variable, indicating that the more hours spent with family, the less likely that the head would feel the most important things that happen to the head are connected to his/her work. A positive coefficient for the variable support by other, reveals that an increase by outside support is associated with an increase in the feeling that the most important things happen involving a head's work.

The addition of support variables to create model 30 explained 28.1% of the overall variation in satisfaction with family connections. Whereas in model 18, length of current relationship was significant, in model 30 this was no longer the case. However, support by family was a significant determinant ($p = .000$), with a positive correlation double that of length of current relationship in model 18 (4.18 vs. 2.07), indicating that support by family increases the feeling of satisfaction with family connections.

Model 31, other than explaining 22.8% of the overall variation in satisfaction with spiritual growth, as opposed to 20.4 % in model 19, had the same significant determinants, namely hours spent on spiritual growth ($p = .045$), felt prior balance ($p = .000$), and balance is important right now ($p = .001$). Model 32 was able to explain 38.7% of the overall variation in satisfaction with time to relax, with only felt prior balance ($p = .000$) still a significant variable as in model 20. In addition, hours spent with partner per

week had a positive, significant correlation ($p = .034$) and hours spent on other activities was borderline significant ($p = .050$), also with a positive coefficient. Model 33 saw an increase to 28.9% over model 21 in being able to explain satisfaction with connections outside of school with support by friends and additional significant determinant ($p = .021$).

As stated above all three summed satisfaction models were statistically significant. Model 34 identified 14.9% of the overall variation of the sum of all professional satisfaction variables with hours spent on other activities ($p = .018$) and support by other ($p = .003$) the only significant determinants. The explanation of overall variation in the sum of all personal satisfaction variables by model 35 increased over model 23 to 40.5%. The independent variable years in current position was no longer significant, however support by family was a significant determinant ($p = .007$). Similarly, model 36 showed an increase in the explanation of overall variation in the sum of all professional and personal satisfaction variables over model 24 up to 35.1%. In addition to years in current position no longer being significant and support by family becoming significant ($p = .030$), support by other was also significant ($p = .038$).

Regression models using all variables. The final twelve models (37-48) added the balance strategy variables to the third set of models, which had included demographic, role balance and support variables. As with the third set of models, there was an overall increase in the ability to explain the variations in satisfaction scores up to 46%. The same nine of 12 models showed statistical significance ($p \leq .05$): two models in the professional satisfaction domain, all four personal satisfaction domain models, and all three summed satisfaction models.

By adding the balance strategy variables, model 40 now explained 22.5% of the variation of satisfaction with skill development, with only two significant determinants: felt prior balance ($p = .017$) and hours spent on other activities ($p = .030$). The correlation of the latter variable was positive indicating that the more time spent on other activities, possibly skill development, led to an increase in satisfaction with skill development. Model 41 increased the explanation of the variation of the most important things that happen to a head are connected to his/her work up to 20.7% at a statistical significance of $p = .014$. The significant variables were the same as in model 29 with the addition of hours spent on academic pursuits ($p = .032$) and a positive correlation.

Model 42 identified 33.7% of the variation in satisfaction with family connections, as compared to 28.1% of model 30. Hours spent working and with family were no longer significant variables. The balance strategy variable creating time/space to walk was significant at the $p = .008$ level. Model 43 was able to explain 25.5% of the overall variation in satisfaction with spiritual growth, up from 22.8% in model 31. With the addition of the balance strategy variables, hours spent on spiritual growth was no longer statistically significant ($p = .058$). With the largest leap in percentage, model 44 was able to explain 45.6% of the overall variation in satisfaction with time to relax, as compared to 38.7% of model 32. The balance strategy creating time/space for reading a book was an additional significant determinant ($p = .002$), however hours spent with partner and on other activities were no longer or only borderline significant ($p = .070$ and $p = .052$ respectively). Model 45 identified 34.5% of the overall variation in satisfaction with connections outside of school. Hours spent on spiritual growth ($p = .049$) and creating time/space for reading a book ($p = .011$) became additional significant

determinants, whereas balance is important right now and support by friends no longer were as compared to model 33.

Eighteen point seven percent of the variation in the sum of all professional satisfaction variables was explained by model 46 with the same significant determinants as in model 34, with both showing a higher level of significance: hours spent on other activities ($p = .007$) and support by other ($p = .002$) as well as higher positive coefficients (see Table 13). The ANOVA showed statistical significance ($p = .047$).

Table 13

Professional Satisfaction Summation (Model 46)

	Est. Coefficients	Std. Error	t-statistic	Sig.
(Constant)	56.89	11.36	5.01	.000
Hours work per week	0.08	0.10	0.79	.432
Hours sleep per week	0.10	0.11	0.84	.403
Hours spent with family per week	-.18	0.09	-1.92	.056
Hours spent with partner per week	0.11	0.12	0.88	.382
Hours spent on academic pursuits	0.21	0.24	0.85	.396
Hours spent on personal recreation	0.08	0.17	0.44	.664
Hours spent on spiritual growth	-.05	0.28	-0.17	.866
Hours spent on other activities	0.52	0.19	2.72	.007
Felt balance prior to question	-2.16	1.85	-1.17	.245
Balance is important right now	4.53	2.34	1.93	.055
Gender	2.32	1.98	1.17	.243
Age	0.24	0.64	0.37	.712
Location International vs. U.S.	0.61	1.87	0.33	.743
Years in current position	0.26	0.76	0.35	.730
Length of current relationship	0.18	0.46	0.38	.705
Relative employed with the school	3.45	1.86	1.86	.065
Support by partner/spouse	0.30	3.01	0.10	.921
Support by family	1.75	2.72	0.65	.520
Support by friends	1.70	2.26	0.75	.453
Support by colleagues	2.98	2.41	1.24	.218
Support by other	7.90	2.49	3.17	.002
Create time/space for partner	.36	1.01	0.36	.720
Create time/space for family	1.33	0.83	1.61	.109
Create time/space for friends	-0.94	1.66	-0.56	.574
Create time/space for reading a book	0.05	0.81	0.06	.953
Create time/space to walk	-0.52	0.92	-0.57	.572
Create time/space for sports/recreation	-0.24	1.06	-0.23	.821
Participate in activities not related to school	-2.27	1.16	-1.96	.052
Employ household help	-1.98	1.87	-1.06	.290
R Squared = .187 Adjusted R Squared = .066				

Model 47 was the best-fit model, explaining 46% of the variation of the sum of all personal satisfaction variables at a $p = .000$ level of significance. The significant determinants included those from model 35 plus creating time/space for reading a book ($p = .046$) and employ household help ($p = .041$). As can be seen in Table 14, the latter had a negative correlation, indicating that not employing household help decreased the level of overall personal satisfaction, or rather employing household help, increased the level of overall personal satisfaction.

Table 14

Personal Satisfaction Summation (Model 47)

	Est. Coefficients	Std. Error	t-statistic	Sig.
(Constant)	44.08	16.51	2.67	.008
Hours work per week	-0.08	0.15	-0.53	.600
Hours sleep per week	0.02	0.17	0.11	.911
Hours spent with family per week	0.10	0.13	0.77	.440
Hours spent with partner per week	0.19	0.17	1.11	.268
Hours spent on academic pursuits	-0.36	0.36	-1.00	.318
Hours spent on personal recreation	0.11	0.25	0.42	.675
Hours spent on spiritual growth	-0.03	0.40	-0.08	.934
Hours spent on other activities	0.41	0.28	1.49	.139
Felt balance prior to question	-17.19	2.69	-6.40	.000
Balance is important right now	6.86	3.41	2.02	.045
Gender	-1.31	2.88	-0.45	.651
Age	-0.20	0.93	-0.21	.835
Location International vs. U.S.	-0.84	2.71	-0.31	.756
Years in current position	1.96	1.10	1.78	.077
Length of current relationship	0.17	0.67	0.25	.802
Relative employed with the school	-3.54	2.70	-1.31	.192
Support by partner/spouse	-6.12	4.37	-1.40	.163
Support by family	11.40	3.95	2.88	.004
Support by friends	3.93	3.29	1.20	.233
Support by colleagues	1.95	3.50	0.56	.579
Support by other	-1.99	3.62	-0.55	.583
Create time/space for partner	1.07	1.47	0.73	.468
Create time/space for family	1.14	1.20	0.95	.345
Create time/space for friends	0.06	2.41	0.02	.981
Create time/space for reading a book	2.36	1.17	2.01	.046
Create time/space to walk	1.69	1.33	1.27	.206
Create time/space for sports/recreation	0.40	1.54	0.26	.794
Participate in activities not related to school	2.20	1.68	1.31	.192
Employ household help	-5.57	2.71	-2.06	.041
R Squared = .460 Adjusted R Squared = .379				

Finally, model 48 was able to explain 39.5% of the overall variation in the sum of all professional and personal satisfaction variables at a $p = .000$ level of significance. The major difference to model 36 was that support by other was no longer a significant determinant, and employing household help was significant ($p = .032$), again with a negative coefficient (see Table 15).

Table 15

Professional and Personal Satisfaction Summation (Model 48)

	Est. Coefficients	Std. Error	t-statistic	Sig.
(Constant)	51.55	10.05	5.13	.000
Hours work per week	0.01	0.09	0.10	.923
Hours sleep per week	0.06	0.10	0.63	.529
Hours spent with family per week	-0.06	0.08	-0.73	.469
Hours spent with partner per week	0.15	0.11	1.44	.152
Hours spent on academic pursuits	-0.04	0.22	-0.19	.847
Hours spent on personal recreation	0.08	0.15	0.51	.613
Hours spent on spiritual growth	-0.05	0.25	-0.21	.834
Hours spent on other activities	0.47	0.17	2.78	.006
Felt balance prior to question	-8.72	1.63	-5.33	.000
Balance is important right now	5.50	2.07	2.65	.009
Gender	0.70	1.75	0.40	.689
Age	0.01	0.57	0.01	.990
Location International vs. U.S.	-0.05	1.65	-0.03	.977
Years in current position	1.02	0.67	1.52	.131
Length of current relationship	0.21	0.41	0.45	.618
Relative employed with the school	0.24	1.65	0.15	.883
Support by partner/spouse	-2.39	2.66	-0.90	.369
Support by family	5.62	2.41	2.34	.021
Support by friends	2.75	2.00	1.38	.170
Support by colleagues	2.62	2.13	1.23	.219
Support by other	3.44	2.20	1.56	.120
Create time/space for partner	0.59	0.89	0.66	.510
Create time/space for family	1.24	0.73	1.68	.094
Create time/space for friends	-0.44	1.47	-0.30	.765
Create time/space for reading a book	1.07	0.71	1.49	.138
Create time/space to walk	0.48	0.81	0.60	.551
Create time/space for sports/recreation	0.06	0.94	0.06	.952
Participate in activities not related to school	-0.20	1.02	-0.19	.849
Employ household help	-3.56	1.65	-2.16	.032
R Squared = .395 Adjusted R Squared = .304				

Summary of Regression Models

Through a series of regression analyses, significant determinants ($p \leq .01$) of personal and professional satisfaction were identified. These can be found summarized in Table 16. The determinants of professional satisfaction included hours spent on other activities and support by other. As respondents spend more time on other activities and feel supported by others (other than partner/spouse, family, friends, and colleagues) there is an increased perception of professional satisfaction. Write-in responses to what other support was offered included support from members of the school community, board of trustees, pets, professional organizations, ex-colleagues, mentors, religious community, mission organization, personal growth outside of school and self. The variables hours spent with family and participate in activities not related to school showed borderline significance with negative correlations, indicating that more time spent with family and in activities not related to school decrease the overall perception of professional satisfaction. In addition, the variables balance is important right now and relative employed with school were also borderline significant, however with positive correlations, implying that not feeling balance is important right now and having relatives employed with the school increases the overall perception of professional satisfaction.

Overall personal satisfaction was determined ($p \leq .05$) by the variables felt prior balance, balance is important right now, support by family, creating time/space for reading a book, and employing household help. Prior balance and employing household help both had negative coefficients, indicating that having felt balance prior to the survey and employing household help increase the feeling of personal satisfaction. Balance is important now, support by family, and creating time/space for reading a book all had

positive coefficients, indicating that not placing importance on feeling balance right now, feeling supported by family and creating time/space for reading a book all lead to increased personal satisfaction.

Statistically significant determinants ($p \leq .05$) of all professional and personal satisfaction indices were hours spent on other activities, feeling prior balance, balance is important right now, support by family and employing household help. Hours spent on other activities included household chores, yard work, commuting, shopping, coaching, fishing, internet surfing, watching TV, relaxing, caring for aging parents, walking the dog, napping and volunteer work. Again, prior balance and employing household help both had negative coefficients, indicating that having felt balance prior to the survey and employing household help increase the feeling of overall professional and personal satisfaction. Hours spent on other activities, balance is important now, and support by family all had positive coefficients, indicating that spending time on other activities, not placing importance on feeling balance right now, and feeling supported by family all lead to increased overall satisfaction (see Table 16).

Table 16

Significant Variables in Satisfaction Indices

Summed Professional Satisfaction Variables	Summed Personal Satisfaction Variables	Combined Professional and Personal Satisfaction Variables
Hours spent on other activities (p = .007) Support by other (than listed) (p = .002)	Prior feeling of balance (p = .000) Balance is important now (p = .045) Support by family (p = .004) Create time/space to read a book (p = .046) Employ household help (p = .041)	Hours spent on other activities (p = .006) Prior feeling of balance (p = .000) Balance is important now (p = .009) Support by family (p = .021) Employ household help (p = .032)
R Squared = .187	R Squared = .460	R Squared = .395

Perception of balance was either borderline or a significant determinant in all summed satisfaction models, including the three best-fit models (46, 47, & 48). As stated above in model 46, not feeling balance is important right now increased the overall perception of professional satisfaction. Assuming that heads are more satisfied professionally if they feel successful, it is telling that the perception of less balance increases the professional satisfaction and feeling of success. When looking at the open responses to the question why or why not (is balance important right now), over 10% of respondents claimed it was their choice (to have a demanding position) and they were passionate about their work. Similarly, it was claimed that the professional and personal domains were blended. Some heads in their first headship found it overwhelming but expected it to get better, while others felt project-specific pressures that would relax in a specified time. There were also responses that achieving balance was important for one's health, to divert burn-out, be more effective in the job, and two respondents stated they had already achieved balance.

Although only borderline significant in the professional satisfaction model, the feeling prior balance variable was significant in both the personal satisfaction and overall satisfaction models with the same positive correlation. Using the same argumentation that heads are more satisfied personally and overall if they feel successful, in models 47 & 48, the significant determinant of feeling prior balance, and the negative correlation indicating that an increase in the perception of balance increases the level of personal and overall satisfaction supports a clear relationship between personal and overall measures of personal and professional satisfaction and success.

Research Question 5: Are there significant differences across demographic factors between reports from school heads working in international schools and independent schools within the United States?

This section focuses on what the data say about the answer to the fifth research question. Inferential analyses using independent samples t-tests and chi-square tests of survey items 21 through 30 (questions on demographics) comparing the location of the school head (international vs. U.S.) were used to answer question 5. All individual role balance, personal satisfaction, professional satisfaction, support, and balance strategy variables were also tested for significant differences comparing the location of the school head. Finally, the professional, personal, and combined professional and personal satisfaction scores of international school heads were compared to those of heads based in the U.S., to evaluate further whether there are significant differences between reports from school heads working in international schools and those working in U.S. independent schools.

As stated in the sample characteristics section above, the sample reflects fairly similar demographics when comparing location (international vs. in the United States or home country vs. not home country). A notable exception can be found in the length of years the school head has held his/her current position (see Table 11). In this case, approximately 50% of U.S. school heads have held their current position at least 7 years vs. only 25% of international school heads having held their position for the same length of time.

In order to determine significance, independent samples t-tests of the variables age, years in current position, and length of current relationship and chi-square tests of the variables first headship, current relationship, relative living in house, relative employed with the school, and child attends/ed school were conducted. There was a significant difference in the scores for international ($M=4.77$, $SD=4.08$) and U.S. ($M=7.55$, $SD=5.97$) school heads' years in current position; $t(220)=-4.13$, $p=.000$. Furthermore, there were significant differences between international and U.S. school heads' first headship, $X^2(1, N=222)=25.44$, $p=.000$, and relative employed with school $X^2(1, N=221)=20.20$, $p=.000$. These results suggest U.S. heads are more likely to be in their first headship and have longer tenures than international school heads. However, international school heads are more likely to have a relative employed at the school (see Table 17).

Table 17

Significance Scores of International and U.S. Heads Across Demographic Factors

Variables	N	df	t/ X^2	Sig.
Age	223	221	0.53	.599
Years in current position	222	220	-4.13	.000
Length of current relationship	208	206	-1.37	.172
Gender	222	1	0.03	.869
First headship	222	1	25.44	.000
Current relationship	223	1	0.33	.566
Relative living in house	222	1	1.07	.302
Relative employed with the school	221	1	20.20	.000
Child attends/ed school	223	1	0.47	.492

Further inferential analyses using independent samples t-tests and chi-square tests showed absolutely no significant differences between responses from international school heads and U.S. heads in any role balance or personal satisfaction variables as well as most professional satisfaction, support, and balance strategies. However, there were a few significant differences found, namely between international ($M=3.26$, $SD=0.69$) and U.S. ($M=3.47$, $SD=.062$) school heads' satisfaction with skill development (professional satisfaction variable); $t(219)=-2.30$, $p=.023$, between international and U.S. school heads' support by church (support variable), $X^2(1, N=223)=5.41$, $p=.020$, and employment of household help (balance strategy variable), $X^2(1, N=222)=9.17$, $p=.002$. These results suggest U.S. heads are more likely to be satisfied with their professional skill development as well as feel support from their church than international school heads. However, international school heads are more likely to employ household help.

When comparing professional satisfaction, personal satisfaction and overall satisfaction scores between international heads and those based in the United States, there are also very similar results. The comparison can be seen in Table 18. Approximately 79% of international heads scored 75 or more points (on a scale of 100) for professional satisfaction as compared to 83.3% of U.S. based heads. While the scores shift a bit lower on the personal satisfaction scale, the scores are still comparable, with 66.3% of international heads scoring 56,25 or higher and 66.6% of U.S. based heads scoring at the same level. Although international heads score a bit lower on the professional and personal satisfaction scales, on the overall satisfaction scale, international school heads score slightly higher with 56.6% scoring 72.2 or higher and 53.3% of U.S. based heads scoring at the same level. Independent samples t-tests showed no significant differences between international and U.S. school heads responses.

Table 17

Comparison of International and U.S. heads Satisfaction Scores

Variable	International	U.S.
Summed Professional Satisfaction Scores		
≤ 50	3.1%	2.2%
55 - 70	18.1%	14.4%
≥ 75	78.9%	83.3%
Summed Personal Satisfaction Scores		
≤ 25	9.1%	5.5%
31.25 - 50	24.8%	27.8%
≥ 56.25	66.3%	66.6%
Combined Professional and Personal Satisfaction Scores		
≤ 50	4.7%	3.3%
52.5 – 69.4	39.4%	43.3%
$\geq 72,2$	56.6%	53.3%

Examining the responses to the two balance questions, regarding feeling prior balance and whether balance is important right now, cut by international heads vs. U.S. heads, the results are very similar as can be seen in Table 19. Approximately 43% of international heads felt balance as compared to 41.1% of U.S. based heads. A slightly larger difference was noted between international heads and U.S. based heads when examining whether they felt balance was important right now: 87.6% international heads responded in the affirmative vs. 81.8% of U.S. based heads, however chi-square tests showed neither difference to be significant.

Table 18

Comparison of International and U.S. Heads Balance Variables as Percentage within Location

Variable		Location	
		International	U.S.
Felt balance prior to question	Yes	42.9%	41.1%
	No	57.1%	58.9%
Balance is important right now	Yes	87.6%	81.8%
	No	12.4%	18.2%

In summary, there were significant differences reported by U.S. and international school heads in only a few distinct variables, namely first headship, length in current position, having a relative employed with the school, satisfaction with professional skill development, support from church, and employing household help. However, no significant differences were reported between the two groups when comparing summed satisfaction scores or feelings of balance.

CHAPTER 5: CONCLUSION

This final chapter will briefly review the problem, purpose, methods, and main findings of the dissertation. Then these findings will be compared to the current literature on work/life balance. Next, the focus shifts to recommendations for further studies on the topic of balance for international school heads and their work. Finally, this section will conclude with implications and suggestions for existing and potential school heads and perhaps school boards interested in maintaining stability in their schools.

The Problem and Purpose of the Dissertation

Interest in the topic of professional/personal balance has garnered increased attention over the past two and a half decades (Cornell University, 2002). Both national and more recent international studies on work/life balance tend to target corporate executives, professional services, such as physicians, attorneys, accountants, or governmental employees but not education or non-profit leadership. The limited research that exists on the work/life balance topic in the education field either targets higher education or is not scholarly in nature. Yet, K-12 industry periodicals anecdotally describe the difficulty of achieving work/life balance for educational leaders and state that balance must be a goal for these leaders in order to successfully continue in the profession (Milne, 2007).

The purpose of this study was to expand the body of knowledge about professional/personal balance of organizational leaders in the K-12 education field, and specifically international school heads. With a high turnover rate of international school heads (average 2.8 years), the possible link of work/life balance to longevity in the

headship position has been tangentially investigated (Littleford, 1999). This study of whether and/or how school heads find balance between their professional and personal lives and how this correlates to their success and satisfaction in both the professional and personal arenas begins to address this gap.

Methods

This quantitative study built upon an earlier qualitative investigation of work/life balance, which involved interviews of five current international school heads. In order to determine the generalizability of the findings of the qualitative study, as well as to verify those findings quantitatively, an internet survey was distributed to the target population of international school heads through listserves of two professional organizations to which many heads subscribe, i.e. the Association for the Advancement of International Education (AAIE) and the Academy for International School Heads (AISH), as well as through eleven regional membership organizations. As a comparison group, U.S. based independent school heads were also asked to participate through the professional list-serve of the organization the National Association of Independent Schools (NAIS). The survey instrument asked participants to provide information in six areas: 1) role balance, 2) professional satisfaction, 3) personal satisfaction, 4) support, 5) balance strategies, and 6) demographics.

There were 227 independent school heads who were the focus of this study, 133 located internationally and 90 located in the U.S. (four respondents did not check their location). The response rate for independent school heads located in the U.S. was 7.4%. The response rate of international school heads, however is impossible to determine, as the total population cannot be determined. The data collected were analyzed through the

use of both descriptive and inferential statistics. First, descriptive statistics, including means and standard deviations, frequencies, and bi-variate correlations were run for all variables. The results provide a general perception of school heads' balance and what contributes or detracts from that perception of balance. Next, a total of 48 regression models were performed to ascertain a best-fit model to identify the determinants of professional and personal satisfaction and success of school heads. Finally, further inferential analysis was used to determine whether there were significant differences between international school heads and those working in U.S. independent schools.

Summary of Findings

The profile of the sample of international school heads used in this study closely matched the profile of all international school heads during the time period of the study. The Academy of International School Heads (AISH), for example, reports that in December 2009 27.5% of its members were female and 72.5% were male. This closely matches the international school heads population used in this study since there were 23.5% female and 76.5% male international respondents. Similarly, the profile of U.S. based independent school heads closely matched the profile of all U.S. based independent school heads during the time period of the study. The National Association of Independent Schools (NAIS) reports 30.9% females and 69.1% males in its 2009-2010 membership. The U.S. school heads participating in this study were 24.4% female and 75.6% male. Furthermore the age distribution was also very similar in this study's sample with the largest group responding being in their 50s: 44% of international heads and 47% of U.S. heads. NAIS reports the largest group of their members in 2009-2010 was also in

their 50s (37.6%). Due to the limited studies available, additional demographic variables for comparison with those used in this study were not accessible.

In order to identify whether there were differences between the two samples within the study, international school heads and independent school heads based in the U.S., demographics variables were compared. As can be seen above, the two groups within the sample were comparable in both gender and age. There were notable differences, however, in the length of current position, with U.S. heads having longer terms than their international counterparts, which substantiated earlier findings by Hawley (1994) as well as figures reported by the New York Association of Independent Schools (2003). Notable differences were also found in reports of having a relative employed at the school. The ratio of international heads reporting a relative employed at the school to U.S. heads reporting the same was approximately 3:1. This last statistic is perhaps easily explained, in that trailing spouses to international assignments often have limited opportunities to work outside of an international school community, and therefore find employment, if desired, with the school. Spouses of U.S. heads may not be as dependent on the school as they are presumably in their home country.

The first major finding of the study is that although over 85% of heads feel that balance is important right now, less than half feel they have achieved balance in their lives with no significant difference reported between international school heads and independent school heads located in the U.S. The factors reported as impacting heads' ability to find balance between their professional and personal lives include the nature of the leadership position and the difficulty in drawing clear lines between the two domains of a heads life. In the case of school heads, the passion for the work being done was often

cited as compensating for the perception of imbalance. Heads find support through a partner/spouse, family, friends, and colleagues with partner/spouse and family reported as the highest sources of support by almost 90% of respondents.

The strategies used by heads to establish balance are another major finding of this study. Ninety-two percent of respondents did not list any other strategies to establish balance other than the list provided, i.e. creating time/space to spend with partner/spouse, family, friends, reading, walking and sports/recreation. Employing household help was listed by 66.4% of all heads and 85.2% of female heads; clearly the use of household help is a widely used strategy to establish balance.

Overall, heads reported satisfaction with the four indicators of professional satisfaction surveyed, namely success, income, advancement, and skill development. Similarly, heads reported personal satisfaction with family relationships. However, the percentage of heads satisfied with their level of spirituality was quite a bit lower and their satisfaction with time to relax and satisfaction with connections outside of school was bimodal with almost equal percentages agreeing to some extent and disagreeing to some extent to being satisfied with these two measures.

The regression analyses were able to predict up to 46% of the variation in the summed satisfaction scores, suggesting that demographic, role balance, support and balance strategy variables were important. Specifically, having the perception of balance prior to the survey, not placing importance on feeling balance right now, feeling supported by family, creating time/space for reading a book and employing household help all lead to increased personal satisfaction of a school head.

Summing all professional and personal satisfaction scores, 39.5% of the overall variation could be explained with a statistically significant ANOVA ($p=.000$). This model showed having the perception of balance prior to the survey, not placing importance on feeling balance right now, feeling supported by family, and employing household help all lead to increased overall satisfaction. Although only borderline significant in the summed professional satisfaction model, there is a clear significant relationship between not placing importance on feeling balance right now and the summed personal satisfaction and overall satisfaction models. The latter two models indicate that when reporting feeling balanced, the level of satisfaction increases, but perhaps more significantly, not placing importance on feeling balanced right now increases satisfaction.

The last important finding of this study was that there were no significant differences reported between heads working in international schools and those working in U.S. schools when comparing summed professional and personal satisfaction scores or feelings of balance. However, there were significant differences reported in a few distinct variables, namely first headship, length in current position, having a relative employed with the school, satisfaction with professional skill development, support from church, and employing household help.

Interpretation: The Findings and the Literature

The importance of “maintaining an overall sense of harmony in life” (Clarke, Koch, & Hill, 2004) is underscored by respondents in this study, i.e. 85% stated they feel balance is important right now. However, with only 41.9% indicating that they currently are experiencing balance in their lives, it seems clear that work/life *imbalance* is the current state of affairs for the majority of K-12 school leaders who responded to the

survey used in this study. This study suggests school heads knowingly choose imbalance as a bi-product of having chosen a high-profile position with leadership responsibilities. The limited current literature on the balance of K-12 educational leadership supports this perception of imbalance (Milne, 2007). Furthermore, some respondents report that the passion for the job and the ideological importance of the work compensate for the lack of perceived balance. This finding supports a compensation model, which proposes that what is lacking in one area of life can be made up for in another (Guest, 2002).

The study suggests that a mix of support mechanisms and strategies help heads achieve a sense of balance. As stated earlier, support by partner/spouse and family were the highest reported sources of support with 89% and 88% respectively, followed by support by colleagues (84%) and support by friends (81%). There was a significant difference found between international and U.S. school heads reporting feeling support by church, namely U.S. heads more likely to feel support. This may be related to the longer tenures of U.S. heads and/or possible religious affiliations of many U.S. independent schools. In general, the findings related to support described here substantiate the earlier results of Tully's 2004 survey, which reported familial support as the most significant source of support, with collegial/professional support and religious and community support cited as 2nd and 3rd most significant respectively. The variable support by family was also found to be a significant determinant in both the summed personal satisfaction and summed professional and personal satisfaction regression models, confirming the apparent relationship between longer term and more successful heads having stable marriages or support systems (Littleford, 1999). This finding seems to support a boundary/border theory, a theory that suggests that there are different types

of permeable borders around the various domains of one's life and the different roles are interdependent (Desrochers & Sargent, 2003). By gleaning professional support from both personal friends and professional colleagues, the personal and professional roles of a school head are intersecting, and the resulting integrated space may facilitate, or compensate for, finding work/life balance.

As mentioned in chapter 3, data gathered in my earlier qualitative investigation into the topic of professional/personal balance of international school heads showed six specific strategies used by five international school heads to help find balance, i.e. creating time/space to spend with partner/spouse, family, friends, reading, walking and sports/recreation. Since 92% of respondents to this survey found this list to be complete, the findings corroborate my previous study. In addition, since the results from only five interviews is not sufficient to give a representative picture of the culture of international school heads' grappling with balance, this quantitative study that vastly expanded the sample frame and used heads of independent schools within the U.S. as a comparative group, has yielded a relatively large and seemingly representative group of participants which suggest that the earlier findings are likely to be generalizeable to the population.

An additional strategy to achieve balance cited in my earlier qualitative study was employing household help, which was also substantiated by this quantitative study's results: 66.4% of all heads and 85.2% of female heads employ household help. These results also support Gershuny's (2008) findings that the decline in leisure time versus work time was due in large part to the distribution of unpaid work in the household. By employing household help, the majority of all school heads, and the vast majority of female heads, is attempting to restore some of that perceived lack of balance. This study

suggests that international school heads are more likely to employ household help than U.S. heads, which may be due not only to the support that such help gives the international school head, but also due to cultural expectations of the location of that school head.

A high level of satisfaction was reported in all four professional indices by respondent heads (88%), however the same cannot be said for personal satisfaction. With the notable exception of satisfaction of heads with family relationships (85%), the other indicators of personal satisfaction that were studied, namely satisfaction with personal growth, with time to relax, and with connections outside of school, showed a bimodal majority of heads either satisfied or dissatisfied. In other words, almost equal numbers of heads reported being satisfied as being dissatisfied with these measures. Since the position of school head carries with it a high degree of professional advancement (i.e. it is the highest attainable paid position within a K-12 independent school), it follows that, professionally, school heads are satisfied and feel successful. Personal satisfaction of school heads, however, is apparently influenced more by other factors, most notably the perception of balance between work and life. This research identified five significant determinants of overall personal satisfaction of school heads, namely a perception of balance, not placing importance on feeling balanced right now, feeling supported by family, creating time/space for reading a book, and employing household help.

Significant differences were not reported between U.S. and international school heads in summed personal and professional satisfaction scores or perceptions of balance. This would indicate that the work of a school head is similar regardless of location, with similar struggles to find balance and personal satisfaction and success. There is not a

great deal of literature to link this finding to, other than a brief survey conducted by Tully (2004), which also found more similarities than differences between independent school heads located in the U.S. and international school heads, specifically in the interrelationship between the professional and personal aspects of a school heads' life and the reliance on the personal side, e.g. familial support, to survive the position's professional demands. However, when looking at specific indicators of success, such as longevity in position, satisfaction with family relationships, and satisfaction with connections outside of school, this study suggests U.S. heads have a clear advantage over international heads. Similarly, Tully found the headship was less of a stress factor on the marriage of independent school heads in the U.S. than for international school heads.

Conducting this quantitative study that vastly expanded the sample frame as compared to the prior qualitative study, allowed a substantiation of the results from a previous qualitative study, Tully's 2004 survey, Littleford's 1999 anecdotal evidence, and suppositions mentioned in professional periodicals.

Recommendations for Future Studies

There are a number of implications and recommendations for future research on work/life balance of school heads that are suggested by this study. Recommendations to improve the existing survey instrument as well as suggestions for further studies are discussed here.

Due to the use of data from the prior qualitative study, as well as consulting existing instruments, the preset responses offered in the survey instrument used in this quantitative study seemed to provide respondents with the major indicators of how their time is spent (role balance), professional satisfaction, personal satisfaction, sources of

support, and balance strategies. “You seem to have hit them all,” is the way one respondent put it in the space provided for respondents to add additional indicators than the ones listed. However, although the opportunity to write in “other” indicators was given on a number of survey items, there was no opportunity for respondents to comment further on any one item. Some respondents used the “other” responses to make comments not directly related to the survey item. Through these comments it became clear that respondents wished to elaborate upon or clarify their answers. Adding a question at the end, such as, “Is there anything else you would like to comment upon?” would have given these respondents a voice. Also, or alternatively, a statement at the end such as “If you would like to be contacted by the researcher to give further input, please submit your email address here,” would give respondents the opportunity to give further input. Those doing similar studies in the future, especially researchers who adapt the instrument that was used in this study, should consider adding such questions/options.

Another shortcoming of the survey instrument was the confusion surrounding the question of where the respondents were currently located, internationally (outside your passport country), in your passport country and in the United States. In the interest of trying to retain anonymity of the respondents, this wording seemed better than simply asking what country the respondent was located in. However, future research may want to ask more specifically the location and add a separate question, “Are you a citizen of the country in the prior question?” This would not only alleviate the confusion, but also may lead to further analysis. For example, cultural differences in the expectations of balance could be investigated.

A third improvement on the study would be better timing on the launching of the survey. This survey was launched just a few weeks prior to the summer holiday for most northern hemisphere schools, and international schools on a northern hemisphere calendar. Launching the survey fairly soon after the start of the school year, e.g. late September, may find heads not as pressed for time as at the end of the school year, which could increase the sample size.

While this study has given a first identification of the factors that impact a school heads' ability to find balance, satisfaction and success, it is clear that measuring and identifying such factors is a difficult process. A more complete and accurate picture of what influences heads' perceptions of balance and how institutions, communities, families, and heads' themselves can affect this perception requires longitudinal studies.

Investigating whether there are gender differences among professional and personal satisfaction, success and perceptions of balance went beyond the scope of this study. However, as there was a marked difference between male and female heads in employing household help, with females much more likely to employ household help, it stands to reason that other significant differences may exist. This would also support finding from the earlier qualitative study, where female heads reported higher expectations in a male-dominated field, as well as in the personal domain.

Expanding the respondent base to include the responses of those close to school heads, namely spouses/partners, other family members, boards, and even colleagues and their perception of the school heads balance and related success would give additional data from a different yet related perspective on the topic of heads' struggles with balance.

Finally, while some of the determinants of professional and personal satisfaction were identified, there were a number of borderline significant variables that bear further research. Further studies using a mixed methodology are suggested. By mining more subtle nuances in the various factors that influence balance as well as identifying additional potential determinants, and how these determinants relate to personal and professional satisfaction, will add to the knowledge base.

Implications and Suggestions for Existing and Potential School Heads

There are important implications for both existing and potential school heads as well as school boards on the topic of balance of international school heads, which will be considered in this section.

First, this study has clearly demonstrated a positive relationship between both personal and professional satisfaction and success, on the one hand, and the perception of balance in one's life, on the other. While the perception of balance was a significant determinant of personal and overall satisfaction, not placing importance on feeling balanced right now was not a significant determinant of personal and overall satisfaction, but it also was a borderline, i.e. very close to being considered a significant determinant of professional satisfaction. The two determinants may seem contradictory, however this may underscore the interrelationship of a school heads personal and professional domains. Existing and potential school heads may consider this a call to make balance a priority in their life, or at least a means to an end, if satisfaction and success are goals. Assuming that professional success of a school head is also positive for the school s/he is leading, school boards will want to support heads' striving for balance.

Employing household help is another important variable that has a significant influence on personal as well as overall satisfaction of school heads. A decision to employ household help is largely within the control of the school head, and thus a strategy that can be fairly easily implemented. Perhaps a school board can assist by offering household help as a component of the school heads' compensation package.

Creating time/space for reading, another significant correlate for personal satisfaction, is completely under the control of the school head. However, family support, which is also a significant determinant of both personal and overall satisfaction, while undoubtedly influenced by the school head, is beyond her/his control. The implications of not having familial support, however, are reduced satisfaction and success, so that finding strategies to secure this source of support is critical. Professional associations may want to take a more active role in helping boards identify those strategies and support mechanisms, that individually help them find balance as well as act as advocates for school heads, not only in the professional domain, but also the personal domain.

Those thinking of becoming a school head may want to prioritize balance as a goal in their lives. Creating habits to enhance the feeling of balance, such as taking a walk, or pursuing sports or other recreational activities, is not only physically healthy, but also mentally rejuvenating. School boards can assist by supporting school heads efforts to create time/space for outside activities. This may include less permeable borders between roles. Professional associations can offer opportunities for heads to access not only professional development but also such outside activities. There will be important

benefits to the school and ultimately the students, when the head can model a healthy balance between the professional and personal aspects of life,

Conclusion

The challenges of a school head are numerous. Trying to find and/or maintain balance between the different facets of one's own life in the midst of the heavy responsibilities of school leadership, which can include demands from a much wider community, can be difficult. Yet this study suggests that it would be wise for school heads to tackle the difficult task since the study suggests that work/life balance is related to both personal and professional satisfaction and success.

Three significant variables related to achieving balance were identified in this study. The first two variables identified by this study, creating time/space to read a book and employing help to get household chores done, are under the control of the school head. The third variable was support from family. While this may seem somewhat beyond the control of the head, through technology, families that are across town or across the globe can remain in close contact and give a school head the feeling s/he is supported in their work.

The boundaries between the different roles of a school head's life, whether defined purposefully or intuitively, are fluid. The areas of intersection provide opportunities to facilitate finding that "overall sense of harmony in life" (Clarke, Koch, & Hill, 2004). With over 85% of school heads identifying balance as an important goal, but less than half feeling they have achieved balance, and the clear link between the perception of balance and personal and professional satisfaction and success, there must be efforts made to assist heads in finding or possibly recognizing balance in their lives.

This study investigated some of the factors that effect the perception of balance of K-12 school heads, both internationally and in the U.S., a group that previously had not been studied. This research has provided correlations between school heads' perception of balance and personal and professional feelings of success. While professional periodicals describe anecdotally the difficulty in achieving work/life balance for educational leaders, as well as strategies used by some, this research adds empirical evidence to the literature, which has been absent.

References

- Blalock, H. M., & Blalock, A. B. (1971). *Methodology in social research*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Bond, T., Thompson, C.T., Galinsky, E., & Prottas, D. (2002). *The 2002 national study of the changing workforce: Executive summary*. New York, NY: Families and Work Institute. Retrieved from <http://familiesandwork.org/site/research/summary/nscw2002summ.pdf>
- Bowes, J. M. (2005). Emphasizing the family in work-family research: A review of current research and recommendations for future directions. In S. A. Y. Poelmans (Ed.), *Work and family: An international research perspective* (pp. 415-438). Mahwah, NJ, U.S.: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishers.
- Bradburn, N., Sudman, S., & Wansik, B. (2004). *Asking questions: the definitive guide to questionnaire design – for market research, political polls, and social and health questionnaires*. (Rev. ed.) San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Brayfield, A. H., & Wells, R. V. (1957). Interrelationships among measures of job satisfaction and general satisfaction. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 41(4), 201-205. doi: 10.1037/h0048095
- Bureau of National Affairs, I. (1989). *The 1990s Father: Balancing Work & Family Concerns*. BNA Special Report Series on Work & Family. Special Report # 18. Retrieved from ERIC database. (Accession No. ED313564)
- Campbell Clark, S. (2000). Work/family border theory: A new theory of work/family balance. *Human Relations*, 53(6), 747-770. doi: 10.1177/0018726700536001

Chen, P. (2004). Maintaining a healthy work-life balance. ZweigWhite. Retrieved from <http://www.zweigwhite.com/articles/archive-topic.asp?topic=LE>.

Clarke, M. C., Koch, L. C., & Hill, J. E. (2004). The work-family interface: Differentiating balance and fit. *Family & Consumer Sciences Research Journal*, 33(2), 121-140. doi: 10.1177/1077727X04269610

Cornell University, School of Industrial and Labor Relations Research [ILR], 2002. Retrieved from <http://www.ilr.cornell.edu/library/research/QuestionOfTheMonth/archive/balancingWorkandPersonalLife.html>

Davidson, M. J., & Cooper, C. L. (1984). Occupational stress in female managers: A comparative study. *Journal of Management Studies*, 21(2), 185-205. doi: 10.1111/j.1467-6486.1984.tb00231.x

Desrochers, S. & Sargent, L. (2003). Boundary/border theory and work-family integration. In *The Sloan Work Family Encyclopedia*. Retrieved from http://wfnetwork.bc.edu/encyclopedia_entry.php?id=220&area=All.

Drago, R., & Kashian, R. (2003). Mapping the terrain of work/family journals. *Journal of Family Issues*, 24(4) 488-512. doi: 10.1177/0192513X02250741

Ezra, M., & Deckman, M. (1996). Balancing work and family responsibilities: flextime and child care in the federal government. *Public Administration Review*, 56(2), 174-179. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/977205>

Friend, J. G., & Haggard, E. A. (1948). Work adjustment in relation to family background. *International Review of Applied Psychology*, 16 150 p. Retrieved from PsychINFO database. (Accession No. 1949-00977-001)

- Frone, M. R. (2003). Work-family balance. In J. C. Quick & L. E. Tetrick (Eds.), *Handbook of occupational health psychology* (pp. 143-162). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Frone, M. R., Russell, M., & Cooper, M. (1993). Relationship of work-family conflict, gender and alcohol expectancies to alcohol use/abuse. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 14(6), 545-558. doi: 10.1002/job.4030140604
- Gallegos, K. (1999). One principal's secret to happiness: A balanced life. *Thrust for Educational Leadership*, 28(5), 35. Retrieved from Academic Search Premier database. (Accession No. 2134859)
- Gelfland, M. J., & Knight, A. P. (2005). Cross-cultural perspectives on work-family conflict. In S. A. Y. Poelmans (Ed.), *Work and family: An international research perspective* (pp. 401-414). Mahwah, NJ, U.S.: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishers.
- Gershuny, J. (2008). Veblen in Reverse: Evidence from the Multinational Time-Use Archive, *Social Indicators Research*, 93(1), 37-45 doi: 10.1007/s11205-008-9369-6
- Greenhaus, J. H., & Beutel, N. (1985). Sources of conflict between work and family roles. *Academy of Management Review*, 10(1), 76-78. doi: 10.2307/258214
- Greenhaus, J. H., Collins, K. M., Shaw, J. (2003). The relation between work-family balance and quality of life. *Journal of Vocational Behavior* 63(3),510-531. doi: 10.1016/S0001-879(02)00042-8

- Greenhaus, J. H., Parasuraman, S., & Wormley, W. M. (1990). Effects of race on organizational experiences, job performance evaluations, and career outcomes. *Academy of Management Journal*, 33(1), 64-86. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/256352>
- Gruner, S. (1997). Get a life! *Inc. Magazine* Retrieved from <http://www.inc.com/magazine/19971001.1342.html>
- Guest, D. E. (2002). Perspectives on the study of work-life balance. *Social Science Information*, 41(2), 255-279. doi: 10.1177/0539018402041002005
- Halpern, D. F. & Murphy, S. E. (Eds.). (2005). *From work-family balance to work-family interaction: Changing the metaphor*. Mahwah, NJ, U.S.: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishers.
- Harvard Business Review on Work and Life Balance (2000). Boston: Harvard Business School Press.
- Hawley, D. (1994). How long do international school heads survive? Part 1. *International Schools Journal*, 14(1), 8-21.
- Hawley, D. (1994). How long do international school heads survive? A research analysis (part 2). *International Schools Journal*, 14(2), 23-36.
- Herzberg, F., Mausnes, B., Peterson, R. O., & Capwell, D. F. (1957). *Job attitudes: Review of research and opinion*. Oxford England: Psychological Service of Pittsburgh. Retrieved from PsychINFO database. (Accession No. 1958-02165-000)

- Hill, E. J., Hawkins, A. J., Ferris, M., & Weitzman, M. (2001). Finding an extra day a week: The positive influence of perceived job flexibility on work and family balance. *Family Relations: Interdisciplinary Journal of Applied Family Studies*, 50(1), 49-58. doi: 10.1111/j.1741-3729.2001.00049.x
- Hobson, C. J., Delunas, L., Kesic, D. (2001). Compelling evidence of the need for corporate work/life balance initiatives: results from a national survey of stressful life-events. *Journal of Employment Counseling*, 38(1), 38-44.
- Iris, B. & Barrett, G. V. (1972). Some relations between job and life satisfaction and job importance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 56(4), 301-304. doi: 10.1037/h0033095
- Kavanagh, M. J., & Halpern, M. (1977). The impact of job level and sex differences on the relationship between life and job satisfaction. *Academy of Management Journal*, 20(1), 66-73. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/255462>
- Keene, J. R. & Quadagno, J. (2004). Predictors of perceived work-family balance: Gender difference or gender similarity? *Sociological Perspectives*, 47(1), 1-23. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/1389601>
- Kimmel, M. S. (1993). What do men want? *Harvard Business Review*, 71(6), 50-59. Retrieved from the Business Source Premier database. (Accession No. 9402241876)

- Kleeman, R. S. (1992). The changing workforce, demographic issues facing employers. Testimony before the subcommittee on census and population, committee on post office and civil service, U.S. House of Representatives. *General Accounting Office*, Washington, D.C. Retrieved from <http://www.eric.ed.gov> (ERIC# ED349413)
- Kopelman, R. E., Greenhaus, J. H., & Connolly, T.F. (1983). A model of work, family, and interrole conflict: A construct validation study. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, 32(2), 198-215. Retrieved from Academic Search Premier database. (Accession No. 6336854)
- Littleford, J. (1999). Leadership of schools and the longevity of school heads. *International Schools Journal*, 19(1), 23-34
- Lodahl, T. M., & Kejner, M. (1965). Definition and measurement of job involvement. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 49(1), 24-33. doi: 10.1037/h0021692
- Louis, L. (2006). Life as a mother-scientist. *Chronicle of Higher Education*, 53(15), C1-C4. Retrieved from Academic Premier database. (Accession No. 23349213)
- Lyness, K.S., & Kropf, M. B. (2005). The relationships of national gender equality and organizational support with work-family balance: A study of European managers. *Human Relations* 58(1), 33-60. doi: 10.1177/0018726705050934
- Mangels, S. E. (2008). *Does balance matter? The relationship between work-life balance and success for woman college presidents*. (Doctoral dissertation). Available from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (Publication No. AAT 3316751)
- Marks, S. R., & MacDermid, S. M. (1996). Multiple roles and the self: A theory of role balance. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 58(2), 417-432. doi: 10.2307/353506

- Milne, J. (2007, June 22). Heads need training in work-life balance. *The Times Educational Supplement*, 4742, 28.
- Milne, J. (2007, September 21). Heads tune in to a better work-life balance. *The Times Educational Supplement*, 4755, 18-19.
- New York State Association of Independent Schools, (2003). *Averages and Transitions* (Bulletin #282, October 2003). Retrieved from <http://www.nysais.org>.
- Parasuraman, S., Greenhaus, J. H., & Granrose, C. S. (1992). Role stressors, social support, and well-being among two career couples. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 13(4), 339-356. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2488063>
- Patton, M. Q. (2002). *Qualitative research & evaluation methods* (3rd e.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Poelmans, S., O'Driscoll, M. & Beham, B. (2005). An overview of international research on the work-family interface. In S. A. Y. Poelmans (Ed.), *Work and family: An international research perspective* (pp. 3-46). Mahwah, NJ, U.S.: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishers.
- Rice, R. W., Frone, M. R., & McFarlin, D. B. (1992). Work-non-work conflict and the perceived quality of life. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 13(2), 155-168.
doi: 10.1002/job.4030130205
- Rodgers, F., & Rodgers, C. (1989). Business and facts of family life. *Harvard Business Review*, 67(6), 121-129. Retrieved from the Business Source Premier database.
(Accession No. 9001080594)
- Salant, P., & Dillman, D. A. (1994). *How to conduct your own survey*. New York, NY: Wiley.

- Saltzstein, A L., Ting, Y., & Saltzstein G. H. (2001). Work-family balance and job satisfaction: the impact of family-friendly policies on attitudes of federal government employees. *Public Administration Review*, 61(4), 452-467. Retrieved from the Business Source Premier database. (Accession No. 5191104)
- Schreiber, P. J. (1998). Women's career development patterns. *New Directions for Adult and Continuing Education*, (80), 5-13. Retrieved from Academic Search Premier database. (Accession No. 9178698)
- Selltiz, C., Jahoda, M., Deutsch, M., & Cook, S. W. (1965). *Research methods in social relations*. Texas: Holt, Rinehart & Winston
- Shaffer, M. A., Harrison, D. A., Gilley, K. M., & Luk, D. M. (2001). Struggling for balance amid turbulence on international assignments: work-family conflict, support and commitment. *Journal of Management* 27(1), 99-121. Retrieved from Business Source Premiere database. (Accession No. 4228180)
- Singer, T. (2000). The power of Balance. *Inc. Magazine* Retrieved from <http://www.inc.com/magazine/20001015.20754.html>
- Sotile, W. & Sotile, M. (2000). *The medical marriage: sustaining healthy relationships for physicians and their families*. Chicago: American Medical Association.
- Sotile, W. & Sotile, M. (2001). *The Resilient Physician: Effective Emotional Management for Doctors and Their Medical Organizations*. Chicago: American Medical Association.
- Spain, D., & Bianchi, S. M. (1996). *Balancing act: motherhood, marriage, and employment among American women*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

- Staples, J., & Neal, C. (2000). The forgotten partner: the superintendent's husband. *School Administrator*, 57(3), 56-57.
- Stevens P. & Centre for Worklife Counselling, (1990). *Strategies for dual-career couples. [Second Edition]*.
- Thomas, L. T., & Ganster, D. C. (1995). Impact of family-supportive work variables on work-family conflict and strain: a control perspective. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 80(1), 6-15. doi: 10.1037/0021-9010.80.1.6
- Tomlinson, J. (2006). Women's work-life balance trajectories in the UK: reformulating choice and constraint in transitions through part-time work across the life-course. *British Journal of Guidance & Counselling*, 34(3), 365-382. doi: 10.1080/03069880600769555
- Voydanoff, P. (2005). Toward a conceptualization of perceived work-family fit and balance: a demands and resources approach. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 67(4), 822-836. doi: 10.1111/j.1741-3737.2005.00178.x
- Zigler, T. (2007). No such thing as balance. *Principal Leadership*, 7, 30-32.

Appendix A

Interview Guide

(From Qualitative Study that informed current study)

Note: I used a conversational approach and, consequently, the questions listed below were merely samples of the sort of questions anticipated to arise during the interviews.

- Tell me a bit about your professional path to headship and how long you have served in this capacity.
- Tell me about how you find balance in your professional and personal life.
- Are there certain factors that contribute or detract from this balance more than others?
- How would you describe a healthy balance?
- What has helped you to balance your professional and personal life that you would recommend to other school heads?

Appendix B

Email Survey Invitation

Dear Colleagues:

As a school head consistently striving for work/life balance and seeing the recent increase in interest in the topic, even reaching the U.S. First Lady's priority list, I have decided to focus my doctoral dissertation from the University of San Diego School of Education on this topic. In short, I am conducting a research study designed to explore the factors that impact a school head's work/life balance.

Access to a number of professional list-serves facilitates the collection of information in a quick and user-friendly format, and it would be deeply appreciated if you could spend about ten minutes completing the survey. By participating in this survey, you will not only be helping me to collect data for this study, but also contributing to the knowledge base on work/life balance issues of school heads. Also, I would hope that you will find reflecting upon this topic both interesting and beneficial, perhaps resulting in a reevaluation of your own strategies/priorities.

Participation in the study is completely voluntary and you may stop the survey at any time; however, data from partially completed surveys will not be used. The data collected, which will not allow the identification of any individual or institution, will be made available to any participant who wishes to receive the results.

The survey consists of 30 questions in the areas of role balance, personal satisfaction, support, balance strategies, and select demographics. The first question is the most detailed and will take the longest to answer, while the rest are quite quick to respond to.

Simply follow the link below, or cut and paste the link into your Internet browser, and you will be taken directly to the survey instrument: <http://www.zoomerang.com/survey>

Thank you for your willingness to help in this project.

With kind regards,

Chrissie P. Sorenson
Director
Dresden International School
Annenstraße 9
01067 Dresden, Germany
T: +49 351 44007-10
F: +49 351 44007-23
csorenson@dresden-is.de
www.dresden-is.de

Appendix C

Survey

Role Balance

1) Please estimate how many hours in a typical week you:

work (ex: 8 hours a day for five days is 40 hours)

sleep (ex: 6 hours a night times 7 days is 42 hours)

spend with family (playing, shopping, eating dinner, etc.)

spend with partner (alone time, meeting with friends, etc.)

spend on academic pursuits (studying, professional writing, etc.)

spend on personal recreation (arts, music, athletics, hobbies,

lunch with friends etc.)

spend on spiritual growth (church, meditation, personal reflection, etc.)

2) Please describe any other activities that take up significant time in your week on a regular basis and estimate the number of hours spent engaging in these activities in a typical week.

3) In a week, there are 24 hours a day times 7 days for a total of 168 hours. Did you come close to that total?

☐ Yes

☐ No

4) Did you feel that things were pretty much in balance before I asked you to count up numbers?

☐ Yes

☐ No

5) If yes, do you still feel that way?

☐ Yes

☐ No

6) Do you feel that achieving a balance in your life is important right now?

☐ Yes

☐ No

7) Why or why not?

please continue to next page

Professional Satisfaction

8) I am satisfied with the success I have achieved in my career.

- ☐ Strongly agree
- ☐ Agree to some extent
- ☐ Uncertain
- ☐ Disagree to some extent
- ☐ Strongly disagree

9) I am satisfied with the progress I have made toward meeting my expectations for income.

- ☐ Strongly agree
- ☐ Agree to some extent
- ☐ Uncertain
- ☐ Disagree to some extent
- ☐ Strongly disagree

10) I am satisfied with the progress I have made toward meeting my expectations for advancement.

- ☐ Strongly agree
- ☐ Agree to some extent
- ☐ Uncertain
- ☐ Disagree to some extent
- ☐ Strongly disagree

11) I am satisfied with the progress I have made toward meeting my expectations for the development of new skills.

- ☐ Strongly agree
- ☐ Agree to some extent
- ☐ Uncertain
- ☐ Disagree to some extent
- ☐ Strongly disagree

12) The most important things that happen to me involve my work.

- ☐ Strongly agree
- ☐ Agree to some extent
- ☐ Uncertain
- ☐ Disagree to some extent
- ☐ Strongly disagree

please continue to next page

Personal Satisfaction

13) I am satisfied with the relationships I have with family.

- ☐ Strongly agree
- ☐ Agree to some extent
- ☐ Uncertain
- ☐ Disagree to some extent
- ☐ Strongly disagree

14) I am satisfied with my level of spirituality.

- ☐ Strongly agree
- ☐ Agree to some extent
- ☐ Uncertain
- ☐ Disagree to some extent
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ N/A

15) I am satisfied with the time I have to relax.

- ☐ Strongly agree
- ☐ Agree to some extent
- ☐ Uncertain
- ☐ Disagree to some extent
- ☐ Strongly disagree

16) I am satisfied with the connections I have with the community outside of school.

- ☐ Strongly agree
- ☐ Agree to some extent
- ☐ Uncertain
- ☐ Disagree to some extent
- ☐ Strongly disagree

Support

17) I feel supported by my (check all that apply):

- ☐ partner/spouse
- ☐ family
- ☐ friends
- ☐ colleagues
- ☐ church
- ☐ other _____

please continue to next page

Balance Strategies

18) How often in a typical week do you create time/space for yourself to:

	Never	1-3 times	4-6 times	7-9 times	>9 times
spend time with spouse/partner	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
spend time with family	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
meet with friends	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
read a book	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
go for a walk	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
pursue sports/recreation	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
other _____	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

19) How often in a typical week do you participate in activities not related to your school or school community?

- ☐ Never
☐ 1-3 times
☐ 4-6 times
☐ 7-9 times
☐ >9 times

20) Do you employ household help?

- ☐ Yes
☐ No

Demographics

21) What is your gender?

- ☐ Male
☐ Female

22) What is your age?

☐ 20 – 24	☐ 40 – 44	☐ 60 – 64	☐ 80 and over
☐ 25 – 29	☐ 45 – 49	☐ 65 – 69	
☐ 30 – 34	☐ 50 – 54	☐ 70 – 74	
☐ 35 – 39	☐ 55 – 59	☐ 75 – 79	

please continue to next page

23) Where are you currently head of school?

- ☐ Internationally (outside your passport country)
- ☐ In your passport country
- ☐ In the United States

24) How long have you been in your current position?

_____ ☐ months or ☐ years (check one)

25) Is this your first headship?

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No

26) Are you currently in a relationship (partner/spouse)?

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No

27) If yes, how long have you been in your current relationship?

_____ ☐ months or ☐ years (check one)

28) Do you currently have a partner or family members living with you?

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No

29) Do you currently have a partner or family members employed at your school?

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No

30) Did you at one time or do you currently have children attending your school?

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No

Thank You For Your Help!

Appendix D

Specification of Variables

<u>Independent Variables</u>	<u>Description and Coding</u>
Demographic variables:	
1. GENDER	Gender was coded as a dichotomous variable. (Numeric – Nominal). “Male” is the reference category. 0 if male; 1 if female
2. AGE	Number of years (Numeric – Interval Scale)
3. LOCNONUS	Location was coded as a dichotomous variable. (Numeric – Nominal). “Internationally” is the reference category. 0 if Internationally; 1 if United States
4. CURRENTPOS	Number of years in current position (Numeric – Scale)
5. CURRENTPOS2	Number of years in current position (Numeric – Interval Scale)
6. 1STHEAD	First headship was coded as a dichotomous variable. (Numeric – Nominal). “Yes” is the reference category. (Yes, the respondent is a first-time head) 0 if yes; 1 if no
7. RELSTATUS	Relationship status was coded as a dichotomous variable. (Numeric – Nominal). “Yes” is the reference category. (Yes, the respondent is currently in a relationship) 0 if yes; 1 if no
8. RELLENGTH	Number of years (Numeric – Scale)
9. RELLENGTH2	Number of years (Numeric – Interval Scale)
9. RELHOUSE	Partner/family members living with respondent was coded as a dichotomous variable. (Numeric – Nominal). “Yes” is the reference category. 0 if yes; 1 if no
10. RELEMPLOY	Partner/family members employed at school was coded as a dichotomous variable. (Numeric – Nominal). “Yes” is the reference category. 0 if yes; 1 if no
11. CHILDDATTEND	Child attending or having attended school was coded as a dichotomous variable. (Numeric – Nominal). “Yes” is the reference category. 0 if yes; 1 if no

Role balance variables:

12. WORK	Hours spent at work in a week (Numeric – Scale)
13. SLEEP	Hours spent sleeping in a week (Numeric – Scale)
14. FAMILY	Hours spent with family in a week (Numeric – Scale)
15. PARTNER	Hours spent with partner in a week (Numeric – Scale)
16. ACAD	Hours spent on academic pursuits in a week (Numeric – Scale)
17. RECREATION	Hours spent on personal recreation in a week (Numeric – Scale)
18. SPIRITUAL	Hours spent on spiritual growth in a week (Numeric – Scale)
19. OTHER	Hours spent on other activities in a week (Numeric – Scale)
20. TOTAL	Total hours in a week accounted for was coded as a dichotomous variable. (Numeric – Nominal). “Yes” is the reference category. 0 if yes; 1 if no
21. PRIORBAL	Prior feeling of balance was coded as a dichotomous variable. (Numeric – Nominal). “Yes” is the reference category. 0 if yes; 1 if no
22. STILLBAL	Still feeling balance was coded as a dichotomous variable. (Numeric – Nominal). “Yes” is the reference category. 0 if yes; 1 if no
23. BALIMPORT	Balance is important right now was coded as a dichotomous variable. (Numeric – Nominal). “Yes” is the reference category. 0 if yes; 1 if no

Support variable:

24. SUPPORT	Each of the six responses to whom the respondent feels supported by was coded as a separate dichotomous variable (Numeric – Nominal). No check is the reference category. 0 if not checked, 1 if checked.

Balance strategies variables:

25. **TIMESPACE** Each of the seven areas respondent created time/space for was coded as a separate dichotomous variable (Numeric – Ordinal). “Never” is the reference category. Since there are five time span choices, four dichotomous variables were created; one for “1-3 times,” one for “4-6 times,” one for “7-9 times,” and one for “>9 times”
26. **ACTOUTSCHOOL** How often respondents participate in activities not related to school or school community was coded as a dichotomous variable (Numeric – Ordinal). “Never” is the reference category. Since there are five time span choices, four dichotomous variables were created; one for “1-3 times,” one for “4-6 times,” one for “7-9 times,” and one for “>9 times”
27. **HOUSEHELP** Employing household help was coded as a dichotomous variable. (Numeric – Nominal). “Yes” is the reference category. 0 if yes; 1 if no

Dependent Variables**Professional satisfaction variables:**

1. **PROFSAT** Answers to questions 8-12 pertaining to professional satisfaction were coded as follows: 4 if “strongly agree,” 3 if “agree to some extent,” 2 if “uncertain,” 1 if “disagree to some extent,” and 0 if “strongly disagree” (Numeric – Ordinal)

Personal satisfaction variables:

2. **PERSAT** Answers to questions 13-16 pertaining to personal satisfaction we coded as follows: 4 if “strongly agree,” 3 if “agree to some extent,” 2 if “uncertain,” 1 if “disagree to some extent,” and 0 if “strongly disagree” (Numeric – Ordinal)

Summed satisfaction variables:

3. **PROFSATALL** Since I used a scale of 4, 3, 2, 1, 0 noted above, the possible range of scores for the sum of professional satisfaction areas per participant is from 0 to 20, i.e. five scores of ‘0’ to five scores of ‘4’. By multiplying each score by 5, I was able to measure the effects of the independent variables as a percentage change (on a 0 to 100 scale).

4. PERSATALL Since I used a scale of 4, 3, 2, 1, 0 noted above, the possible range of scores for the sum of personal satisfaction areas per participant is from 0 to 16, i.e. four scores of '0' to four scores of '4'. By multiplying each score by 6.25, I was able to measure the effects of the independent variables as a percentage change (on a 0 to 100 scale).
5. PROFPERSALL To extend the above methodology to all professional and personal satisfaction areas, which ranged from 0 – 36, I multiplied the scores by 2.77 to achieve a 0 to 100 scale.