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ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to examine the relationship between perceived level of synergistic supervision received, job satisfaction, and intention to turnover of new professionals in the profession of student affairs administration. This investigation examined the relationships between new professionals’ scores on the Synergistic Supervision Scale (SSS), and measures of job satisfaction and intention to turnover, taken from the Michigan Organizational Assessment Questionnaire (MAOQ) and selected demographic variables. Four hundred and thirty-five respondents, members of the American College Personnel Association participated in the study.

A positive significant correlation was found between perceived level of synergistic supervision received and job satisfaction. A negative significant correlation was found between perceived level of synergistic supervision received and intention to turnover. Significant correlations were found for both gender and race among supervisor/supervisee dyad pairs for perceived level of synergistic supervision received, job satisfaction and intention to turnover, as well as other identified exploratory variables.

The findings of this study will advance the body of knowledge in the area of staff supervision, job satisfaction and retention in student affairs administration, particularly for new professionals. This study provides a greater understanding of the supervisory needs of new professionals and how supervisory style can enhance job satisfaction and retention of new professionals in the profession of student affairs administration.
CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

“No relationship holds greater natural potential to influence self-image, career satisfaction, and professional development than the relationship with a supervisor,” (Harned & Murphy, 1998, p. 43).

The five chapters that follow comprise a dissertation study designed to add to the understanding of the relationship between perceptions of synergistic supervision received, job satisfaction, and intention to turnover for new professionals in student affairs administration. This dissertation contains an introduction to the purpose and significance of this study in Chapter One. The culture of higher education organizations, characteristics of student affairs administration, new professionals in the field, job satisfaction, intention to turnover and synergistic supervision will be discussed in Chapter Two. A methodology for this study will be presented in Chapter Three. The results of this study will be presented in Chapter Four and discussion and conclusions; implications and recommendations will be presented in Chapter Five.

Background

New professionals leave the field of student affairs administration every year. One common reason for this attrition is job dissatisfaction. Job dissatisfaction can result from role ambiguity, role conflict, role orientation, role stress, job burnout, work overload and perceived opportunities for goal attainment, professional development and career advancement (Berwick, 1992; Conley, 2001). Brown (1987) suggested that we should be concerned about high attrition. He further stated that high attrition indicated low morale and this, “demands constant training of new professionals,” (p. 14).

The culture of an organization, particularly in higher education, has the potential to influence the new professional’s retention in the job setting. New professionals encounter a host of issues with entry into the profession (Ellis, 2002; Hamrick & Hemphill, 2002; Marsh 2001). New professionals in student affairs administration are in need of orientation and socialization to their field of work, their institutions and work in higher education (Amey, 1990, 2002; Katz & Tushman, 1983). An effective model of supervision is one way the profession and employing institutions can reduce the attrition of new professionals while providing the necessary orientation and socialization to student affairs and work in higher education. Ward (1995) stated:

We know what role ambiguity and conflict are and we know where they come from. We also know how to reduce both – talk with staff about roles, clarify expectations, reduce
the number of masters to whom any one person has to answer, increase decision-making autonomy, increase self-directedness, and improve organizational communication (p. 41).

Supervisors who work closely with new professionals are best able to address the issues mentioned by Ward, as staff supervision is a critical element to the success of any organization, particularly in higher education. Supervision is one of the most complex activities for which organizational leaders are responsible, and certain skills and knowledge about staff development are required for effective supervision. Winston & Creamer (1997) defined supervision in higher education as:

Supervision in higher education is a management function intended to promote the achievement of institutional goals and enhance the personal and professional capabilities of staff. Supervision interprets the institutional mission and focuses human and fiscal resources on the promotion of individual and organizational competence (p. 42).

Synergistic staff supervision is a model of supervision focused on a holistic approach to supervision that would serve new professionals well. Winston and Creamer (1997), when describing synergistic supervision, concluded that it is related to “a) discussion of exemplary performance, b) discussion of long-term career goals, c) discussion of inadequate performance, d) frequency of informal performance appraisals and e) discussion of personal attitudes” (pp. 42-43). The synergistic model allows supervisors the ability to clarify expectations through discussion of performance and informal appraisals (Winston & Creamer, 1998). The model also results in better organizational communication between the supervisor and professional. Therefore, those new professionals in student affairs administration engaged in a synergistic supervisory relationship may have greater job satisfaction and perceived opportunities for professional development and advancement. This could lead to less attrition of new professionals in the field of student affairs administration, thus insuring the presence of well-prepared administrators equipped to lead the profession in the future.

Purpose of Study

The purpose of this study was to examine the relationship between perceived level of synergistic supervisory relationships, job satisfaction, and intention to turnover of new professionals in the field of student affairs administration. This investigation examined the relationships between new professional’s scores on the Synergistic Supervision Scale (SSS) with measures of job satisfaction, intention to turnover and selected demographic variables. Four hundred and thirty-five members (43.8% response rate) of the American College Personnel Association (ACPA) who had worked in the field of student affairs administration for five years or less were surveyed. Their scores on the Synergistic Supervision Scale were correlated with measures of job satisfaction and intention to turnover taken from The Michigan Organizational Assessment Questionnaire to determine their relationship. Correlations were examined for the following variables: supervisor and supervisee position level, length of supervisor/supervisee relationship, supervisor/supervisee gender, supervisor/supervisee racial or ethnic background and size and type of institution where they are employed. The following diagram is used to illustrate the conceptual framework that guided this study (see Figure 1).
The educational significance of this study was to advance the body of knowledge in the area of staff supervision and retention in student affairs administration, particularly for new professionals. Professionals, particularly new professionals, in student affairs administration have received little attention in the existing body of student affairs research (Rosser & Javinar, 2003). Lovell and Kosten (2000) found in their meta-analysis of 30 years of research in the field that only 9% of the research had a focus on new professionals. Human facilitation, inclusive of staff supervision, was found to be critical to the success of student affairs administrators. This notion was evident in 78% of the research articles included in Lovell and Kosten’s meta-analysis. By investigating the relationship between perceived level of synergistic supervision, job satisfaction, and intention to turnover with the previously mentioned variables, student affairs administrators may be able to identify “best practices” that enhance the performance and retention of new professionals.

Staff supervision is one area that most student affairs administrators spend great amounts of time. Supervision in student affairs often occurs with minimal training in the area of supervision (Dalton, 1996). Cooper, Saunders, Howell, and Bates (2001) found, when surveying the literature on supervision in student affairs, that much of the literature on supervision does not address satisfaction, performance and retention outcomes. Their research indicated that research in the area of supervision should progress further. This study should provide a greater
understanding of the supervisory needs of new professionals and should also help us better understand how supervisory style can enhance retention of new professionals in the profession. The Synergistic Supervision Scale was chosen for its ability to measure supervisory characteristics and its design and use specifically with those working in student affairs administration.

Research Questions

After a review of current higher education, student affairs and management literature on supervision, job satisfaction, and intention to turnover the following research questions were designed to meet the purpose of the study and direct the study and methods of data analysis.

1. Is there a relationship between perceived level of synergistic supervision received and job satisfaction of new professionals in student affairs administration?
2. Is there a relationship between perceived level of synergistic supervision received and intention to turnover of new professionals in student affairs administration?
3. Is there a relationship between perceived level of synergistic supervision received and job satisfaction of new professionals in student affairs administration based on gender of supervisor and supervisee?
4. Is there a relationship between perceived level of synergistic supervision received and job satisfaction of new professionals in student affairs administration based on race of supervisor and supervisee?
5. Is there a relationship between perceived level of synergistic supervision received and intention to turnover of new professionals in student affairs administration based on gender of supervisor and supervisee?
6. Is there a relationship between perceived level of synergistic supervision received and intention to turnover of new professionals in student affairs administration based on and race of supervisor and supervisee?
7. Is there a relationship between perceived level of synergistic supervision received, job satisfaction, and intention to turnover of new professionals in student affairs administration based on size of employing institution and type of employing institution?
8. Is there a relationship between perceived level of synergistic supervision received, job satisfaction, and intention to turnover of new professionals in student affairs administration based on supervisor position level, supervisee position level and length of supervisor/supervisee relationship?

Definition of Terms

New Professionals. New professionals were defined as those who have worked in the profession of student affairs administration for five years or less.

Synergistic Supervision. Synergetic supervision has been defined as the “a) discussion of exemplary performance, b) discussion of long-term career goals, c) discussion of inadequate performance, d) frequency of informal performance appraisals and e) discussion of personal

**Institutional Type.** New professionals in student affairs administration work at a variety of types of institutions. For the purposes of this study, the following institutional types were utilized: four-year public colleges and universities; four-year private secular colleges and universities; four-year private faith oriented colleges and universities; community and junior colleges; and technical colleges.

**Student Affairs Administration.** Also called student personnel work or services and student services, “constitutes all activities undertaken or sponsored by the educational institution, aside from curricular instruction, in which the student’s personal development is the primary concern,” (Cowley, 1983, p. 65).

**Limitations**

The membership of ACPA does not fully represent the members of the student affairs administration profession. Further, those who are members of the American College Personnel Association (ACPA) and have worked for five years or less do not fully represent all new professionals who have worked in student affairs administration for five years or less.

Those who become members of ACPA or any other national, regional or statewide professional association may join because of the influence of a persuasive “synergistic” supervisor. The supervisor may have encouraged their membership as a means of professional development and advancement.

New professionals may participate more actively at the regional and statewide level rather than the national level and may not be included in the national ACPA Membership Directory. This could be due to fewer resources for professional development provided by institutions, or limited personal resources of new professionals, and stronger identification with local, or functional area groups with more opportunities for professional development and involvement.

**Delimitation**

A delimitation of this study was that subjects were not evenly divided among institutional types, sizes and functional areas of employment. Subjects represent a variety of types and sizes of institutions and functional areas of employment. Generalizability may be affected by this notion.

**Summary**

The use of an effective model of supervision in student affairs administration is one way that the profession can reduce the attrition rate of new professionals. A common reason for attrition among new professionals is job dissatisfaction. These issues will be addressed in more
detail in Chapter Two. The culture of an organization can affect the experiences of new professionals entering work in student affairs administration and can facilitate or hinder the socialization process. Synergistic supervision is a model of supervision that was utilized in this study to examine organizational entry, socialization, satisfaction and performance goals of new professionals in student affairs administration.

The purpose of this study was to examine the relationships between perceived level of synergistic supervision, job satisfaction, and intention to turnover among new professionals in student affairs administration. This was done by conducting a correlational study of the constructs of synergistic supervision, job satisfaction, and intention to turnover with several outlined variables. The Synergistic Supervision Scale along with three measures of job satisfaction and three measures of intention to turnover were used from The Michigan Organizational Assessment Questionnaire.
CHAPTER TWO

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

The culture of an organization is reflected in its shared knowledge, values and daily routines and rituals. Cultural characteristics are observed by new professionals as they learn the patterns of interactions and make meaning of the images and themes present in the organization. (Morgan, 1986). Schein (1985) stated that cultural embedding and reinforcement occur through primary measures that are used by organizational leaders. These measures are evident in the espoused values presented by organizational leaders, as well as through secondary mechanisms, such as physical space and informal myths and legends shared by members of the organization.

Birnbaum (1988) identified five types of institutional cultures in higher education. These included: collegial, bureaucratic, political, anarchical, and cybernetic. Kuh and Whitt (1988) identified three types of subcultures that exist in higher education. These included: enhancing, orthogonal, and counterculture. Kuh and Whitt stated that the characteristics of an institution are important to the culture of an organization. These characteristics include: internal and external influences; curriculum; the personnel core; social environment; architecture; ceremonies; and rites and rituals.

New professionals enter the work environment of student affairs administration through a variety of ways. Many enter after completing a graduate preparation program (Janosik & Creamer, 2003; Snyder & McDonald, 2002). New professionals encounter a host of challenges and issues when entering work in the profession (Ellis, 2002; Marsh, 2001; Hamrick & Hemphill, 2002). The participation in orientation and socialization processes prescribed by supervisors can reduce the challenges and issues faced by new professionals at the entry stage.

Both the orientation and socialization processes help the new professional in adjusting to the work and culture of student affairs organizations in higher education (Amey, 1990, 2002; Harned & Murphy, 1998). The success or failure of new professionals has been attributed to the social support that is received in the organization (Amey, 1990, 2002; Katz & Tushman, 1983; and Scher & Barr, 1979). The inability of supervisors to provide the necessary support and reassurance to new professionals through the orientation and socialization processes can hamper the development of new professionals (Harned & Murphy, 1998; Rosen, Taube & Wadsworth, 1980).

The orientation of new professionals has been described as more of a process than an event (Saunders & Cooper, 2003). The orientation process should provide new professionals with information about procedures, organizational culture and personal and professional expectations (Flion & Pepermans, 1998). Many supervisors have not given the orientation process the attention that it deserves (Winston, Torres, Carpenter, McIntire & Peterson, 2001).
Job satisfaction has been cited as a reason for attrition among new professionals in student affairs administration. Creamer and Winston (2002) stated that one of the principal factors for attrition is the quality of supervision received in the first one or two jobs. Job dissatisfaction can include: role conflict, role ambiguity, role orientation, role stress, job burnout, work overload and perceived opportunities for professional development, goal attainment and career advancement (Rosser & Javinar, 2003). Effective supervision of new professionals is one way that the profession can reduce the propensity of new professionals to leave.

Synergistic supervision is an approach to supervision that enhances the personal and professional development of new professionals. The synergistic approach involves establishing open lines of communication, building trusting relationships, supervisory feedback and appraisal, identification of professional aspirations of staff and identification of the knowledge and skills necessary for advancement (Winston & Creamer, 1998). These characteristics of the synergistic approach to supervision are well suited to meet the needs of new professionals in the entry stage to the student affairs profession. Through participation in synergistic supervisory relationships new professionals are able to avoid factors leading to job dissatisfaction. New professionals are able to gain important information about the organization, their roles, expectations, goals, norms, and opportunities for personal and professional development (Amey, 1990, 2002; Carpenter, Torres & Winston, 2001; Rosser & Javinar, 2003; Schneider, 2002).

The synergistic approach to supervision provides supervisors opportunities to engage their new professional staff members in orientation and socialization processes that should reduce job dissatisfaction and attrition among new professionals. Through this review of the literature, the following issues will be discussed: organizational culture and characteristics of student affairs work, characteristics of new professionals in student affairs administration, job satisfaction and synergistic staff supervision in student affairs administration. A summary will conclude this section.

Culture of Organizations

Organizations can have different personalities, while still sharing much in common. (Morgan, 1986). For new professionals, entering the organization, learning the culture of an organization can occur through observation and interaction among those already in the organization. New professionals can learn also through the images and themes apparent in the conversations of organizational members (Morgan). Cultural characteristics can be observed by new professionals as they become aware of the patterns of interactions and languages used by organizational members in their daily routines and rituals. (Morgan).

Organizations have been described as bureaucracies that are socially invented and are supposed to create a predictable and routine atmosphere, rather than an uncertain one (Kanter, 1993). Supervisors in bureaucratic organizations often rely on outward manifestations of those new to the organization in order to determine who is the right sort of person (person-organization fit), (Kanter). Three sources of uncertainty in even the most efficient bureaucracies have been discovered:
a lack of cause-effect understanding in the culture at large (limiting the possibility for advance planning); contingencies cause by the fact that the bureaucracy is not alone, so that outcomes of organizational action are in part determined by action of other elements in the environment; and the interdependence of parts, the human interconnections inside the organization itself, which can never fully be reduced to predictable action,” (Kanter, 1993, p. 48).

Many new professionals seek similarities and dissimilarities between their old and new tasks when entering an organization for the first time. They often fall back on their cultures of orientation in learning about the organization and completing work tasks. (Van Maanen, 1984). Van Maanen stated that when we change jobs, we carry those things that we have learned with us. We are required to make revisions to our old understandings, skills and values that we once held during the socialization process with the new organization.

Organizational Socialization

Organizations similar in appearance can socialize their “recruits” differently, as in the case of Van Maanen’s (1984) study of Harvard and MIT MBA students. Van Mannen found Harvard graduates to be better suited to fit more easily into organizations than their counterparts at MIT. MIT graduates were found to be better suited for analytic competence and managerial techniques. While both programs have a shared outcome, producing MBA graduates, the differences were related to the emphasis placed by each organization on specific managerial competencies.

Schein (1985) outlined five primary mechanisms that are used by organizational leaders for cultural embedding and reinforcement: “1) what leaders pay attention to, measure, and control; 2) leader reactions to critical incidents and organizational crises; 3) deliberate role modeling, teaching, and coaching by leaders, 4) criteria for allocation of rewards and status; 5) criteria for recruitment, selection, promotion, retirement, and excommunication,” (p. 224-25). Schein also outlined five secondary mechanisms that are used by organizational leaders for cultural embedding and reinforcement: the design structure of an organization; systems and procedures of an organization; buildings and design of physical space; myths, stories, and legends about significant people and events; and formal statements about the organization, such as philosophy, creed and charters.

Kuh and Whitt (1988) identified some typical steps in the socialization process that included: “1) identification of role models, 2) observation of role model behavior, 3) imitation of role model behavior, 4) evaluation by others of ‘imitation,’ 5) modification of behavior in response to the evaluation, and 6) incorporation of values and behaviors of the role model into the newcomer’s self-image,” (p. 38). Monmonier (1991) used the metaphor of cartography when describing the sensemaking (socialization) process encountered by those new to organizations. In this metaphor, Monmonier described how cartographer’s maps represent where they look and what they want to represent.
Synergistic supervision appeared to have characteristics of the human relations model. Early organizational literature on the human relations model of management was important for discovering the importance of informal relationships among workers in organizations. This became evident through the Hawthorne experiments at Western Electric, conducted by Elton Mayo. (Kanter, 1993). The concept of the “informal organization” was developed which includes the emotional, non-rational and sentimental aspects of human behavior, important for socialization within organizations. (Kanter, 1993). The human relations model assumes that individuals are motivated socially and economically and that their behaviors and attitudes are a function of their group memberships. Participation, communication patterns and leadership styles affecting organizational outcomes are emphasized in the human relations model (Kanter).

Bolman and Deal’s (1997) human resource frame is important for understanding the person-organization fit and the socialization process necessary for new professionals. The human resource frame was built on core assumptions including the following:

1) organizations exist to serve human needs rather than the reverse, 2) people and organizations need each other: organizations need ideas, energy, and talent; people need careers, salaries, and opportunities, 3) when the fit between individual and system is poor, one or both suffer: individuals will be exploited or will exploit the organization – or both will become victims, 4) a good fit benefits both: individuals find meaningful and satisfying work, and organizations get the talent and energy they need to succeed (p. 102-103).

Kanter outlined five assumptions about the person-organization fit relationship that exists for new professionals entering work in organizations:

work is not an isolated relationship between actor and activity; behavior in organizations is, when all is said and done, adaptive; if behavior reflects a ‘reasonable’ response to an organizational position, it is not thereby seen as mechanically inevitable; behavior is also directly connected to the formal tasks set forth in a job’s location in the division of organizational labor; and an interest in the relationship of formal task, formal location, to behavior responses also leads to an emphasis on competence – ability to do the job, (p. 250-253).

Culture of Higher Education Organizations

Higher education organizations are influenced by both their internal and their external environments. This notion is important for new professionals entering organizations to understand when navigating the landscape of a higher education organization. Colleges and universities are constantly changing in response to factors in their external environments, (Kuh & Whitt, 1988). Internal groups that can influence culture include: students, faculty, staff and
administrators. External groups that influence can include: accrediting, governmental, occupational, and professional agencies, (Kuh & Whitt).

Culture in higher education is shaped over time by a system of routine interactions among students, faculty, and institutional leaders, along with other constituents. (Kuh & Whitt, 1988). This culture may be hard to decipher. Supervisors are able to transmit and interpret cultural characteristics to their supervisees. Sagas have been described as the institutional memory that is a tissue that connects an institution’s past and present. Sagas also shape the interpretation of how future events will be viewed in the organization (Kuh & Whitt). Academic programs are important in developing strong institutional cultures with the integral components of moral capital, loyalty and commitment (Kuh & Whitt). Distinctive themes are “Deeply held beliefs and guiding principles [that] may develop into an institutional ethos, an underlying attitude that describes how faculty and students feel about themselves; this attitude is comprised of the moral and aesthetic aspects of culture that reflect and set the tone, character, and quality of institutional life,” (Kuh & Whitt, p. 47).

Cultural Types

An understanding of cultural and subcultural types that exist at institutions is important for the new professional. Robert Birnbaum (1988) outlined five different cultures of institutions of higher education. These included the collegial, bureaucratic, political, anarchical and cybernetic. While these descriptions presented by Birnbaum may not characterize all higher education organizations, many new professionals will enter organizations that may possess some or many of the characteristics of the cultures mentioned above.

The collegial organization is characterized by a shared sense of leadership and values among a community of equals. Loops of interaction are evident in collegial organizations, where upward feedback and communication is valued. Face to face contact in the collegial organization provides its members with opportunities to share culture and traditions that allow for the development of a coherent campus culture (Birnbaum, 1988).

The bureaucratic organization has been described as an organization where rationalizing structures and decision-making give a sense of stability. Bureaucratic organizations are generally rigid and unchanging. Most bureaucratic colleges and universities are public institutions, because they are embedded in bureaucratic systems of local and state government. Vertical lines connecting offices are readily apparent in the organizational charts depicting most bureaucratic colleges and universities. These depict a systematic division of labor, rights and responsibilities of those employed in the organization (Birnbaum, 1988).

In the political organization, power comes neither from norms nor rules, but is negotiated. A supercoalition of subcoalitions with diverse interests, preferences and goals is in existence. Most individuals, in the political organization, are not concerned with most issues all of the time. Groups acquire, develop and use power to obtain their preferred outcomes. A large number of individuals or groups in the political organization operate autonomously, but are interdependent. Social exchange and mutual dependence is also a characteristic of the political organization in higher education (Birnbaum, 1988).
In the anarchical organization, everyone has what they wish. Three technologies most clearly characterize the anarchical organization. They include: problematic goals, unclear technologies and fluid participation. Problematic goals, are general and imprecise statements, curriculum reflects individual and departmental interests and goals are collected loosely and change often. Unclear technologies are processes that have been used over time that appear to be effective. These have been developed largely through trial and error. Fluid participation is characterized by formal and informal groups at all levels involved. Membership in groups changes frequently and people tend to move in and out of various parts of the organization on a regular basis (Birnbaum, 1988).

The cybernetic organization provides direction through self-regulation with an objective of achieving balance. Feedback loops are implemented that will tell the organization when things are going wrong. The cybernetic organization responds to both its internal and external environments.

Subcultures and Institutional Characteristics

Three types of subcultures (enhancing, orthogonal, and counterculture) have been identified in the higher education literature (Kuh & Whitt, 1988). Enhancing subcultures follow the values more fervently than the rest of the college. Orthogonal subcultures accept the values of the institution but create their own for themselves. Countercultures threaten the values of the institution. Countercultures thrive best when given a risk free environment in which to operate. Individual actors are also important in the development of culture in the higher education organization. All actors (faculty, staff, students and administrators) contribute to an institution’s culture. Some may do this more than others (e.g. the president), but all are not passive recipients of the institution’s culture, (Kuh & Whitt).

Historical roots and external influences contribute largely to the culture of higher education organizations. For example, for a religious college or university, “The mores of the supporting religious body are manifested in codes of student conduct (often enforced by students themselves), mandatory courses in religion, and the sedate social life usually marked by the absence of alcohol or drugs,” (Kuh & Whitt, p. 55) The curriculum of an institution of higher education is influenced by several constituent groups. The curriculum and academic climate can be influenced by faculty, students and external constituent’s perceptions of the importance of teaching and learning (Kuh & Whitt).

The personnel core and the social environment of a college or university contribute to both the internal and external image of the organization. Faculty members are influential in both maintaining and enriching organizational culture. This is particularly true of those viewed by their colleagues as opinion leaders (Kuh & Whitt). The social environment of a college or university is important because it projects the image of the institution externally (Kuh & Whitt).

Architecture, ceremonies, rites and rituals are important to the culture of higher education organizations. Sturner (1972) stated that the physical environment reflects the values and aspirations of those who live and work in a college. “Ceremonies, rites, and rituals on a college
campus give form to communal life. Kuh and Whitt stated they enrich the campus ethos and allow interpretations and meanings to be made of special events.

The size and type of the employing institution have been found to affect the culture of an organization and may present challenges for new professionals. “Larger institutions of higher education tend to be more complex structurally, which impedes development of a coherent picture or tone,” (Peterson, Cameron, Mets, Jones, & Ettington, 1986, p. 48). Formal structure has been found to be less important in small colleges because it determines only a minor portion of the interactions between institutional agents and other members of the organizational culture, (Clark, Heist, McConnell, Trow, & Yonge, 1972). Institutional affiliations (type), particularly for private institutions, may possess cultures heavily influenced by religious purposes, origins, and values that may be evident in the curriculum and practices of students who are members of the institution (Kuh & Whitt, 1988).

Characteristics of Student Affairs Administration

Entry into student affairs administration can occur in several ways. Many new professionals enter after completion of a graduate preparation program in student affairs administration, college student personnel services, higher education or some similar degree program (Janosik & Creamer, 2003; Snyder & McDonald, 2002). Student affairs administration has been characterized as, “a hidden profession insofar as there is not a direct field of undergraduate study leading to graduate training in this area,” (Richmond & Sherman, 1991, p. 8). The student affairs work setting is a unique one. Student affairs professionals work in a number of functional areas including, but not limited to: Academic Advising, Admissions/Enrollment Management, Adult Learner Services, Assessment/Research, Career Planning/Placement, Compliant Services, Counseling, Disabled Student Services, Financial Aid, Food Services, Greek Affairs, Health/Drug and Alcohol, International Students, Intramural/Recreation Sports, Judicial Affairs, Leadership Development, Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual & Transgender Student Services, Multicultural Affairs, Orientation, Religious Programs, Residence Life, Service Learning, Student Activities, Student Affairs, Student Union, Teaching Faculty and Women’s Resources.

Many people enter student affairs work after experiencing critical incidents, such as serving as a resident assistant and being introduced to the field of student affairs administration (Brown, 1987; Hunter, 1992). Other reasons for entry include, “encouragement by those already in the field…values shared with student affairs professionals…others’ reactions to employment in student affairs and improving campus life,” (Hunter, 1999, pp. 183-185). Current student affairs professionals are seen as principal players in the selection of and socialization of professionals to student affairs administration (Hunter, 1992).

A model of professional development developed by Miller and Carpenter (1980) best describes the career patterns of many student affairs professionals. The four stages of development include the formative stage, application stage, additive stage and the generative stage. In the formative stage, students are involved in masters preparation programs and are
learning the language of the profession; its values and are preparing to enter the profession in their first job. The application stage involves the new professional using the skills and knowledge acquired in graduate training and making a commitment to student affairs work as a profession.

The additive stage occurs when student affairs professionals make the move into more senior-level or administrative work in student affairs administration. This involves the supervision of other staff, orienting new professionals to the profession and serving in leadership roles for professional organizations in the field. The generative stage is reached only by a limited number of student affairs professionals. The stage is signaled by the respect given to individuals by their peers, being called on as a consultant or advisor, assuming top positions with professional organizations and continued contributions to the professional literature in the field of student affairs administration (Carpenter, 1983; Young, 1987).

Characteristics of New Professionals

Each year new professionals enter the world of work in student affairs administration fresh from undergraduate and/or graduate training to assume positions within organizations (Harned & Murphy, 1998; Scher & Barr, 1979; Snyder & McDoanld, 2002). New professionals who enter student affairs organizations encounter a host of challenges, expectations and responsibilities that are new to them (Ellis, 2002; Hamrick & Hemphill, 2002; Hatcher & Crook, 1988, Snyder & McDonald, 2002; Toma & Grady, 2002).

Marsh (2001) outlined several issues for new professionals during their entry into student affairs work. These included: “(a) making early commitments in career and personal life, (b) personalizing values and developing congruence between actions and values, (c) developing a sense of self and work-related identity, (d) adjusting to the ‘real world,’ and (e) experiencing burnout and attrition,” (p. 48).

New professionals’ experiences with an organization are largely based on their perceptions of the individuals they work with and their work environment (Amey, 2002). Chipman and Kuh (1988) likened organizational entry to skydiving. They stated, “Skydiving is an adventure of the senses that requires planning, patience, personal resources, appropriate equipment, poise and presence of mind – characteristics that will serve a staff member well when negotiating entry into the student affairs division,” (p. 275). Olson (1993) found when studying faculty that stress related variables like time and balance conflicts, compensation issues, and feedback and job security were experienced by faculty members. Olson’s study demonstrated the individual nature of the experience of new professionals and further portrayed the issues that new professionals encounter upon entry into a new organization.

Supervisor/Supervisee Dyad Relationships

Supervisor and supervisee similarities and differences, and how they are perceived by new professionals, can affect the outcomes of this relationship. As the diversity of the workplace
changes, particularly in the field of student affairs administration, many professionals will be supervised by individuals different from them. Vecchio and Bullis (2001) stated, “as workplace diversity increases and supervisory ranks are staffed by a broader range of individuals, it becomes increasingly more common to be supervised by someone who is, in historical terms, an atypical supervisor,” (p. 884). Many have found that the similarity of the supervisors and their supervisees is related to organizational attachment (Harrison, Price, & Bell, 1998; Mueller, Finley, Iverson, & Price, 1999), job satisfaction (Mueller, Finley, Iverson, & Price, 1999; Tsui, Egan, & O’Reilly, 1992; Vecchio, & Bullis, 2001) and intention to turnover (Tsui, Egan, & O’Reilly, 1992). Vecchio and Bullis (2001), when studying job satisfaction, found no evidence that suggested a reduction in dissatisfaction over time for subordinates who are supervised by supervisors who are different from them. This notion could eventually lead to greater intentions to turnover in the organization.

Williams and O’Reilly (1998) and Riordan and Shore (1997) reviewed three major theories to better explain the role of diversity in organizations: social categorization, similarity/attraction, and information/decision making. The social categorization theory involves organizational members striving to maintain high self-esteem, which is typically gained from social comparisons with others. The similarity/attraction theory holds that organizational members find social interactions to be less stressful and more reinforcing with those who share similar demographic dimensions, life experiences and beliefs. In the information/decision making theory, organizations with greater diversity are said to have a greater range of information available to them outside of the organization itself. Riordan and Shore (1997) further discussed the relational demography theory. This theory proposes that the more similar an individual is to their work group, the more positive the individuals attitudes and behaviors will be.

**Race**

Race of supervisors and supervisees should be examined because cross-cultural issues in supervision could create problems in working relationships. Schneider (2002) stated that performance issues should be handled in a fair and consistent manner, without regard to gender, race, sexual orientation or disability. Schneider further stated that if supervisors are uncomfortable in supervisory situations due to racial, ethnic, or gender related differences, it is their responsibility to identify the root of the discomfort and take appropriate steps to address it.

Student affairs administrators who are minorities may experience isolation or loneliness. This may come as a result of having fewer like peers or role models. They may also feel excluded from informal information channels or networks (Trimble, Allen, & Vidoni, 1991). Credibility issues may also arise for the minority supervisor or supervisee, as one or both may try to operate effectively with additional pressures experienced in their positions (Trimble, Allen, & Vidoni). Further examination of the relationship between supervisor and supervisee dyads based on race is important, as minorities hold fewer types of positions (mostly financial aid and academic assistance) and often occupy entry-level positions (Sagaria & Johnsrud, 1991).

Tsui, Egan, & O’Reilly (1992) found that the effects of being different by race in organizations was associated with organizational attachment. They further stated, “the greater the
difference in race between an individual and all other individuals in a work unit, the lower the individual’s attachment to the organization (p. 568). This was found to be truer for whites than for nonwhites. Research has shown that group composition defined by race has affected member behavior and attitudes, depending on whether the member shares the race that is dominant in the larger group (Mueller, Finely, Iverson, & Price, 1999). These effects tend to be lessened for those individuals who are accustomed to being in the minority in society (Mueller, Finely, Iverson, & Price, 1999). Vecchio and Bullis (2001), when studying the moderators of influence on supervisor-subordinate similarity, found that, “race may be a more powerful influence on the reactions of subordinates than is gender or ethnicity,” (p. 893). Vecchio and Bullis, when studying job satisfaction, stated, “concerning racial similarity... subordinates were comparatively more satisfied with their supervisors during the earliest phase of their working relationship. However, a greater drop in satisfaction was suggested for subordinates who differed racially from their superiors,” (p. 894). Based on the above the following two interactive hypotheses were created:

1. Race will influence the relationship between synergistic supervision and job satisfaction such that the positive relationship between synergistic supervision and job satisfaction will be stronger for “like dyads” (e.g. white supervisor/white supervisee and non-white supervisor/non-white supervisee) than for “unlike dyads” (e.g., white supervisor/non-white supervisee and non-white supervisor/white supervisee).

2. Race will influence the relationship between synergistic supervision and intention to turnover will be stronger for “unlike dyads” (e.g., white supervisor/non-white supervisee and non-white supervisor/white supervisee) than for “like dyads” (e.g., white supervisor/white supervisee and non-white supervisor/non-white supervisee).

Gender

Rickard and Clement (1994) found, when studying female student affairs officers, that they were open to the importance of relationships and that while females roles varied they entailed cooperation, collaboration and the facilitation of development. These appear consistent with those described by Jones and Komives (2001). Males on the other hand have been described as placing “emphasis on logical, linear modes of thought and action, and the drive for results at the expense of network and community building,” (Morgan, 1997, p. 133). These traits have been characterized as more “male” than “female,” (Morgan). Gardiner and Tiggemann (1999) found that those supervisors who are stereotypically masculine emphasized the achievement of organizational goals, while those that were stereotypically feminine emphasized people and relationships. Gardiner and Tiggemann also found female supervisors to be more democratic in their style than men. Morgan stated, “The subtleties associated with gender often create different experiences of the same organizational situation and present many practical problems for the way men and women interact on a daily basis” (p.192).

Supervisor’s effectiveness in their roles have been perceived based on gender traits. Successful managers have been found to possess more masculine traits, while those demonstrating more feminine traits have been perceived as being less competent or successful (Gardiner & Tiggemann). This could affect new professionals perceptions of their supervisors.
Tsui, Egan, and O’Reilly (1992) found that differences in sex, among other characteristics, between supervisor-subordinate dyads lead to “heightened role ambiguity, unfavorable performance evaluations, and a lower level of attraction by the superiors to these subordinates,” (p. 551). They further found that individuals, who use sex as self-identification criteria, would have higher levels of job satisfaction with the organization, when the organization is comprised of a higher number of individuals like them. Based on the above, the following two interactive hypotheses were created:

1. Gender will influence the relationship between synergistic supervision and job satisfaction such that the positive relationship between synergistic supervision and job satisfaction will be stronger for “like dyads” (e.g., male supervisor/male supervisee and female supervisor/female supervisee) than for “unlike dyads” (e.g., male supervisor/female supervisee and female supervisor/male supervisee).

2. Gender will influence the relationship between synergistic supervision and intention to turnover such that the negative relationship between synergistic supervision and job intention to leave will be stronger for “unlike dyads” (e.g., male supervisor/female supervisee and female supervisor/male supervisee) than for “like dyads” (e.g., male supervisor/male supervisee and female supervisor/female supervisee).

Situational variables may also affect the supervisor/supervisee dyad relationship based on gender. Liden (1985) found, “that female managers appeared to have less influence as they reported being affected more by restraints than were male managers,” (p. 430). These restraints could be personnel policies or lack of authority, as indicated by Liden. Experience was another situational variable that could affect the supervisor/supervisee relationship. Those male managers who have been working in their positions longer than their female counterparts may have more power and influence when working with those they supervise (Liden). The perceived power and/or influence of male managers, could affect the preferences of male and female supervisees for a male supervisor. Eagley, Makhijani and Klonsky (1992) stated, “If people are biased to evaluate female leaders’ efforts less favorably than those of their male counterparts, women who aspire to leadership roles would encounter very serious barriers to entering these roles and advancing to higher levels within the organization,” (p. 3).

Levels and Length of Relationship

Supervisor and supervisee position level, along with the length of the supervisor/supervisee relationship should be examined because new professionals may be at different levels in their development with varying supervisory needs. Janosik & Creamer (2003) stated, “supervision of people always is important to an organization, and is a key ingredient in any staffing plan, but supervision of new professionals may be among the most critical supervision tasks or responsibilities of a college or university,” (p. 1). Dalton (1996) stated that student affairs professionals should adopt a flexible approach to supervision by employing multiple perspectives to communicate effectively across multiple disciplines (functional areas) from which people are employed in the profession. An employee’s developmental status has been found to be very important to the establishment of working relationships among student affairs professionals. Supervisors should employ the appropriate strategies for determining their employee’s status and act accordingly. Different developmental needs exist for different level
employees (new professionals, mid-life, mid-career professionals); all types should have appropriate relationships with a supervisor (Janosik & Creamer). Based on the above, the following two interactive hypotheses were created:

1. Length of the relationship between the supervisor and subordinate will influence the relationship between synergistic supervision and job satisfaction such that the positive relationship between synergistic supervision and job satisfaction will be stronger as the length of the time together increases.
2. Length of the relationship between the supervisor and subordinate will influence the relationship between synergistic supervision and intention to turnover such that the negative relationship between synergistic supervision and intention to turnover will be stronger as the length of the time together increases.

Socialization

Much has been written in the literature about the socialization of new hires within organizations (Amey, 2002; Harned & Murphy, 1998; Klein & Weaver, 2000; Nelson & Quick, 1991). Klein and Weaver (2000) stated that the socialization of new hires is important because they encounter adjustment issues and are most susceptible to the influence of the organization they are entering. They described socialization as a time when employees learn to adapt, and learn about organizational culture.

The challenges, expectations and responsibilities faced by new professionals are best encountered when coupled with supportive work environments and working relationships. Through effective staff supervision, new professionals are able to meet the demands of their new positions, while gaining knowledge, professional development and career experiences from the organizations that employ them (Anthony, Kacmar & Perrewe, 2002; Desimone, Werner & Harris, 2002; Holmes, Verrier & Chisholm, 1983; Schneider, 2002; Snyder & McDonald, 2002).

The socialization process is important for helping new professionals in adjusting to their new work environments, in a time in which they are the most susceptible to influence from the organization (Amey, 1990, 2002; Scher & Barr, 1979). The success or failure of new professionals is often attributed to the amount of social support they receive upon entering the organization (Amey, 1990, 2002; Katz & Tushman, 1983; Scher & Barr, 1979). Supervisors in organizations are able to provide new professionals with important information about the organization’s goals, norms and values as well as the necessary information to conduct their jobs (Amey, 1990, 2002; Carpenter, Torres & Winston, 2001; Schneider, 2002). This is most helpful in assisting the new professionals with understanding their role within the organization (Scher & Barr, 1979; Schneider, 2002). Ideally new professionals should receive this type of information from their employing supervisor, but this may not be adequate for the new professional.

Because a new professional’s experience is based on their perceptions of the organization, the existence of a social support system is important (Nelson & Quick, 1991; Scher & Barr, 1979). A new professional’s perceived lack of a social support system could affect their decision to stay or leave the organization (Johnsrud & Rosser, 1999; Klenke-Hamel & Mathieu,
Organizations and supervisors should not take social support for granted as great amounts of time and resources have often been spent in the hiring process.

Unfortunately for many new professionals, their supervisors are pre-occupied with their own responsibilities and often have little time for support and reassurance or they are ill-prepared to supervise (Dalton, 1996; Harned & Murphy, 1998; Rosen, Taube & Wadsworth, 1980). This absence of support can hamper the learning and development of new professionals.

For new professionals entering the world of work for the first time, the need for support and learning may be multiplied. While many new professionals today receive graduate training that includes internships or co-op experience, encountering full-time work in an organization may still be challenging. Richmond (1986) offered advice to young professionals employed at small colleges that included:

cultivate faculty relationships, make changes for the better, but do so carefully, get the lay of the land, get to know your supervisor, move quickly to develop support systems, move quickly to establish relationships with students, take care of yourself, become active in professional organizations and maintain your sense of humor (pp. 33-36).

Social support within organizations has been identified in the literature as an important factor in the adjustment of new hires. New hires often enter organizations with little support from others in the work environment, a time when they need the most support during their adjustment. Nelson and Quick (1991) found that positive psychological and emotional adjustments to the work environment were associated with the presence or lack of presence of social support systems.

For new professionals, the presence of a support system provides the employee with information resources (Harned & Murchpy, 1998; Scher & Barr, 1979). Morrison (1993) studied newcomer’s information seeking strategies within the organization as part of their organizational socialization. Newcomers seek a variety of information from those they work with in the organization. Some information sought by newcomers includes: role definitions, expectations, role demands, norms and values of the organization, feedback from supervisors, and social feedback (Harned & Murphy, 1998; Morrison, 1993, Scher & Barr, 1979; Schneider, 2002).

Supervisors and others in organizations should not ignore the important role that they play in the integration of new professionals in organizations. Supervisors should be concerned with educating new professionals on the important role that they play in the organization. By demonstrating an interest in the career development and advancement of new professionals, supervisors and others in the organization show their commitment not only to the new professional, but to their organization as well (Schneider, 2002). Not all supervisors in organizations share the same affinity for building relationships with the new professionals they work with. Supervisors and others within the organization should not ignore or take for granted the support needs of the new professionals they employ.
The orientation process, an important part of supervision of new professionals, will help to identify the supervision needs of the new professional (Amey, 2002). The orientation process has been described as more than an event and more of a process (Saunders & Cooper, 2003). Hicks (2000) stated, “it’s part of the overall integration of new employees into an organization, by which it helps new employees adapt to the work environment and their jobs,” (p. 59). Carpenter, Torres, and Winston (2001) stated that, “orienting staff to new positions involves attention to operative philosophies and procedures, organizational cultures, and personal and professional expectations,” (p. 4). Flion and Pepermans (1998) found that orientation program content, particularly organizational information, influenced the job satisfaction of employees, mainly in their first year.

New professionals who are able to gain knowledge of the organization’s values and their importance are more likely to experience greater attainment of goals. As mentioned previously, supervisors are able to communicate an organization’s values and their importance to the new professional. Twombly (1990) stated, “the highways and byways of administrative careers in higher education are not well marked; the road signs are often subtle,” (p. 5). Supervisors are best able to direct their new professionals through the orientation process, insuring their successful entry into student affairs work. Orientation programs are important for communicating an organization’s values to new professionals (Carpenter, Torres & Wintson, 2001; Klein & Weaver 2000).

Supervisors can be instrumental in the orientation of new professionals, which includes sharing the organization’s mission and values, as well as its norms and operating procedures (Carpenter, Torres & Winston, 2001; Harned & Murphy, 1998; Saunders & Cooper, 2003; Scher & Barr, 1979; Schneider, 2002; Snyder & McDonald, 2002;). Upcraft (1988) stated,

the supervisor should take direct responsibility for helping a new employee get oriented to the new job and should present a plan, on the first day of work … the new employee should be given a chance to revise that plan to meet his or her needs (p. 43).

Winston, Torres, Carpenter, McIntire and Peterson (2001) have called attention to the lack of orientation provided to new professional employees in student affairs organizations. They further suggested that this is not congruent with the espoused value of orienting undergraduates. They stated, “virtually no college or university would consider bringing new students into the institution without providing them an orientation program that prepares them to be full participants in the education enterprise,” (p. 23).

Klein and Weaver’s study of new hires in the orientation process found that participants in orientation programs, “related to the people, goals/values, and history dimensions of socialization,” (2000, p. 59). Supervisors who are experienced within the organization can assist the new professional with important information about the organization’s goals and specific information needed to be successful in the job. This should occur during the recruitment and selection stages and continue as an on-going process (Saunders & Cooper, 2003).
Job Satisfaction

Job satisfaction is related to many variables in the organization. Some of these include participation in an orientation process (Flion & Pepermans, 1998; Klein & Weaver, 2000), the presence of mentors (Hoffman, 2001; Kelly, 1984; Kram, 1985; Moore, 1982; Noe, Greenberger & Wang, 2002; Schmidt & Wolfe, 1980; Twale & Jelinek, 1996; Young & Perrewe, 2000a, 2000b; Zachary 2000), supervisor feedback (Katz & Weaver, 2000), job burnout (Klenke-Hamel & Mathieu, 1990; Ward, 1995; Zellars, Perrewe & Hockwarter, 2000), social support (Klein & Weaver, 2000; Morrison, 1993; Nelson & Quick, 1991), organizational commitment (Blackhurst, Brandt & Kalinowski, 1998) and career advancement opportunities.

Locke (1969) described job satisfaction as being a pleasurable emotional state that is achieved through an appraisal of one’s job in relation to their attainment of job related values. Locke further described job dissatisfaction as being a displeasurable emotional state that is achieved through an appraisal of one’s job in relation to their attainment of job related values. New professionals in organizations who gain knowledge of the importance of their organization’s values are less likely to possess a lack of attainment related to these values.

Supervisors in the area of student affairs administration should “tune in” to the dissatisfaction that exists in the field. Bender (1980) noted that little exists in the literature that suggests that the needs of the dissatisfied are being met. This should be cause for concern in the field of student affairs administration as there will be significant turnover in the coming years. The lack of well-prepared new professionals to fill those posts vacated by senior student affairs professionals will have implications on the field and the institutions facing turnover. Evans (1988) suggested that job dissatisfaction could be attributed to the lack of opportunities for personal and professional growth for those working in student affairs. Klenke-Hamel and Mathieu (1990) also noted a significant impact when studying accountants and faculty members job satisfaction; however, they did discover a negative impact with hospital employees and blue-collar workers. Further, job satisfaction is important because it is associated with role ambiguity, role conflict, and role orientation. Based on the above, the following main effect hypothesis was created:

There will be a positive relationship between perceived level of synergistic supervision received and job satisfaction for new professionals in student affairs administration.

Role Ambiguity, Role Conflict, and Role Orientation

New professionals who lack knowledge about their role within the organization and the behaviors necessary may experience role ambiguity (Berwick, 1992). Role ambiguity occurs when a new professional is encountered with new situations on the job for which the prescribed behaviors for accomplishment of a task are unknown or unclear (Zellars, Perrewe & Hochwarter, 2000). Not all new professionals are savvy enough to figure out their role within the organization and interpret what contributions they can make. Ward (1995) found that, “results indicate, in particular, the salience of role ambiguity as a variable in job satisfaction and the decision to leave,” (p. 41). Any manager supervising new professionals should be aware of the problems
associated with role ambiguity and conflict that occur for new staff members (Amey, 2002; Schneider, 2002).

Role conflict can arise when a new professional is met with “incompatible or incongruous expectations,” (Zellars, et al., 2000, p. 1573). New professionals who are unable to interpret their role within the organization may encounter difficulty with role orientation. Role orientation has been defined by Desimone, Werner and Harris (2002) as, “the extent to which individuals are innovative in interpreting their organizational roles, versus ‘custodial’ in maintaining what has been done in the role previously,” (p. 672). The debate about the degree to which role stress is attributed to the organization or the individual continues. Role stress, conflict and ambiguity have been linked to job satisfaction and employee’s desire to leave an organization.

Job Burnout

Job burnout is most commonly linked to role stress (inclusive of role conflict, role ambiguity, role orientation and role overload). Much of the prior research that has been conducted on job burnout has focused on organizational characteristics, rather than individual characteristics of employees. Zellars, et al. (2000), conducted research aimed at examining individual’s personality characteristics through the use of the five factors model of personality as it related to job burnout. Their study found that personality does explain some of the variance with regard to job burnout and that managers might encourage certain personality dimensions in their employees, although this may not be the first inclination among managers. Job burnout can occur when new professionals experience role conflict, role ambiguity, problems with role orientation and role overload (Berwick, 1992). Each can be avoided through effective supervision within the organization.

Work Overload

New professionals who are unable to cope with the demands on them as new professionals may encounter work overload. Desimone, et al., (2002) defined work overload as, “A situation where the employee perceives the role as being more than he or she can reasonably do,” (2002, P. 672). Work overload appears to be more individual in nature. While new professionals may attribute a work overload situation to the organization, the new professional may create “situation” because of their own perceptions of their work within the organization.

Perceived Opportunities for Professional Development, Goal Attainment and Career Advancement

Professional development initiatives in student affairs administration are related to Winston and Creamer’s definition of supervision in higher education (1997). Winston and Creamer spoke of supervision as a function to promote both the achievement of institutional goals and the personal and professional capabilities of staff. They further described synergistic supervision as related to the discussion of long-term career goals (1997). Professional development initiatives are a means for student affairs administrators to assist the new professional with orientation to their role, the institution and the field of student affairs.
administration (Hirt & Winston, 2003). These can take a variety of forms. Schwartz and Bryan (1998) outlined several levels of professional development in student affairs administration. These included: 1) individual, 2) group or program, 3) departmental, 4) divisional and 5) professional associations. Supervisors are able to assist new professionals at each of these levels.

Cooper and Miller (1998) spoke of mentoring in student affairs as being a professional development process important to the development of character and quality of student affairs professionals. Synergistic supervision appears to have similar effects to that of mentorship. Bryan and Schwartz (1998) stated “a supervisor may be viewed as a mentor by some of his or her staff,” (p. 96).

Intention to Turnover

Creamer and Winston (2002) stated that one of the principal factors that have caused some new professionals to thrive and others to leave the field is the quality of supervision that they received in their first one or two jobs. The lack of a support system or perceived support system may cause some to question their decision to stay or leave the organization (Harned & Murphy, 1998). Johnsrud and Rosser (1999), in a study of mid-level administrators found that an employee’s decision to stay in or leave an organization is influenced by their perceptions of individual and institutional characteristics. They further suggested that supervisors should not dismiss the perceptions of their employees. Attrition of new professionals can be attributed to many positive and negative things including level of job satisfaction, perceived opportunities for goal attainment, professional development, and career advancement. Based on the above, the following main effect hypothesis was created:

There will be a negative relationship between perceived level of synergistic supervision received and intention to turnover for new professionals in student affairs administration.

In their 1988 study, Holmes, Verrier and Chisholm found that the year-by-year movement of staff out of student personnel work resulted in a 39% retention rate by the sixth year. This issue should be cause for concern for those interested in the state of the profession in the future. Bender (1980) surveyed 145 NASPA Region II members and found that:

Although the level of job satisfaction is relatively high, only 36% of the respondents indicated that they intended to do student affairs work for their entire career with 39% reporting indecision and 25% clearly indicating that they did not intend to do student affairs work for their entire career” (p.4).

Wood, Winston, and Polkosnik (1985) found that entry-level student affairs positions tend to be more structured, which increases the tendency for those who are seeking more autonomy to leave the field sooner than anticipated. For some new professionals, the longer they are in the field and advance, the fewer contacts they have with students. Carpenter, Guido-DiBrito and Kelly (1987) stated that young professionals lose contact with students as they
progress in the field. For many this student contact was the primary reason they entered student affairs work.

Hamel and Mathieu (1990) found that job conflict was less consistent across employee populations in predicting job satisfaction and propensity to leave the job. The persistence of new professionals can be attributed to the presence of variables that contribute to the commitment and success of employees. This has been found to be particularly true for women employed in student affairs administration. Blackhurst, Brandt and Kalinowski (1998), stated when referring to women in the student affairs profession, “identifying the variables that contribute to commitment and satisfaction of women … is critical to improving the success and well being of women in the student affairs profession,” (p. 94). Blackhurst et al, further described the affects of commitment and satisfaction as they related to women remaining in the profession. This was done to ensure that gender equity is achieved.

Research in the area of student affairs administration suggests that there might be a relationship between job satisfaction and decisions to leave the field (Lorden, 1998). Attrition of new professionals in organizations can be attributed to several things including job burnout, level of job satisfaction (Bender, 1980; Lorden, 1998), and perceived opportunities for goal attainment, professional development, and career advancement. Job satisfaction has been linked to attrition within the organization (Bender, 1980; Harned & Murphy, 1998; Lorden, 1998). The degree to which new professionals are satisfied with their attainment of job related values is related to their job satisfaction.

Depending on the functional area of work that new professionals are employed in, certain knowledge, skills and abilities are necessary for the new professional to be able to function and ultimately persist or advance in the position and/or the organization. In the field of student affairs administration, Trimble, Allen and Vidoni (1991) outlined seven personality preconditions that help motivate and sustain employees. These included: the ability to function without unanimous support, political savvy, organization, tolerance for ambiguity, social skills, tolerance for the delay of positive outcomes, and openness to negative feedback (pp. 158-159).

Katz and Tushman (1983), when studying engineers, concluded that, “the relationship between lower turnover and high interpersonal involvement with gatekeeping supervisors affirms the important role that project supervisors can and should play during the early socialization years of young professionals,” (p. 453).

Ward (1995) found when studying implications for attrition of student affairs professionals that the high attrition rate for student affairs staff might suggest incongruence between new professionals and their work environments. This can further challenge the new professional who lacks a meaningful relationship with a supervisor or opportunities for further personal and professional development (Amey, 2002; Scher & Barr, 1979; Schneider, 2002).
Synergistic Staff Supervision

Staffing practices in student affairs administration have received little attention in the literature. Winston and Creamer (1997) proposed a integrated model of staffing practices (p. 40) that incorporated four functions: recruitment and selection, orientation, staff development, performance appraisal and recently a fifth was added by Conley (2001) to include separation. This model of staffing practices incorporates the values of the student affairs profession. These include: “this historic values of human dignity (including freedom, altruism, and truth), equality (including individuals and groups), and community (including justice),” (Creamer & Winston, 2002).

Supervision in student affairs has been defined by Winston and Creamer (1997) as, “a management function intended to promote the achievement of institutional goals and to enhance the personal and professional capabilities and performance of staff,” (p. 42). Supervision was described by participants in Arminio and Creamer’s (2001) study of quality supervision as: “establishing on-going relationships to ensure goals of the institution, division of student affairs, the unit, and the individual staff member are met,” (pp. 38-39).

Staff behaviors associated with quality supervision have included: “leading by example, being clear about values, ethics, and principles of fairness, interpreting and building the culture of the institution; and having a vision of where the institution is going,” (Arminio & Creamer, 2001, p. 39). Supervision in student affairs has often had a negative connotation attached to it, with some believing that supervision is only for those who have not performed as expected (Creamer & Winston, 2002, September 12). Creamer and Winston have identified six interrelated functions of supervision. These are:

- Articulate the unit’s mission and needs up and down the organizational hierarchy, monitor and manage the work environment and the valence of the psychosocial climate, foster individual development of staff members, develop framework capabilities and group resources, promote active problem solving and coordinate work activities (2002, September 12).

Dalton (2003) outlined four essential tasks for human resource management in student affairs,

(a) helping employees fulfill the responsibility for which they were hired, (b) helping employees master the specific competencies necessary for success in assigned duties, (c) helping employees understand and cope – professionally and personally – with the culture and requirements of their work environment and (d) helping employees engage in continual learning, professional development, and personal renewal (p. 398-399).

Several processes have been identified by Arminio and Creamer (2001) as exemplifying quality supervision. These are: holding regular meetings, involving staff members in the planning process, utilizing face to face time, communicating consistently and introducing challenges to staff members. Staffing practices in student affairs administration are often
influenced by the size and type of institution, geographic location of institution, political forces, reputation and laws and regulations. Staffing practices are also influenced at the institutional level by the institutional culture and institutional resources (Arminio & Creamer 2001; Creamer & Winston, 2002, September 5).

Winston and Creamer (1997), through observation and experience, identified four basic forms of supervision. Authoritarian, laissez faire, companionable and synergistic. Synergistic supervision has been characterized as: dual focus, joint effort, two-way communication, focus on competence, growth orientation, proactivity, goals based, systematic and on-going process and holistic (Carpenter, Torres & Winston, 2001; Creamer & Winston, 2002, September 12; Janosik & Creamer, 2003; Saunders, Cooper, Winston, & Chernow, 2000; Winston & Creamer, 1997, 1998).

The amount and type of supervision received is dependent on the supervisee and their needs. The use of the synergistic supervision approach for new professionals can be one way of developing student affairs professionals who are satisfied with their work and are less likely to leave the profession. Their participation in synergistic supervision will allow them more opportunities for discussion of their long term goals and appraisals that may bring them greater satisfaction with their work in student affairs. For the new professional, more concentrated supervision and time may be required (Creamer & Winston, 2002, September 12).

One reason that new professionals leave the field is the lack of autonomy they are afforded in their new positions (Winston & Hirt, 2003). Autonomy appears to be gained through more experience and responsibility in their profession. New professionals with little patience may feel constricted in their work and seek employment outside of the profession.

Employing techniques from the synergistic model allows both the supervisor and the staff member opportunities to establish clear and open lines of communication about staff expectations and their roles as professionals in the field. It ensures a better work environment for both the manager and the new professional, where discussion and feedback occur often. Winston and Creamer stated that to adopt the synergistic approach to supervision supervisors should: “Establish an open, trusting relationship between staff member and supervisor, determine each staff member’s career anchor; identify professional aspirations of staff; and identify necessary knowledge and skills required of staff to advance professionally,” (1998, p. 36-37). This clearly identifies the link between supervision of staff and professional development initiatives. Marsh (2001) outlined several areas where supervisors can assist new professionals while in the entry stage. These are:

(a) orient to the profession, world of work, institution, etc. (b) encourage involvement in professional organizations and campus-wide activities for exposure to student affairs and higher education, (c) identify mentors, (d) serve as a role model, (e) include in decision making, (f) provide skill development in time and financial management, and (g) encourage a healthy lifestyle (p. 48).

Through the identification of those practices mentioned above, supervisors are best able to provided staff with an orientation to the organization and their role, while preparing them for a
career in student affairs administration for the long-term. This becomes an integration of the processes of supervision and professional development.

Summary

Organizational culture, particularly in higher education is important to the entry and socialization process of new professionals. New professionals encounter various cultures that are influenced by both internal and external environments to the institution. New professionals experiences are shaped by their socialization to their employing organizations. Many new professionals enter the field of student affairs administration each year after completion of graduate preparation programs. The student affairs profession is unique in that is has been characterized as a hidden profession with no direct links to undergraduate programs of study (Richmond & Sherman, 1991). Student affairs professionals are employed in a number of functional areas within their division, institution and the profession of student affairs administration. A review of the literature revealed a four-stage development pattern for student affairs professionals (Miller & Carpenter, 1980). The formative stage, involving the preparation of new professionals for their first jobs, is important to our understanding of the organizational entry and orientation process for new professionals.

New professionals encounter a variety of challenges and expectations upon entering student affairs work (Rosen, Taube, & Wadsworth, 1980; Trimble, Allen, & Vidoni, 1991). As previously mentioned, effective supervision is a way in which the student affairs profession can help new professionals meet the demands of their new positions, while helping them develop professionally and contribute to their employing organizations. The socialization and information seeking processes are important to new professionals for learning about their new work environments, their role within the organization and the expectations that are placed on them (Morrison, 1993; Nelson, & Quick, 1991).

New professionals look to their supervisors for information and support. The degree to which new professionals transition to their new positions and organizations can have an effect on their decision to stay or leave the profession (Creamer & Winston, 2002, September 5; Evans, 1988; Holmes, Verrier, & Chisholm, 1983; Klenke-Hamel, & Mathieu, 1990; Ward, 1995). This becomes critical to the future of the profession, as there will be significant turnover in the near future.

Staff supervision in student affairs has been described as promoting the achievement of institutional goals, while enhancing the professional and personal performance of staff (Winston & Creamer, 1997). Synergistic supervision (Saunders, Cooper, Winston, & Chernow, 2000; Winton & Creamer, 1997; Creamer & Winston 2002, September 12) has been characterized by its emphasis on dual focus, joint effort, two-way communication, competence, growth orientation, proactivity, goals based, and systematic and holistic orientation. These characteristics are good for the development of the new professional entering work in the field of student affairs administration. Each new professional will have different supervision needs and more time and concentration may be necessary for the orientation and development of new staff.
Effective supervision is important for job satisfaction and attrition of new professionals in the field. The following is a summary of the main effect and interactive hypotheses that have been developed after a review of the higher education, student affairs administration and management literature:

Main Effect Hypotheses

1. There will be a positive relationship between perceived level of synergistic supervision received and job satisfaction for new professionals in student affairs administration.
2. There will be a negative relationship between perceived level of synergistic supervision received and intention to turnover for new professionals in student affairs administration.

Interactive Hypotheses

3. Gender will influence the relationship between synergistic supervision and job satisfaction such that the positive relationship between synergistic supervision and job satisfaction will be stronger for “like dyads” (e.g., male supervisor/male supervisee and female supervisor/female supervisee) than for “unlike dyads” (e.g., male supervisor/female supervisee and female supervisor/male supervisee).
4. Gender will influence the relationship between synergistic supervision and intention to turnover such that the negative relationship between synergistic supervision and job intention to leave will be stronger for “unlike dyads” (e.g., male supervisor/female supervisee and female supervisor/male supervisee) than for “like dyads” (e.g., male supervisor/male supervisee and female supervisor/female supervisee).
5. Race will influence the relationship between synergistic supervision and job satisfaction such that the positive relationship between synergistic supervision and job satisfaction will be stronger for “like dyads” (e.g. white supervisor/white supervisee and non-white supervisor/non-white supervisee) than for “unlike dyads” (e.g., white supervisor/non-white supervisee and non-white supervisor/white supervisee).
6. Race will influence the relationship between synergistic supervision and intention to leave such that the negative relationship between synergistic supervision intention to turnover will be stronger for “unlike dyads” (e.g., white supervisor/non-white supervisee and non-white supervisor/white supervisee) than for “like dyads” (e.g., white supervisor/white supervisee and non-white supervisor/non-white supervisee).
7. Length of the relationship between the supervisor and subordinate will influence the relationship between synergistic supervision and job satisfaction such that the positive relationship between synergistic supervision and job satisfaction will be stronger as the length of the time together increases.
8. Length of the relationship between the supervisor and subordinate will influence the relationship between synergistic supervision and intention to turnover such that the negative relationship between synergistic supervision and intention to turnover will be stronger as the length of the time together increases.
CHAPTER THREE

METHOD

The purpose of this study was to examine the perceived level of synergistic supervision, job satisfaction, and intention to turnover of new professionals in student affairs administration. New professionals who are engaged in positive synergistic supervisory relationships are likely to be more satisfied with their jobs and less likely to turnover. By examining the constructs of supervision, job satisfaction, and intention to turnover this research attempted to identify any significant relationships between a new professional’s perception of the supervision they receive, their job satisfaction, and intention to turnover and selected variables. The analysis of data may provide a picture of the workplace setting and characteristics that surround positive supervisory relationships and job satisfaction. The analysis will help in designing future models of supervision for new professionals in student affairs administration.

The following research questions were developed after a review of higher education, student affairs and management literature.

1. Is there a relationship between perceived level of synergistic supervision received and job satisfaction of new professionals in student affairs administration?
2. Is there a relationship between perceived level of synergistic supervision received and intention to turnover of new professionals in student affairs administration?
3. Is there a relationship between perceived level of synergistic supervision received and job satisfaction of new professionals in student affairs administration based on gender of supervisor and supervisee?
4. Is there a relationship between perceived level of synergistic supervision received and job satisfaction of new professionals in student affairs administration based on race of supervisor and supervisee?
5. Is there a relationship between perceived level of synergistic supervision received and intention to turnover of new professionals in student affairs administration based on gender of supervisor and supervisee?
6. Is there a relationship between perceived level of synergistic supervision received and intention to turnover of new professionals in student affairs administration based on and race of supervisor and supervisee?
7. Is there a relationship between perceived level of synergistic supervision received, job satisfaction, and intention to turnover of new professionals in student affairs administration based on size of employing institution and type of employing institution?
8. Is there a relationship between perceived level of synergistic supervision received, job satisfaction, and intention to turnover of new professionals in student affairs administration based on supervisor position level, supervisee position level and length of supervisor/supervisee relationship?
Design

A correlational design was implemented for this study. A correlational design describes any existing relationship between two or more variables. “A correlational study describes the degree to which two or more quantitative variables are related, and it does so by using a correlation coefficient,” (Frankel & Wallen, 2003, p. 338). In this study, the researcher examined the relationships between perceived level of synergistic supervision received, job satisfaction, and intention to turnover for new professionals in student affairs administration with selected variables. “When a correlation is found to exist between two variables, it means that scores within a certain range on one variable are associated with scores within a certain range on another variable,” (Frankel & Wallen, 2003, p. 338). The results of correlational studies in which significant relationships are found can then be used to make predictions (Gay & Airasian, 2000).

Participants

The subjects in this study were current members of the American College Personnel Association (ACPA). ACPA’s membership represents over 7,000 members representing nearly 1,500 public and private institutions of higher education across the United States and internationally. ACPA’s mission states, “ACPA supports and fosters college student learning through the generation and dissemination of knowledge, which informs policies, practices and programs for student affairs professionals and the higher education community, (http://www.myacpa.org/au/index.cfm).”

ACPA was chosen for the sample of the total population of new professionals in student affairs administration because it has the largest number of new professionals among the national student affairs professional associations. The subjects were drawn from membership data submitted at the time of their membership application or renewal of membership. Subjects included those who have indicated they have worked in the field of student affairs administration five years or less.

There were 1,233 members of ACPA found who met the above criteria. After a review of membership data in the ACPA database 993 members were found to have usable email addresses. Of those 993 who were sent messages (with a link to the survey), 435 responded for a 43.8% response rate. Members of ACPA are employed in student affairs administrative functions at a variety of types of institutions including: four-year public, four-year private, two-year/community/technical schools, graduate and professional schools and associations related to higher education and student affairs administration.

Members of ACPA are employed in a number of functional areas within student affairs administration. Functional areas of employment for ACPA members include: Academic Advising, Admissions/Enrollment Management, Adult Learner Services, Assessment/Research, Career Planning/Placement, Commuter Services, Counseling, Disabled Student Services, Financial Aid, Food Services, Greek Affairs, Health/Drug and Alcohol, International Students, Intramural/Recreation Sports, Judicial Affairs, Leadership Development, Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual & Transgender Student Services, Multicultural Affairs, Orientation, Religious Programs,
Prior to the start of this study the researcher received the necessary approval for research involving human subjects from the Florida State University Institutional Review Board. Approval to conduct this study was granted on November 4, 2003. A copy of the Institutional Review Board’s Approval Memorandum can be found as Appendix A.

**Instrumentation**

*Synergistic Supervision Scale (SSS)*

The Synergistic Supervision Scale (SSS), (Saunders, Cooper, Winston & Chernow, 2000) was used to examine the perceptions of synergistic supervision among participants (See Appendix B). Permission to use the SSS was obtained from the authors of the SSS (see Appendix C). The SSS included 22 items that were developed as a result of a review of student affairs, higher education and management literature. Subjects rated the frequency of each described behavior based on their perceptions of their current supervisory relationship. The ratings were on a five-point scale (1=never or almost never; 2=seldom; 3=sometimes; 4=often; 5=always or almost always).

The essential characteristics measured by the SSS included: “a) discussion of exemplary performance, b) discussion of long-term career goals, c) discussion of inadequate performance, d) frequency of informal performance appraisals and e) discussion of personal attitudes,” (Winston & Creamer, 1997, pp. 42-43). Demographic information collected on the SSS included: number of years in current position, title of position, area of office or work (functional area), number of years working at institution, highest level of education completed, field of highest earned degree, supervisor’s title, length of time working with supervisor, gender, age, racial or ethnic background.

Reliability and validity data for the SSS were analyzed by the authors of the survey instrument (Saunders, Cooper, Winston & Chernow) and are presented below. The internal consistency reliability of the SSS was calculated by use of a Cronbach’s alpha coefficient. The SSS had an alpha coefficient of .94. The range of item-total correlation was .44 to .75 (Saunders, Cooper, Winston & Chernow, 2000, p. 185). Validity of the SSS was estimated by correlating scores on the SSS with scores on the Index of Occupational Reaction (IOR), (Smith, 1976) and the Organizational Commitment Questionnaire (OCQ), (Porter & Smith, 1970). “The Pearson product-moment correlation between the IOR and SSS was .91 (n = 275, p < .001) and between the OCQ and SSS was .64 (n = 275, p < .001),” (Saunders, Cooper, Winston & Chernow, 2000).

*Demographic Information*

In addition to the demographic information included on the original SSS the researcher determined the size and type of the supervisee’s institution, for those supervisees that provided
identifying information. Size and type of institution data were collected for three hundred and seventy-five of the supervisees who completed the online survey. Categories for institutional size included: 1) 1,999 and under, 2) 2,000 – 9,999, 3) 10,000 – 19,999, and 4) 20,000 plus. These categories were drawn from the demographic information on the ACPA membership application. Categories for type of institution were: 1) two-year private, 2) two year public, 3) four-year private, and 4) four-year public. The institutional type categories were drawn from the “work setting” question on the ACPA membership application. To determine the size and type of the institution the researcher consulted the 2004 edition of the *U.S. News and World Report Ultimate College Directory*. Size and type of institution was collected for all but seven of the four-year institutions identified by supervisees. These schools were either located in foreign countries or had a proprietary focus and were not included in the *U.S. News and World Report Ultimate College Directory*. Size and type of institution was collected for all but two of the community colleges. These were not included in the *U.S. News and World Report Ultimate College Directory*, but were found through an online search.

Subjects were asked to indicate the gender and race of their supervisor and the level of their supervisor’s position, as well as their own. Categories for position level included: 1) entry level, 2) mid level, 3) senior level, 4) chief student affairs officer, 5) faculty member, 6) college/university president, 7) graduate student, and 8) other. These categories were drawn from the demographic information sought on the ACPA national membership application.

*Michigan Organizational Assessment Questionnaire*

Job satisfaction was measured by the use of several questions taken from the Michigan Organizational Assessment Questionnaire (MOAQ). Specifically, a three-item measure was used to assess organization members overall satisfaction to their jobs (See Appendix D). These measures were scored on a seven-point dimension, with the mean value across the items (with one reverse scored) constituting the scale score (Cook, J. D., Hepworth, S. J., Wall, T. D., & Warr, P. B., 1981). Subjects indicated the degree to which they agreed or disagreed with the following dimensions; (1) Strongly disagree, (2) Disagree, (3) Slightly Disagree, (4) Neither agree or disagree, (5) Slightly agree, (6) Agree, and (7) Strongly agree.

“Means are not cited in the source publication, but coefficient alpha [as cited by Cook, J. D., Hepworth, S. J., Wall, T. D., & Warr, P. B., 1981] is given as 0.71 (N>400). Correlations of 0.35 and -0.58 are reported with the author’s measures of Job Involvement (6.2) and Intention to Turn Over (4.13). Moch (1980a) has recorded an average interconnection between the three scale items of 0.50 (N=466 packaging and assembly workers),” (Cook, J. D., Hepworth, S. J., Wall, T. D., & Warr, P. B., 1981). Three questions, from the Michigan Organizational Assessment Questionnaire, specifically addressed intention to turn over (See Appendix E). Subjects indicated the degree to which they agreed or disagreed with the following dimensions for question four; (1) Not at all likely, (2), (3) Somewhat likely, (4), (5) Quite likely, (6), (7) Extremely likely. For questions five and six, subjects indicated the degree to which they agreed or disagreed with the following dimensions; (1) Strongly disagree, (2) Disagree, (3) Slightly disagree, (4) Neither agree nor disagree, (5) Slightly agree, (6) Agree, and (7) Strongly agree.
“Means are not cited in the source publication, but the coefficient alpha [as cited by Cook, J. D., Hepworth, S. J., Wall, T. D., & Warr, P. B., 1981] is given as 0.83 (N>400). Correlations of -0.58 and -0.27 are reported with the authors’ measures of Overall Job Satisfaction (2.9) and Job Involvement (6.2) respectively.” (Cook, J. D., Hepworth, S. J., Wall, T. D., & Warr, P. B., 1981). Job Satisfaction Questions used from the Michigan Organizational Assessment Questionnaire were the following:

1. All in all, I am satisfied with my job
2. In general, I don’t like my job ®
3. In general, I like working here

Intention to Turnover Questions used from the Michigan Organizational Assessment Questionnaire were the following:

1. How likely is it that you will actively look for a new job in the next year?
2. I often think about quitting
3. I will probably look for a new job in the next year

Variables

The identified variables for this study included: Independent Variable(s) - supervisor behaviors, measured by the Synergistic Supervision Scale; supervisor/supervisee’s race; supervisor and supervisee’s gender; size and type of employing institution; supervisor/supervisee position level and length of supervisor/supervisee relationship.

The Dependent variable(s) included: a measure of job satisfaction, and a measure of intention to turnover measured by selected questions from the Michigan Organizational Assessment Questionnaire.

Data Collection Procedures

Because this study was national in scope, those selected through the sampling process described earlier were asked to complete the survey instrument online. This method of completion was designed to maximize the response rate for this study. Those selected were emailed a letter (Appendix F, G, H), which included a description of the study and potential implications their participation may have, and description of identified incentive prizes offered for participation in the study.

Those subjects who chose to complete the survey were able to access the survey instrument from a web address provided in the email. Those subjects who chose to complete the survey were informed that the completion and submission of the survey instrument assumed their consent to participate in the study. The use of incentive prizes required participants to provide their names and contact information for notification purposes if selected for a prize. The prize process was voluntary and was described as such in the informed consent letter (See Appendix I) sent with the email and survey and in information contained on the survey website.
Subjects were given three weeks to complete the survey. A reminder email was sent at the beginning of both the second and third week. The email asked subjects to complete the survey, if they had not already done so. The reminder email message contained a link to the survey website. Incentive prizes were offered as a strategy to increase the response rate. Those who chose to be eligible were asked for their names and contact information after completion of the survey. Contact information for the researcher, professor directing the dissertation and IRB were provided in the email (Appendix F, G, H) and survey instrument sent to respondents and on the survey website, allowing subjects the opportunity to contact the researcher with questions or concerns they may have about the study or their participation.

Online Data Collection

The researcher chose to conduct the data collection process for this study online because of the benefits that it provided. Researchers are able to save time in data entry, reduce the number of errors, save time and money, and reduce the number of missing values, compared to paper surveys (Couper & Nicholls, 1998; Couper, & Rowe, 1996; Kiesler, & Sproull, 1986; Ramos, Sedivi, & Sweet, 1998). The online survey format also was aimed at maximizing the response rate for the study. Hancock and Flowers (2001) found online response rates to be comparable to response rates for paper surveys. One challenge when conducting online survey research could be the participant’s access to email and comfort levels in using computers to complete the survey instrument (Couper, & Rowe, 1996; Best, Krueger, Hubbard, & Smith, 2001; Tse, 1998; Wright, Aquilino, & Supple, 1998). Most new professional members in student affairs administration regularly use college and university email accounts in conducting college and university business. Almost all subjects had an email address listed in the ACPA Membership Directory. Subjects were required to complete those fields on the online survey necessary for the analysis outlined in this chapter. Subjects were prompted to return to unanswered questions, before being allowed to proceed with the survey. The format and length of the survey were thought to contribute to the positive response rate. The introduction, design, content and format of the survey were thought to be an important factor in the response rate. These have been found to be significant when assessing response rates for surveys in an online format (Crawford, Couper, & Lamias, 2001).

Method of Analysis

The statistical analysis program, SPSS 11.0 was used for the analysis of data. Descriptive statistics (mean, median, mode, frequencies, etc.) were run for all study subjects. The research questions for this study were stated in the following research hypothesis statements with the statistical analysis for each hypothesis type identified.

Main Effect Hypotheses

1. There will be a positive relationship between perceived level of synergistic supervision received and job satisfaction for new professionals in student affairs administration.
2. There will be a negative relationship between perceived level of synergistic supervision received and intention to turnover for new professionals in student affairs administration.

Statistical Analysis: Pearson correlation coefficients were computed between the means of subject’s scores on the Synergistic Supervision Scale and the job satisfaction and intention to turnover measures from the Michigan Organizational Assessment Questionnaire. “Correlation coefficients range in value from –1 (a perfect negative relationship) and +1 (a perfect positive relationship). A value of 0 indicates no linear relationship,” (SPSS, 1999, p. 277). Because the direction of the correlation was not known in advance of the data analysis the researcher selected two-tailed probabilities, when running the data. “Correlation coefficients significant at the 0.05 level are identified with a single asterisk, and those significant at the 0.01 level are identified with two asterisks,” (SPSS, 1999, p.277).

**Interactive Hypotheses**

3. Gender will influence the relationship between synergistic supervision and job satisfaction such that the positive relationship between synergistic supervision and job satisfaction will be stronger for “like dyads” (e.g., male supervisor/male supervisee and female supervisor/female supervisee) than for “unlike dyads” (e.g., male supervisor/female supervisee and female supervisor/male supervisee).

4. Gender will influence the relationship between synergistic supervision and intention to turnover such that the negative relationship between synergistic supervision and job intention to leave will be stronger for “unlike dyads” (e.g., male supervisor/female supervisee and female supervisor/male supervisee) than for “like dyads” (e.g., male supervisor/male supervisee and female supervisor/female supervisee).

5. Race will influence the relationship between synergistic supervision and job satisfaction such that the positive relationship between synergistic supervision and job satisfaction will be stronger for “like dyads” (e.g white supervisor/white supervisee and non-white supervisor/non-white supervisee) than for “unlike dyads” (e.g., white supervisor/non-white supervisee and non-white supervisor/white supervisee).

6. Race will influence the relationship between synergistic supervision and intention to leave such that the negative relationship between synergistic supervision intention to leave will be stronger for “unlike dyads” (e.g., white supervisor/non-white supervisee and non-white supervisor/white supervisee) than for “like dyads” (e.g., white supervisor/white supervisee and non-white supervisor/non-white supervisee).

7. Length of the relationship between the supervisor and subordinate will influence the relationship between synergistic supervision and job satisfaction such that the positive relationship between synergistic supervision and job satisfaction will be stronger as the length of the time together increases.

8. Length of the relationship between the supervisor and subordinate will influence the relationship between synergistic supervision and intention to turnover such
that the negative relationship between synergistic supervision and intention to turnover will be stronger as the length of the time together increases.

Statistical Analysis: Crosstabs were run for each of the above variables. “The Crosstab procedure forms two-way and multiway tables and provides a variety of tests and measures of association for two-way variables,” (SPSS, Inc., 1999, p. 221). Pearson correlation coefficients were run and included correlations between supervisor/supervisee dyads based on gender, race and length of supervisor/supervisee relationship. Correlations run for gender of supervisor/supervisee dyads included all possible combinations of supervisor/supervisee dyads, specifically: male/male, male/female, female/female, and female/male. Correlations were run for race of supervisor/supervisee dyads included all possible combinations of supervisor/supervisee dyads, specifically: white/white, white/non-white, non-white/non-white, and non-white/white. Correlations run for length of supervisor/supervisee relationship were one year/more than one year.

Exploratory Variables

Type of institution, size of employing institution, and level within the organization were examined as exploratory variables. Given the exploratory nature of this section, additional analyses were examined as needed.

Statistical Analysis: Pearson correlation coefficients of the means for scores on the exploratory variables with the variables of synergistic supervision, job satisfaction and intention to turnover were run. The researcher looked for statistical significance between the variables. If significance was reached in response to any of the correlations the researcher concluded that a positive relationship existed or did not exist.

Summary

A correlational design was chosen for this study. Four research questions were chosen after review of higher education, student affairs and management literature. These research questions were designed to measure the relationship between perceived level of synergistic supervision, job satisfaction, and intention to turnover with selected variables for new professionals in student affairs administration.

New professional members of ACPA chosen through the sampling process were contacted by email and given the opportunity to complete the SSS and measures of job satisfaction online. Subjects were given a three-week time period to complete the survey. A reminder email was sent to subjects at the beginning of the second and third weeks of the study. Incentive prizes were offered as a strategy to increase the response rate. Those who chose to be eligible were asked for their names and contact information.

The research questions were then analyzed using descriptive statistics, and Pearson correlation coefficients. These statistical analyses allowed the researcher to accept or reject the
hypotheses that have been created for each of the research questions. If significant relationships were established between synergistic supervision, job satisfaction, and intention to turnover and the outlined variables in this study, the researcher accepted or rejected the hypotheses, signifying a significant relationship does or does not exist for the research question being analyzed. The conclusions generated from this study may allow the researcher to determine which variables are related to positive synergistic supervisory relationships and job satisfaction for new professionals. This will help in the promotion of supervisory “best practices” and identify those areas that may merit further study in the future.
CHAPTER FOUR
RESULTS

This research study was conducted to examine the relationship between perceived level of synergistic supervision received, job satisfaction, and intention to turnover of new professionals in student affairs administration. This chapter contains an analysis of data collected for the study and follows the analytic procedures, which are used to answer each of the hypotheses outlined in Chapter Three. Included is the analysis of data for 435 student affairs administrators and members of the American College Personnel Association who completed the online survey process described in chapter three, during the fall semester of 2003.

Data Collection and Response Rate

Data for this study were collected through the use of an online survey that consisted of the Synergistic Supervision Scale (22 questions), and selected questions on job satisfaction (3 questions) and intention to turnover (3 questions) from the Michigan Organizational Assessment Questionnaire, and demographic information (See Appendix B, D, E). An online format was chosen because the study was national in scope and to maximize the response rate for the study.

A total of 1132 subjects were sent an initial email message (Appendix F) on Monday November 24, 2003 describing the study and its implications, asking for their participation, and a description of identified incentive prizes offered by the researcher for participation in the study. Subjects were given a link in the email message connecting them to the online survey. Subjects who had not yet completed the online survey were sent a second email message (Appendix G) on Monday, December 1, 2003, giving them a second opportunity to participate in the study. Subjects who had not yet completed the online survey were sent a third and final email (Appendix H) on Monday, December 8, 2003, giving them a third and final opportunity to participate in the study. Subjects were instructed in the third email message that in order to participate in the incentive prize process they should complete the online survey by 5:00 p.m. EST Friday, December 12, 2003. One hundred and thirty seven email messages were bounced back over the course of the study for a variety of reasons. Most (124) were bad addresses, eight subjects were away from their offices and would not return prior to the completion of the study, as indicated by their “out-of-office reply” and seven subjects were no longer working at their institutions, as indicated by their “out-of-office reply.”

A final population of 993 subjects were eligible to complete the survey after the purging process. Of those, 435 subjects responded to the survey for a 43.8% response rate. This response rate was calculated after purging those subjects who did not receive any of the email messages due to bad addresses, having left their positions, or were out of their offices, as indicated by their “out of office” reply message.
The use of an online survey, inclusive of the Synergistic Supervision Scale and measures from the Michigan Organizational Assessment Questionnaire, proved to be successful. The use of the online survey helped the researcher reduce the amount of time required for data collection and reduced the number of errors and missing values for survey responses. Optimistically, a 25% - 30% response rate was anticipated for the study. The 43.8% response rate received exceeded this expectation. It was thought that the respondents were comfortable with the format of the online survey and that this contributed to the response rate. The survey length (28 questions with demographic data) may have also contributed to the positive response rate for the study. While it is assumed that the prize process resulted in greater responses, it is not known how much of an effect this had on the overall response rate. Several survey respondents sent separate “qualitative” email messages to the researcher to further explain their experiences as new professionals in student affairs administration. This information provided the researcher with greater feedback than was asked for on the online survey and has resulted in a recommendation for future research.

**Descriptive Characteristics of Supervisees**

Of the 435 respondents, 301 (69%) were female, 134 (30.7%) were male. Respondents race included: 339 (77.9%) White or Caucasian, 36 (8.3%) Black or African American, 24 (5.5%) Hispanic or Hispanic American, 15 (3.4%) Asian or Pacific Islander, 13 (3.0%) Bi-Racial or Multicultural, and 8 (1.8%) Other. The responses for those who indicated Other included: Italian, Middle Eastern (2), Pakistani-American, Polish American, Black-Jamaican, Arab American and one who chose not to respond.

The highest level of education completed for the 435 respondents are: 1 (0.2%) had received an Associate’s Degree, 43 (9.7%) a Bachelor’s Degree, 364 (83.5%) a Master’s Degree, 17 (3.9%) a Doctorate Degree, and 10 (2.3%) indicated other. Of those that indicated Other, the following responses were given: currently completing a Masters Degree (2), Ed[ucation] Specialist Degree (2), All But Dissertation (ABD) (2), Post-Master’s Certificate, Doctoral Candidate, Currently working on Doctorate, and Juris Doctorate.

The areas of respondents’ highest degree varied, with the majority holding masters degrees in College Student Personnel Services, Higher Education Administration, Student Affairs Administration, Counseling, and Student Development. It should be noted that many of the “preparation programs” noted above are similar in curriculum and focus, even though their titles vary considerably. A complete listing of area of highest earned degree responses, as given by the survey respondents can be found as Appendix J.

Of the 435 respondents, the majority 173 (39.7%) worked in Residence Life. No respondents indicated that they worked in the functional areas of: Adult Learner Services, Disabled Student Services, Food Services, Intramural/Recreation Sports, Religious Programs, or Teaching Faculty. A complete listing of respondents’ functional areas of employment, with frequencies and percentages, can be found in Table 1. Twenty-seven (6.1%) indicated Other, when asked what functional area they worked in. The responses for those who chose Other for functional area included: Pre-College Programs, Academic Affairs, Human Resources, Mentorship, First Year Experience, Student Life/Student Activities, Off-Campus Site at Satellite
Campus, Academic Advising, Institutional Research, Campus Life, Conference Services, Development, Community Service and Volunteerism, Director, all of the above, Technology, Habitat for Humanity, Private Housing, Educational Opportunity Program, Generalist for regional higher education location, Academic Support (3), Student Organizations and Leadership Development, Academic Affairs, Theme Housing Programs, Research, and Honors and Scholars Programs.

Of the 435 respondents, 190 (43.6%) indicated that they worked at the Entry Level, 184 (42.2%) the Mid Level, 8 (1.8%), the Senior Level, 8 (1.8%) Senior Student Affairs Officer Level, 4 (0.9%) as Faculty Members, 18 (4.1%) as College/University Administrators, 15 (3.4%) as Graduate Students, and 8 (1.8%) as Other. Position categories given by respondents choosing Other included: Administrative Faculty, Staff Psychologist, Director of Institutional Research, Mid Level, Family Services Coordinator, and Ph.D. Student also in mid level management assistantship. One respondent described them self as, “Age 50 Second Career as Counselor, left field after 2 years in entry level position.”

Of the 435 respondents, 100 (22.9%) had been in their position for 1 year, 118 (27.1%) 2 years, 116 (26.6%) 3 years, 59 (13.5%) 4 years, 29 (6.7%) 5 years, and 13 (3.0%) 6 or more years. Respondents had a mean score of 2.62 for the number of years they had been in their position. The reported median, for years in position was 2.0 and the mode was 2.0. Of the 435 respondents, 79 (18.1%) had been at their institution for 1 year, 103 (23.6%) 2 years, 116 (26.6%) 3 years, 58 (13.3%) 4 years, 43 (9.7%) 5 years, 36 (8.3%) 6 or more years, and 1 (0.2%) did not indicate the number of years at their institution. Respondents reported a mean of 2.97 for years they had been at their institution. The reported median was 3.0 and mode was 3.0 for years at institution. Complete demographic data for all subjects can be found in Appendix K. Respondent’s institutions are identified in Appendix L.

Female subjects were the highest group of respondents for this study at 69%. This number is consistent with the high number of females who enter the student affairs profession. ACPA membership data (See Appendix N) obtained for December 2003 showed females totaling 57.70% of membership with males totaling 42.26%. Women represent the highest enrollment in graduate preparation programs that produce new professionals for work in the field of student affairs administration (Jones & Komives, 2001). Jones and Komives (2001) have described this demographic trend as the “feminization of the profession.”

The racial diversity of the student affairs administration profession, based on this study, appears very low. ACPA membership data (See Appendix N) obtained for December 2003 showed 70.70% of membership as being Caucasian. Non-Caucasian membership totaled 19.17%, and 3.61% who did not indicate their ethnicity. The low number of minorities in the field, based on this study, is counter to the shifting demographic trends with regard to minorities in the workforce. Judy & D’Amico (1997), when describing the predicted changes to occur by the year 2020 stated,
Table 1. Frequencies for Respondents’ Functional Area of Employment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Functional area</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advising</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admissions/Enrollment Management</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment/Research</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.9</td>
<td>.9</td>
<td>9.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning/Placement</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>15.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commuter Services</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.9</td>
<td>.9</td>
<td>16.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counseling</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>19.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Aid</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.2</td>
<td>.2</td>
<td>19.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greek Affairs</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>21.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health/Drug and Alcohol</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>22.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Students</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.7</td>
<td>.7</td>
<td>23.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judicial Affairs</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>24.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership Development</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>27.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual &amp; Transgender Student Services</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.4</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>27.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multicultural Affairs</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>30.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orientation</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>33.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residence Life</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>38.9</td>
<td>39.8</td>
<td>73.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Learning</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>74.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Activities</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>87.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Affairs</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>92.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Union</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>93.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women's Resources</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.4</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>93.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>435</td>
<td>97.8</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

African Americans will make up about 11 percent of the U.S. workforce, the same as in 1995; Hispanics will increase to 14 percent of the workforce, up from 9 percent in 1995; Asians will increase to 6 percent of the workforce, up from 4 percent in 1995; and Whites will decrease to 68 percent, down from 76 in 1995,” (p. 21).

The shifting demographics of the U.S. workforce may not be as representative in the profession of student affairs administration, as described above.

Many of the respondents, 83.5%, had received a masters degree, with many of these in the area of student affairs, higher education, college student personnel, student development or counseling. This finding was not surprising as a master’s degree in one of these areas is a
common “union card” for work in student affairs administration. This is even truer as no bachelor level preparatory programs exist specifically for work in the field. Few new professionals in this study had completed a terminal degree. It is customary that many in the field acquire a doctoral degree after gaining some years of experience and those people then pursue higher-level administrative careers in student affairs administration.

The greatest number of respondents (39.7%) work in the functional area of residence life. It was found that 28.28% of ACPA’s membership works in this functional area. This area seems to employ greater numbers of new professionals each year, as there are also more positions in the area of residence life at colleges and universities than other functional areas. None of the respondents were from the functional areas of Disabled Student Services or Intramural/Recreation Sports. This deficit could be due in large part to new professionals in these functional areas identifying and belonging to professional associations in their specific functional areas such as AHEAD (Association on Higher Education and Disability) or NIRSA (National Intramural-Recreational Sports Association). No respondents indicated employment in the functional areas of Religious Programs or Teaching Faculty, as these more often require a terminal degree and a greater number of years of experience.

A greater number of the respondents were expected to select entry-level as their position level from the available choices for position level. Because the criteria were taken from the ACPA membership application, no explanation was given for position level choices, which may have resulted in the higher number of responses for respondent’s high use of mid-level as their position category. More discrimination should be used for the entry-level and mid-level position categories in future studies.

Descriptive Characteristics of Supervisors

Of the 435 respondents, 249 (57.1%) reported having a female supervisor, and 186 (42.7%) reported having a male supervisor. Supervisor’s race, as reported by their supervisee (respondent) included: 365 (83.7%) White or Caucasian, 41 (9.4%) Black of African American, 12 (2.8%) Hispanic or Hispanic American, 5 (1.1%) Asian or Pacific Islander, 5 (1.1%) Bi-Racial or Multicultural, and 7 (1.6%) Other. The responses for those who indicated Other included: African (Kenyan), 4 supervisors in two years (2 white, 1 Indian-American, 1 African American), Both are White or Caucasian, Jewish, Syrian, and Black Jamaican.

Of the 435 respondents 4 (0.9%) indicated that they supervisors worked at the Entry Level, 174 (39.9%) the Mid Level, 151 (34.6%) the Senior Level, 54 (12.4%) Senior Student Affairs Officer, 4 (0.9%) Faculty Member, 30 (6.9%) College/University Administrator, and 18 (4.1%) Other. Position categories given by respondents choosing other included: Administrative Faculty, Associate Director of Health Services, University Director, Director, Two supervisors, both Senior level, Assistant Dean of Student Activities, Dean of Academic Advising, Counseling and Multicultural Student Affairs, UCC Director and Assistant V.P. of Student Affairs, Vice President of the University and Dean of Student Life, Executive Director, Dean, Associate Director, Housing Director, Director of Residence Life, President, Dean of Students, Associate Dean and Senior Associate.
While the reported gender of supervisors for the subjects was more balanced (between males and females), subjects reported that 57.1% of their supervisors were female. This finding may also be a result of the shifting demographics of the student affairs administration profession. Student affairs administration has historically had more males in supervisory roles than females, particularly at senior levels. This trend seems to have been reversed based on study results.

Respondents, who chose White for race and the race of their supervisors were both high at 77.9% and 83.7% respectively. The high percentage of new professionals supervised by mid-level (39.9%) and senior (34.6%) supervisors was expected, although it was anticipated that more would choose the mid-level position category. The size and type of respondent’s institutions may best explain this response as new professionals are more likely to report to a mid-level supervisor at a larger public institution and a senior-level supervisor at a smaller private institution.

**Main Effect Hypotheses**

By computing Pearson correlation coefficients of the means for scores on the synergistic supervision scale, and for measures of job satisfaction and intention to turnover, the researcher looked for statistical significance between the variables. If (p < .05) was reached, the researcher concluded that a real relationship existed between synergistic supervision and measures of job satisfaction and/or intention to turnover (Frankel & Wallen, 2003). If (p <.05) was not reached for the hypothesis, the researcher concluded that a relationship did not exist between synergistic supervision and the measure of job satisfaction and/or intention to turnover.

**Hypothesis**

There will be a positive relationship between perceived level of synergistic supervision received and job satisfaction for new professionals in student affairs administration.

A positive significant correlation was found at (p <.01) between perceived level of synergistic supervision received and job satisfaction for new professionals in student affairs administration. This significant correlation exceeded the (p <.05) sought by the researcher and this finding demonstrates a positive relationship existing between synergistic supervision and job satisfaction for this study. Data for the correlation can be found in Table 2.

As discussed in Chapter Two, job satisfaction is related to many variables in the organization. Supervisor feedback (Katz & Weaver, 2000), social support (Klein & Weaver, 2000; Morrison, 1993; Nelson & Quick, 1991) and organizational commitment (Blackhurst, Brandt & Kalinowski) can all be linked to the supervisory relationship and job satisfaction of new professionals in student affairs administration. Locke (1969) described job satisfaction as being tied to one’s job in relation to attainment of job related values. Locke speaks to new professionals perception of their work in relation to their own prescribed or personally developed set of job related values. Ultimately, supervisors serve as communicators of job related values or leave new professionals to develop their own job related values that may or may not be consistent with those of the organization. New professionals are then left to develop their own perceptions of the supervision they receive and the job related values sought by the organization.
Table 2. Correlation for Synergistic Supervision and Job Satisfaction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SUPV Pearson Correlation</th>
<th>SUPV Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
<th>SUPV N</th>
<th>JOBSAT Pearson Correlation</th>
<th>JOBSAT Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
<th>JOBSAT N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SUPV</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>432</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>432</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOBSAT</td>
<td>.302**</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>431</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>431</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level

Those new professionals who perceive their supervisors as being synergistic are more likely to learn about their role within the organization and more likely to avoid role ambiguity. Job burnout can result from new professional’s inability to handle role conflict; role ambiguity, role orientation and role overload (Berwick, 1992). Each of these can be avoided through synergistic supervisory techniques. As mentioned earlier, synergistic supervisors are best able to identify and address new professional’s personal and professional development needs. The positive correlation found for this hypothesis suggests that new professionals who perceive their supervisors as synergistic are more satisfied with their jobs. Supervisors are more likely to be viewed as synergistic by their supervisee’s by demonstrating an interest in the long-term career goals and by orienting them to their role within the organization and the field of student affairs administration.

Supervisors are best able to address the dissatisfaction that may exist with their new professional employees. Evans (1988) suggested that job dissatisfaction could be attributed to the lack of opportunities for personal and professional growth, while working in student affairs. Supervisors can address the personal and professional development needs of their new professional staff members through the use of synergistic supervisory techniques. This allows the supervisor and supervisee an opportunity to establish clear and open lines of communication, where roles and expectations can be discussed freely. New professionals are able to gain valuable feedback from their supervisor through this technique. Recognition and feedback also play a powerful role in the synergistic relationship between a supervisor and supervisee. This is critical in the development of new professionals, as a lack of recognition and feedback may lead to job dissatisfaction and ultimately intentions to turnover. By identifying the professional aspirations of new professionals and assisting them in acquiring the necessary knowledge, skills and abilities, supervisors demonstrate their interest and commitment to their supervisee’s personal and professional development. This heightens the new professionals perception of their supervisors as being synergistic in their supervisory relationships with the new professional.
Hypothesis

There will be a negative relationship between perceived level of synergistic supervision received and intention to turnover for new professionals in student affairs administration.

A negative significant correlation was found at \((p < .01)\) between perceived level of synergistic supervision received and intention to turnover for new professionals in student affairs administration. This significant correlation exceeded the \((p < .05)\) sought by the researcher and this finding demonstrates a negative relationship existing between synergistic supervision and intention to turnover for this study. Data for the correlation can be found in Table 3.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SUPV</th>
<th>TURNOV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SUPV</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>432</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TURNOV</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>-.160**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>431</td>
<td>431</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

This finding suggests that new professionals who perceive their supervisors as low or not synergistic in their supervisor relationships will have greater intentions to turnover. What is not known, based on this study, is whether intention to turnover would likely involve a job change for the new professional or whether they would enter a new line of work. Harned and Murphy (1998) suggested that the lack or perceived lack of a support system might cause some to question their decision to stay or leave an organization. This finding speaks directly to the relationship between new professionals perception of their supervisor being synergistic or unsynergistic (lack of support system) and their intention to turnover. Johnsrud and Rosser’s (1999) study found that mid-level administrator’s decisions to stay or leave an organization were related to their perceptions of individual and institutional characteristics. They further suggested that supervisors not dismiss the perceptions of their employees.

Bender (1980) and Lorden (1998) found that the attrition of new professionals could be attributed to opportunities for goal attainment, professional development and career advancement. Each of these was discussed earlier as important to job satisfaction of new professionals. Job dissatisfaction is what ultimately leads to the intention to turnover among new professionals. Because new professionals potential for turnover is related to their work environments, new professionals who find meaningful relationships with their supervisors are
better able to meet their personal and professional development goals (Amey, 2002; Scher & Barr, 1979; Schneider, 2002). This relationship also decreases the new professional’s intention to turnover.

Interactive Hypotheses

By conducting crosstabs, the researcher found the frequencies for each type of dyad being examined by gender and race. Pearson correlation coefficients were used to determine if a significant relationship existed between synergistic supervision, job satisfaction, and intention to turnover for the supervisor/supervisee dyads. If \( p < .05 \) was reached, it was concluded that a relationship exists between synergistic supervision and job satisfaction and/or intention to turnover for supervisor/supervisee dyads for any of the identified variables.

Hypothesis

Gender will influence the relationship between synergistic supervision and job satisfaction such that the positive relationship between synergistic supervision and job satisfaction will be stronger for “like dyads” (e.g., male supervisor/male supervisee and female supervisor/female supervisee) than for “unlike dyads” (e.g., male supervisor/female supervisee and female supervisor/male supervisee).

The crosstabs indicated the following Supervisor/Supervisee dyads based on gender for the analysis of data: female supervisor/female supervisee, 172 dyads; female supervisor/male supervisee, 77 dyads; male supervisor/female supervisee, 129 dyads; and male supervisor/male supervisee 57 dyads.

Positive significant correlations for gender and synergistic supervision and job satisfaction were found for the following supervisor and supervisee dyads: Female Supervisor/Female supervisee \( p < .01 \), Female Supervisor/Male supervisee \( p < .01 \), Male Supervisor/Female supervisee \( p < .01 \). Data analysis related to these correlations can be found in Tables 4 - 6.

There were no negative significant correlations found for synergistic supervision and job satisfaction based on gender. The three significant correlations found above each exceeded the \( p < .05 \) criteria established by the researcher. Based on the interactive hypothesis stated above, gender was not found to influence the relationship between synergistic supervision and job satisfaction such that the positive relationship were found to be stronger for “like dyads” than for “unlike dyads.” The only supervisor/supervisee relationship that did not prove significant was among male supervisor/male supervisee.
Table 4. Correlation for Female Supervisor/Female Supervisee for Synergistic Supervision and Job Satisfaction and Synergistic Supervision and Intention to Turnover

Correlations (a)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SUPV</th>
<th>JOBSAT</th>
<th>TURNOV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SUPV</td>
<td>Pearson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Correlation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.287(**)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>169</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOBSAT</td>
<td>Pearson</td>
<td>-.087</td>
<td>-.454(**)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Correlation</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TURNOV</td>
<td>Pearson</td>
<td>-.240(*)</td>
<td>-.552(**)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Correlation</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

(a) Supervisor Gender = Female, Supervisee Gender = Female

Table 5. Correlation for Female Supervisor/Male Supervisee for Synergistic Supervision and Job Satisfaction and Synergistic Supervision and Intention to Turnover

Correlations (a)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SUPV</th>
<th>JOBSAT</th>
<th>TURNOV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SUPV</td>
<td>Pearson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Correlation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.308(**)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.006</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>77</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOBSAT</td>
<td>Pearson</td>
<td>-.240(*)</td>
<td>-.552(**)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Correlation</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TURNOV</td>
<td>Pearson</td>
<td>-.240(*)</td>
<td>-.552(**)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Correlation</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

* Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

(a) Supervisor Gender = Female, Supervisee Gender = Male
Table 6. Correlation for Male Supervisor/Female Supervisee for Synergistic Supervision and Job Satisfaction and Synergistic Supervision and Intention to Turnover

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SUPV</th>
<th>JOBSAT</th>
<th>TURNOV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Correlations</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUPV</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOBSAT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.372(**)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>128</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TURNOV</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>-.220(*)</td>
<td>-.505(**)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.013</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).
* Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).
a  Supervisor Gender = Male, Supervisee Gender = Female

Hypothesis

Gender will influence the relationship between synergistic supervision and intention to turnover such that the negative relationship between synergistic supervision and intention to turnover will be stronger for “unlike dyads” (e.g., male supervisor/female supervisee and female supervisor/male supervisee) than for “like dyads” (e.g., male supervisor/male supervisee and female supervisor/female supervisee).

There were no positive significant correlations found for gender and synergistic supervision and intention to turnover based on gender. Negative significant correlations found for gender and synergistic supervision and intention to turnover were found for the following supervisor and supervisee dyads: Female Supervisor/Male Supervisee (p < .05) and Male Supervisor/Female Supervisee (p < .05). Data analysis related to these correlations can be found in Tables 5 – 6 above.

The significant correlations for Female Supervisor/Male Supervisee and Female Supervisor/Male Supervisee met the (p < .05) criteria established by the researcher. Based on the interactive hypothesis stated above, gender was not found to influence the relationship between synergistic supervision and intention to turnover such that the negative relationship was found to be stronger for “like dyads,” than for “unlike dyads.”

The greatest number of dyad pairs for gender were found among female supervisors and female supervisees with 172 pairs. It was anticipated that men would make up the majority of the
supervisors at both the mid-level and senior-level, but the number of dyad pairs for male supervisors and male supervisees was only 57. This result may again be representative of the “feminization of the profession,” that Jones and Komives (2001) described.

The correlations between perceived level of synergistic supervision, job satisfaction, intention to turnover and gender, while strongly correlated in this study, did not prove to be more significant for like dyads than for unlike dyads. Some have suggested that the use of gender as a direct measure, rather than more direct measures of characteristics is a poor idea. Wagner and Hollenbeck (2002) found the effect of gender on “leadership” to be only slightly related to the critical characteristics of leadership. They further stated, “so much variability exists within men and women on the critical characteristics that using gender, instead of direct measures of the trait or decision-making style required for a particular situation is a poor idea,” (p. 293). Wagner and Hollenbeck suggested that the wide variability within demographic sub-groupings weakens the predictive power of gender. The current study supports this notion presented by Hollenbeck above.

Some research on gender in student affairs administration has examined the characteristics associated with differences in supervisory style, with regard to men and women (Ragins, 1991). Clement and Rickard (1992b), in a study of 210 student affairs practioners, found that, “women were expected to be more nurturing, more collaborative and less hierarchical, and more forgiving than their male counterparts,” (p. 241). Baxter Magolda (1994), when discussing gender characteristics, stated:

Viewing differences as stemming from biological sex leads to the assumption that all members of a sex share universal characteristics. Such notions supported the perceived dichotomy between men and women and thus were used to perpetuate the dominance of the abstract, rational view of development. The whole approach constrains our understanding of both male and female development by holding each to a universal standard,” (p. 13-14).

Jones and Komives (2001) stated that new theories of leadership are emphasizing the feminist values of, “inclusion, relationships, cooperation, and empowerment,” (p. 238). These values could be associated with the characteristics of synergistic supervision including: dual focus, joint effort, two-way communication, growth orientation and proactivity (Carpenter, Torres & Winston, 2001; Creamer & Winston, 2002, September 12; Janosik & Creamer, 2003; Saunders, Cooper, Winston, & Chernow, 2000; Winston & Creamer, 1997, 1998). While links can be drawn between the feminist values and synergistic supervision described above, no gender was found to more significance was found for like dyads than for unlike dyads. This simply meant that neither gender was found to be more synergistic than the other.

Hypothesis

Race will influence the relationship between synergistic supervision and job satisfaction such that the positive relationship between synergistic supervision and job satisfaction will be stronger for “like dyads” (e.g., White supervisor/White supervisee and non-White
supervisor/non-White supervisee) than for “unlike dyads” (e.g., White supervisor/non-White supervisee and non-White supervisor/White supervisee).

The crosstabs indicated the following Supervisor/Supervisee dyads based on race for the analysis of data: White Supervisor/White Supervisee 298 dyads; White Supervisor/Non-White Supervisee 67 dyads; Non-White Supervisor/White Supervisee 41 dyads; and Non-White Supervisor/Non-White Supervisee 29 dyads.

Positive significant correlations for race and synergistic supervision and job satisfaction were found for the following supervisor and supervisee dyads: White Supervisor/White Supervisee ($p < .01$), White Supervisor/Non-White Supervisee ($p < .01$). Data analysis related to these correlations can be found in Tables 7 - 8.

Table 7. Correlation for White Supervisor/White Supervisee for Synergistic Supervision and Job Satisfaction and Synergistic Supervision and Intention to Turnover

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SUPV</th>
<th>JOBSAT</th>
<th>TURNOV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SUPV</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOBSAT</td>
<td>.294(**)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TURNOV</td>
<td>-.112</td>
<td>-.507(**)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** Significant correlations found for the above dyads exceeded the ($p < .05$) established by the researcher. There were no negative significant correlations found for synergistic supervision and job satisfaction based on race. Based on the interactive hypothesis stated above, race was not found to influence the relationship between synergistic supervision and job satisfaction such that the positive relationship was found to be stronger for “like dyads,” than for “unlike dyads.”
Table 8. Correlation for White Supervisor/Non-White Supervisee for Synergistic Supervision and Job Satisfaction and Synergistic Supervision and Intention to Turnover

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>CORRELATIONS(a)</th>
<th>SUPV</th>
<th>JOBSAT</th>
<th>TURNOV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SUPV</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>66</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOBSAT</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.372(***).</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>66</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TURNOV</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>-.151</td>
<td>-.381(***).</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.226</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

a  Supervisor Race = White or Caucasian, Supervisee Race = Non White or Caucasian

Hypothesis

Race will influence the relationship between synergistic supervision and intention to turnover such that the negative relationship between synergistic supervision and intention to leave will be stronger for “unlike dyads” (e.g., white supervisor/non-white supervisee and non-white supervisor/white supervisee) than for “like dyads” (e.g., white supervisor/white supervisee and non-white supervisor/non-white supervisee).

There were no significant positive correlations found for synergistic supervision and intention to turnover based on race. Negative significant correlations found for synergistic supervision and intention to turnover, based on race, were found for the following supervisor and supervisee dyad: Non-White Supervisor/White Supervisee (p <.01). Data analysis related to this correlation can be found in Table 9.

This correlation exceeded the (p <.05) established by the researcher. Based on the interactive hypothesis stated above, race was not found to moderate the relationship between synergistic supervision and intention to turnover such that the negative relationship was found to be stronger for “unlike dyads,” than for “like dyads.” It was not surprising to find the greatest number of dyad pairs by gender existed for White Supervisor/White Supervisee, with 298 pairs. By comparison, the lowest number of dyad pairs was for Non-White Supervisor/ Non-White Supervisee at 29 pairs.
Table 9. Correlation for Non-White Supervisor/White Supervisee for Synergistic Supervision and Job Satisfaction and Synergistic Supervision and Intention to Turnover

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SUPV</th>
<th>JOBSAT</th>
<th>TURNOV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SUPV</td>
<td>SUPV</td>
<td>JOBSAT</td>
<td>TURNOV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.302</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.055</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOBSAT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>-.507(**)</td>
<td>-.558(**)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TURNOV</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

a  Supervisor Race = Non White or Caucasian, Supervisee Race = White or Caucasian

Race, like gender, may not be a good indicator of supervisory characteristics. Other behavioral characteristics, not related to gender or race, should be considered. Harrison Morson, a Black chief student affairs officer, in Effective Leadership in Student Services: Voices from the Field (1992), discussed his role as a supervisor. He stated, “Some truly expected and accepted less in traditional performance standards because of my ethnicity. Others anticipated, particularly many [Black] brothers and sisters special treatment,” (p. 195). Student affairs leaders who have experienced discrimination or stereotyping, based on gender or race, have lower overall morale. This has not; however, directly affected their intentions to leave, but instead has diminished their level of morale (Johnsrud & Roseer, 1999).

Hypothesis

Length of the relationship between the supervisor and subordinate will influence the relationship between synergistic supervision and job satisfaction such that the positive relationship between synergistic supervision and job satisfaction will be stronger as the length of the time together increases.

Of the 435 respondents, 167 (38.3%) reported the length of their relationship with their supervisor at 1 year, 128 (29.4%) 2 years, 76 (17.4%) 3 years, 35 (8.0%) 4 years, 15 (3.4%) 5 years, and 14 (3.2%) 6 or more years. Respondents reported a mean of 2.17 for length of relationship with supervisor. Their reported median was 2.0 and reported mode was 1.0.

Based on the interactive hypothesis stated above, Pearson correlation coefficients were run for length of relationship. Length of relationship between the supervisor and supervisee was not found to influence the relationship between synergistic supervision and job satisfaction such
that the positive relationship between synergistic supervision and job satisfaction was stronger as the length of time together increased.

Hypothesis

Length of the relationship between the supervisor and supervisee will influence the relationship between synergistic supervision and intention to turnover such that the negative relationship between synergistic supervision and job satisfaction will be stronger as the length of the time together increases.

Based on the interactive hypothesis stated above, Pearson correlation coefficients were run for length of relationship. Length of relationship between the supervisor and supervisee was not found to influence the relationship between synergistic supervision and intention to turnover such that the negative relationship between synergistic supervision and job satisfaction was stronger as the length of time together increased.

The greatest number of supervisor/supervisee dyads existed for the shortest period of time, one year. As the length of relationship increased the fewer number of respondents indicated they were in those relationships. This finding indicates that this research captured the greatest number of new professionals in this group, with the majority engaged in their current supervisory relationship for two or less years. For many, this more than likely also means they are currently employed in their first professional position in the field of student affairs administration.

Exploratory Variables

Type of institution, size of employing institution, and level within the organization were examined as exploratory variables. By running Pearson correlation coefficients of the means for scores on the exploratory variables with the variables of synergistic supervision, job satisfaction and intention to turnover, the researcher looked for statistical significance between the variables. If significance was reached in response to any of the correlations the researcher concluded that a positive relationship existed or did not exist.

A positive significant correlation was found at (p <.01) between intention to turnover and supervisor position level for new professionals in student affairs administration. This correlation exceeded the (p <.05) sought by the researcher and demonstrates a positive relationship between intention to turnover and supervisor position level within the organization. Data for this correlation can be found in Table 10.

A positive significant correlation was found at (p <.05) between perceived level of synergistic supervision received and supervisee position level for new professionals in student affairs administration. This significant correlation met the (p <.05) sought be the researcher and this finding demonstrates a positive relationship existing between perceived level of synergistic supervision and supervisee position level within the organization. Data for this correlation can be found in Table 11.
Table 10. Correlation for Intention to Turnover and Supervisor Position Level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>TURNOV</th>
<th>Supervisor position category</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Supervisors</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>431</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisors</td>
<td>-.188**</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>430</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

A research study (Ward, 1995) that examined new professionals who had worked in the field for two years or less, suggested that greater attention should be given to the characteristics of the organization in which professionals work. Ward’s findings indicated that when morale and decision-making autonomy were enhanced that propensity to leave was reduced. As a result role conflict and ambiguity are minimized, as previously discussed (Ward, 1995). Tarver, Canada, & Lim, 1999) suggested that job satisfaction is linked to “locus of control” in organizations among student affairs professionals. This notion gives greater emphasis on regard for the job and overall organizational working conditions, rather than the relationship between the supervisor/supervisee.

Table 11. Correlation for Perceived Level of Synergistic Supervision Received and Supervisee Position Level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SUPV</th>
<th>Supervisee position category</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Supervisors</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>432</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisors</td>
<td>.115*</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>431</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).
No significant correlations were found for the variables of type of institution or size of employing institution. While the exact effects of type of institution are not known, Wood, Winston, and Polkosnik (1985) stated, “the longer an individual remains in higher education the more likely he or she will remain,” (p. 537). It is also assumed that both students and professionals remain in higher education settings because they are congruent with their values and it meets their needs (Wood, Winston, & Polkosnik, 1985).

Post Hoc Analysis

A correlation matrix (See Appendix M) was created by calculating Pearson correlation coefficients for all variables examined in the study. Several significant correlations were found for both supervisor and supervisee level within the organization.

A significant positive correlation at (p < .05) was found between supervisee position level within the organization and perceived level of synergistic supervision received. This result is presented in Table 12.

Table 12. Correlations for Supervisor and Supervisee Position Level within the Organization

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Supervisee position category</th>
<th>Pearson Correlation (Sig. (2-tailed))</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Supervisee position category</th>
<th>Pearson Correlation (Sig. (2-tailed))</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Supervisor position category</th>
<th>Pearson Correlation (Sig. (2-tailed))</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>TURNOV</th>
<th>Pearson Correlation (Sig. (2-tailed))</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Supervisee position category</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUPV</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.115*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.017</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>431</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor position category</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.337**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>435</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TURNOV</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.106</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-.078</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.160**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>430</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).
** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).
This correlation suggested a relationship between the employment level of new professionals and their perceptions of their supervisors as being synergistic. With many new professionals in need of orientation and socialization to their work in student affairs and higher education, those receiving assistance from their supervisors for their personal and professional development are more likely to view their supervisors as being synergistic. New professionals who may be supervised by mid-level professionals (who may lack training and experience as supervisors) may receive less orientation or socialization to their work and institutions (Dalton, 1996). Those who do not receive this assistance from their supervisor, in an effort to orient and socialize them to the profession, will likely view their supervisors as being less synergistic. Those new professionals working at higher-level positions may have less reliance on their supervisor for orientation and feedback. If so, they may perceive their supervisor as being less synergistic. As discussed in Chapter One, those new professionals who are engaged in synergistic supervisory relationships may have greater job satisfaction, and perceptions of opportunities for professional development, and may be less likely to turnover.

A significant negative correlation at (p < .01) was found between supervisor position level within the organization and intention to turnover. This result is presented in Table 12 above. This correlation suggested a relationship between the employment level of the supervisor and the supervisee intention to turnover. This may be related to the notion that many new professionals are supervised by mid-level professionals with little training or experience with the supervisory process (Dalton, 1996). If these new professionals are not able to receive an orientation to their work, the institution and the profession from these mid-level supervisors, they may have greater intention to turnover. Those in more senior-level positions, who supervise new professionals, may have more ability to provide the new professional with a synergistic experience due to their longevity and experience at the institution or in the profession of student affairs administration. While this does not always insure a synergistic experience, it may be a more natural process for both the supervisor and the supervisee. The data analysis for the two above-mentioned correlations can be found in table 10.

A positive significant correlation at (p < .01) was found between the number of years in position for supervisees and intention to turnover. This result is presented in Table 13.

This correlation suggested a relationship between the number of years in a position and a new professionals intention to turnover. While the exact cause of this relationship is not known for this study, the turnover that exists may occur for a variety of reasons. For those who have spent a few years as a new professional in the field, their reasons for turnover may be related to advancement opportunities in the field. In this case, their intention to turnover would not be viewed as negatively by members of the profession. For others, their intentions to turnover may be related to their overall job satisfaction (Bender, 1980; Lorden, 1998) or experiences with their work environments (Ward, 1995) in the field of student affairs administration. Winston, Wood and Polksnik (1985) however; argue that the longer professionals remain in the field of student affairs and higher education work, the greater the chances that they will remain for the duration of their career. This result may also be directly related to a new professionals congruence with the values of the profession or work in higher education. For some new professionals, other reasons may attribute to their turnover, such as lack of contact with students, which may have been a primary reason they entered the field (DiBrito & Kelly, 1987).
Table 13. Correlation for Number of Years in Position and Intention to Turnover

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Correlations</th>
<th>Number of years in position</th>
<th>TURNOV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of years in position</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td></td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td>435</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TURNOV</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.127**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td></td>
<td>.009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td>430</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

A significant positive correlation at (p < .05) was found between the number of years at an institution for supervisees and their perceived level of synergistic supervision received. This result is presented in Table 14.

Table 14. Correlation for Number of Years at Institution and Perceived Level of Synergistic Supervision Received

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Correlations</th>
<th>Number of years at institution</th>
<th>SUPV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of years at institution</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td></td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td>435</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUPV</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.112*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td></td>
<td>.020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td>431</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).
This correlation suggested a relationship between the number of years spent at an institution and their perceptions of their supervisors as being synergistic. New professionals' perception of their supervisors as being synergistic may be due in large part to the amount of time spent together. It may also be attributed to new professional’s successful orientation and socialization into the institution and profession, which may not have occurred solely through their relationship with their supervisor, but rather as a result of a strong peer group or other network within the institution or profession. As length of time spent together for the supervisor and supervisee increases, supervisees may experience opportunities for personal and professional growth as a result of their relationship with their supervisor. These opportunities for personal and professional growth, if positive, may increase the supervisee’s view of the supervisor as being synergistic and ultimately lengthen the supervisee’s employment at the institution and within the profession of student affairs administration.

A significant positive correlation at (p < .01) was found between the length of the supervisory relationship for the supervisor and the supervisee and perceived level of synergistic supervision received. This result is presented in Table 15.

Table 15. Length of Supervisory Relationship and Perceived Level of Synergistic Supervision Received

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Correlations</th>
<th>Length of relationship</th>
<th>SUPV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Length of relationship Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.198**</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>431</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>432</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

This correlation suggested a relationship between the length of the supervisory relationship and their perceptions of their supervisors as being synergistic. While earlier correlations for length of supervisor/supervisee relationship were analyzed for the variables in this study, the correlations length of the supervisor/supervisee relationship were not found to increase as the length of the relationship increased. This correlation found on the correlation matrix may suggest a positive relationship, but the strength of the relationship may be neutralized after time. The correlation relationship for length of supervisor/supervisee relationship, like that of number of years spent at institution, may likely increase supervisees perceptions of their supervisors as being synergistic.
A significant negative correlation at (p < .05) was found between supervisor’s race and supervisee job satisfaction. This correlation is presented in Table 16.

This correlation suggested a relationship between supervisor’s race and job satisfaction of supervisees. This may be attributed to supervisee’s expectations of their supervisors. Some supervisees may experience lower job satisfaction due to cultural differences with their supervisors. These differences may not at all be related to synergistic supervisory characteristics. As Morson stated above, some expect less in performance standards of their supervisor or may expect some special treatment for one reason or another. This may lead to their job dissatisfaction and may have less to do with the characteristics of synergistic supervision. Supervisees may or may not relate more to supervisors who are more like them. Many supervisees of minorities may not have an appreciation for the “payment of dues” that their supervisors have or are experiencing as a result of their ascent up the student affairs ladder. Igbaria and Wormley (1992) stated that employers cannot assume that the perceptions or experiences on the job of Black and White employees or other subgroups are the same. This may also be true of the supervisory relationship.

### Table 16. Correlation for Supervisor Race and Job Satisfaction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Supervisor Race</th>
<th>JOBSAT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- .097*</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.045</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>430</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>431</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*: Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

**Summary**

This chapter has presented results of a research study conducted to examine the relationship between perceived level of synergistic supervision received, job satisfaction and intention to turnover of new professionals in student affairs administration. Data for this study were analyzed for 435 student affairs professionals, representing a 43.8% response rate, who completed the online survey consisting of questions from the Synergistic Supervision Scale and
selected questions on job satisfaction and intention to turnover from the Michigan Organizational Assessment Questionnaire.

An analysis of the main effect hypotheses was conducted by correlating the means of respondent’s scores on the Synergistic Supervision Scale (SSS) with questions related to job satisfaction and turnover. A significant positive relationship was found at the .01 level between perceived level of synergistic supervision (SSS) and job satisfaction. A significant negative relationship was found at (p< .01) between perceived level of synergistic supervision (SSS) and intention to turnover.

An analysis of the interactive hypotheses was conducted by correlating the means of respondent’s scores on the Synergistic Supervision Scale (SSS) with questions related to the job satisfaction and turnover based on supervisor/supervisee gender, race, and length of supervisory relationship. Several significant positive and negative correlations were found between the moderating variables gender, race, and length of supervisory relationship and perceived level of synergistic supervision, job satisfaction, and intention to turnover. Data was analyzed to determine if any of the variables would result in stronger significant relationship for “like dyads.” Gender, race, and length of supervisory relationship were not found to moderate the relationships between perceived level of synergistic supervision, job satisfaction, and intention to turnover, such that the relationship was stronger for “like dyads.” The length of supervisory relationship was not found to influence the relationship between perceived level of synergistic supervision and job satisfaction such that a relationship between the two was stronger as the length of time together increased. The length of supervisory relationship was not found to influence the relationship between perceived level of synergistic supervision and intention to turnover such that a negative relationship was stronger as the length of time together increases.

After Pearson correlation coefficients for each of the exploratory variables (type of institution, size of institution, and level within the organization) two significant correlations for the exploratory variables were found when correlated with scores for perceived level of synergistic supervision received, job satisfaction and intention to turnover. A correlation matrix was created by correlating each survey and demographic variable to all others in the study. Several significant positive and negative correlations were found. Those correlations that were directly related to the synergetic supervision, job satisfaction and intention to turnover have been reported. Significant positive correlations were found between: supervisee position level within the organization and perceived level of synergistic supervision received; number of years in position and intention to turnover; number of years at an institution and perceived level synergistic supervision received; and length of supervisory relationship and perceived level of synergistic supervision received. Significant negative correlations were found between: supervisee level within the organization and intention to turnover; supervisor level within the organization and intention to turnover; race of supervisor and job satisfaction.
CHAPTER 5
SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This chapter contains a summary of the study as well as conclusions and recommendations based on the results of the dissertation research. The summary includes a review of the study’s purpose and research questions and a discussion of important findings. Implications for new professionals, supervisors and the student affairs profession are also outlined. Recommendations for future study of the variables and population are presented in the last section of this chapter.

Summary

This research study was conducted to examine the relationship between perceived level of synergistic supervision received, job satisfaction, and intention to turnover of new professionals in student affairs administration. This study also examined several exploratory variables related to the above mentioned variables. Results of the analysis of data will be discussed for each of the research questions. Additional results, conducted post hoc, will be discussed for correlations related to the variables of synergistic supervision, job satisfaction and intention to turnover. The analysis of data collected in the research study revealed a number of significant positive and negative relationships between the study variables. These will be discussed in further detail.

Purpose

The purpose of this study was to examine the relationship between the variables of perceived level of synergistic supervision received, job satisfaction, and intention to turnover of new professionals in student affairs administration. After a review of student affairs, higher education and management literature the following research questions were designed to guide the study:

1. Is there a relationship between perceived level of synergistic supervision received and job satisfaction of new professionals in student affairs administration?
2. Is there a relationship between perceived level of synergistic supervision received and intention to turnover of new professionals in student affairs administration?
3. Is there a relationship between perceived level of synergistic supervision received and job satisfaction of new professionals in student affairs administration based on gender of supervisor and supervisee?
4. Is there a relationship between perceived level of synergistic supervision received and job satisfaction of new professionals in student affairs administration based on race of supervisor and supervisee?
5. Is there a relationship between perceived level of synergistic supervision received and intention to turnover of new professionals in student affairs administration based on gender of supervisor and supervisee?

6. Is there a relationship between perceived level of synergistic supervision received and intention to turnover of new professionals in student affairs administration based on race of supervisor and supervisee?

7. Is there a relationship between perceived level of synergistic supervision received, job satisfaction, and intention to turnover of new professionals in student affairs administration based on size of employing institution and type of employing institution?

8. Is there a relationship between perceived level of synergistic supervision received, job satisfaction, and intention to turnover of new professionals in student affairs administration based on supervisor position level, supervisee position level and length of supervisor/supervisee relationship?

The relationship between perceived level of synergistic supervision received and job satisfaction

The researcher had hypothesized that there would be a positive relationship found between perceived level of synergistic supervision received and job satisfaction. The results of this study showed a positive significant correlation between perceived level of synergistic supervision received and job satisfaction for new professionals surveyed. Study results indicated that the characteristics of synergistic supervision were present for many of the new professionals surveyed. This positive relationship should contribute to personal and professional development of new professionals and lead to reduced role ambiguity, job burnout and work overload, as discussed in Chapter Two. Previous research findings (Evans, 1988) have indicated that new professionals have greater perceived opportunities for goal attainment and career advancement as a result of being in synergistic supervisory relationships.

The researcher had hypothesized that correlations for like dyads, based on gender and race, would be stronger than for unlike dyads. When this relationship was examined, stronger correlations for like dyads were not found for gender or race. Positive significant correlations, for gender, were found for all possible combinations of supervisor/supervisee dyad pairs for perceived level of synergistic supervision and job satisfaction except the male/male dyad. This finding was of interest to the researcher since all other combinations of supervisor/supervisee dyad pairs were found to be significantly correlated.

Researchers have stated that the effects of gender on the supervisor/supervisee relationship are negligible (Ragins, 1991; Schneider, 2002; Wagner & Hollenbeck, 2002). They have further stated that researchers examining supervisor/supervisee relationships should place greater emphasis on behavioral characteristics, rather than gender. The findings of this study, are not consistent with others (Jones & Komives; Gardiner & Tiggeman, 1999; Liden, 1985; Morgan, 1997; Rickard & Clement, 1994) that suggested gender differences may be important when examining supervisory relationships. Female supervisors have been described as more democratic, focused on relationships and collaborative (Clement & Rickard, 1994; Gardiner & Tiggeman, 1999; Jones & Komives, 1999), while male supervisors have been described as being
results oriented, logical thinkers, and goal driven (Gardiner & Tiggeman, 1999; Morgan, 1997). Both male and female supervisors were found to be synergistic in this study. Those traits defined as masculine have been described as more desirable for those seeking to become successful managers, while those who possess feminine traits can be seen as less competent or successful (Gardiner & Tiggeman, 1999).

The question of why male supervisors and male supervisees were not found to be correlated for perceived level of synergistic supervision received and job satisfaction is important to consider. Some reasonable explanations can be suggested as well as research. Previous research has described the supervisory characteristics of both males and females as being different (Tsui, Egan, & O’Reilly, 1992; Liden, 1985). Newell (2001) stated that males do not possess good active listening skills. This involves concentrating on what is being said and showing empathy for the speaker. Metcalfe and Altman (2001) stated that males practice the “masculine” traits associated with success at the expense of practicing the “feminine” traits viewed as less successful.

The researcher would argue that males practicing “masculine” traits are neglecting those traits outlined in this study as being synergistic. This has been described by Wilson (2001) as macho management. This style has been described as highly aggressive, ruthless and clearly damaging to most subordinates (Wilson, 2001). Kanter (1993) has described the way that many corporations and organizations have operated in order to promote males to positions of power. Forman (2001) stated that “competitive masculinity” now exists when previously “paternalistic management” practices may have once existed. This is as a result of both internal and external competition present in the workplace. The researcher proposes that the practice of “macho management” by both supervisor and supervisee could lead to competitiveness and a relationship that is opposite of synergistic. This competitive relationship could be enhanced in the male/male dyad supervisory relationship.

The relationship between perceived level of synergistic supervision received and intention to turnover

The researcher had hypothesized that there would be a negative relationship found between perceived level of synergistic supervision received and intention to turnover for new professionals surveyed. Study results confirmed a significant negative correlation between perceived level of synergistic supervision received and intention to turnover. The results demonstrated that lack of a synergistic supervisory relationship could lead to greater intentions to turnover among new professionals. The results, along with others (Creamer & Winston, 2002; Harned & Murphy, 1998), confirmed that the quality of supervision could be a reason for some new professionals to thrive and for others to leave the field of student affairs administration. New professionals intentions to turnover have been attributed to their level of job satisfaction (Bender, 1980; Hamel & Mathieu, 1990; Lorden, 1998). Job satisfaction has been linked to quality of supervision received (Amey, 2002; Arminio & Creamer, 2001; Schneider, 2002).

The researcher had hypothesized that correlations for unlike dyads, based on gender and race, would be stronger than for like dyads. When the relationships were examined, stronger correlations for unlike dyads were not found for gender or race. A review of literature found that
similarity of supervisees to their supervisors would lead to less intention to turnover (Tsui, Egan, & O’Reilly, 1992). The review of the literature revealed that minority supervisors and supervisees may be striving to operate effectively while experiencing additional pressures in their positions (Trimble, Allen, & Viodoni, 1991). Tsui, Egan, & O’Reilly (1992) found that differences in gender between supervisor-subordinate dyads could lead to role ambiguity and lower levels of attraction between supervisor-subordinate dyads and thus greater intentions to turnover.

The effects of Institutional Size, Type of Employing Institution and Position Levels

The researcher had hypothesized that the length of the supervisory relationship for dyad pairs would influence the relationship between synergistic supervision, job satisfaction and intention to turnover. The length of the supervisory relationship was not found to influence the relationship between synergistic supervision, job satisfaction and intention to turnover. Of those surveyed, over 50% had been in their supervisory relationship for two years or less. For many of the new professionals surveyed, this likely meant that they were in their first professional position in the field of student affairs administration. This notion is important with regard to intention to turnover. Creamer and Winston (2002) stated that the quality of supervision received in the first one or two jobs is a reason that some choose to leave the field.

Institutional type, size and supervisor/supervisee position levels within the organization were studied as exploratory variables. The results of the analysis on these variables showed two positive significant relationships. The researcher did not develop any hypotheses related to these correlations, but rather correlated these as exploratory variables. The position level of supervisors was found to be correlated to supervisee’s intention to turnover. Study results found that approximately 75% of respondents were supervised by supervisors in mid-level positions or lower. Thirty-nine percent of the respondents reported to entry-level supervisors. Mid-level and many entry-level supervisors may have little training or experience in the supervision process (Dalton 1996). This lack of experience could be associated with new professional’s intention to turnover. New professionals who receive inadequate supervision have difficulty in the orientation and socialization process to their work environment and the field of student affairs administration. Poor supervision can lead to job dissatisfaction and ultimately increased intentions to leave the field.

The position level of supervisees was found to be correlated to perceived level of synergistic supervision received, for new professionals surveyed. Study results indicated that 43.6% of the survey respondents worked at the entry level. A combined 85.8% reported that they worked at the mid-level or below. Research has shown that student affairs professionals, particularly those at the entry-level, may require more concentrated supervision and time in the process (Creamer & Winston, 2002, September 12). Supervisors in mid-level positions may be less able to provide synergistic supervision. This notion is even more important as those new professionals surveyed in this study are more likely to be oriented, socialized and have greater perceptions of opportunities for professional development and career advancement, in synergistic supervisory relationships. Survey respondent’s who have stronger perceptions of their supervisor’s as being synergistic will benefit from discussions about their performance, long-term career goals, and personal attitudes (Winston & Creamer, 1997). Winston and Hirt (2003)
found that many leave the field due to a lack of autonomy in their new positions. For new professionals in this study, autonomy could be something gained through experience; an area that should be addressed through the supervisory process.

*Post Hoc Analysis*

As discussed earlier in Chapter 4, a correlation matrix was created by running Pearson correlation coefficients for all study variables. Several significant correlations related to the variables were found. The positive correlation found between supervisee position level and perceived level of synergistic supervision received may relate to the amount of orientation and socialization new professionals usually receive when entering the field. The position level of the new professional may be directly related to the concentration and time received in the supervisory process. Those new professionals with supervisory needs not satisfactorily addressed will likely view their supervisors as being less synergetic in the supervisory process. Like supervisee position level, the level of the supervisor is important in the supervisory process. The correlation matrix produced a correlation between supervisor position level and supervisee intentions to turnover. Those supervisors who are not equipped to properly supervise their new professional supervisees may likely contribute to job dissatisfaction and heightened intentions to leave the field.

Like the position level of new professionals, the number of years worked in the field of student affairs was significantly correlated to both perceived level of synergistic supervision received and intention to turnover. This correlation is important as research has shown that the longer professionals remain in the field of student affairs and higher education the greater the chances that they will remain for their careers (Winston, Wood, & Polksnik, 1985); this result has implications for the retention of new professionals in the field. Study results showed a significant correlation between the length of the supervisor/supervisee relationship and supervisee’s perceived level of synergistic supervision received. This notion could have greater implications for “like dyads” as similarity of supervisees to their supervisors has lead to greater organizational attachment (Harrison, Price, & Bell, 1998; Mueller, Finley, Iverson, & Price, 1999). Pos hoc analysis results showed a negative significant correlation between race and job satisfaction. For those new professionals surveyed, this notion may be explained by similarity/attraction or relational demography theories outlined in Chapter Two. These theories held that individuals who are similar to individuals might hold more positive attitudes and behaviors.

*Implications for New Professionals and Supervisors*

The results of this study have implications for new professionals, supervisors and the profession of student affairs administration. Several implications for new professionals, supervisors and the profession follow.

1. This study confirms the importance of effective supervisory characteristics that can lead to the development of new professionals in student affairs administration.
Winston and Creamer stated that supervisors should: “Establish and open, trusting relationship between staff member and supervisor, determine each staff member’s career anchor; identify professional aspirations of staff; and identify necessary knowledge and skills required of staff to advance professionally,” (1998, p. 36-37). By doing this, supervisors at all levels within student affairs administration can work with new professionals in a holistic manner. While the extent of the characteristics necessary for the effective supervision of new professionals may not be totally known, those outlined by Winston and Creamer provide a group of focused activities that can contribute to the development of student affairs professionals. Those outlined above appear to transcend many common effective techniques used by supervisors for work with new professionals. Some may argue that synergistic supervision is similar to aspects of mentoring. For some new professionals, their supervisors may serve as their mentors (Tull, 2003, September 16). In this event, the opportunities for development of the new professional are strengthened and sustained beyond the immediate supervisory relationship.

2. A new professionals orientation and socialization model can be developed from the results of this study that effectively prepares them for work in the profession of student affairs administration.

The organizational entry process is a time when new professionals are faced with the challenges, expectations and responsibilities of their institutional work and the profession of student affairs administration. The characteristics of synergistic supervision appear especially suited to the orientation and socialization process for new professionals. By developing a synergistic relationship with their supervisor, new professionals are able to make known their personal and professional aspirations, and gain the necessary knowledge and skills to succeed and advance in the profession.

By establishing synergistic relationships with new professionals, supervisors are able to communicate the organization’s goals, norms and values and information necessary for the job. This approach makes it more likely that the culture of the work and organization are properly communicated to the new professional. Supervisors will also more likely gain loyalty and respect from their new professional supervisee and create an open and trusting relationship in which communication can more easily take place.

3. A philosophy of management for supervisors at all levels in student affairs administration can be utilized and best maximize the personal and professional development of new student affairs professionals.

New professionals who participated in synergistic relationships are better able to determine career anchors and identify professional aspirations with their supervisors. Both the supervisor and the new professional are able to share feedback in an open and trusting relationship. This allows the new professional an opportunity to seek feedback on their performance and discuss their progress on professional development initiatives. New professionals in synergistic relationships also receive regular appraisals of their work and are able to make adjustments based on information obtained from the supervisor. Synergistic supervision also benefits supervisors. By engaging in two-way communication with their new professional supervisee, supervisors are able to obtain
feedback on their performance as a supervisor. They may also benefit from a mentor-type relationship with a new professional supervisee. Supervisors may be rewarded by seeing their supervisees develop and advance in the profession. Synergistic supervision thus provides opportunities for personal and professional development for both supervisors and new professionals.

4. Several factors contributing to the job dissatisfaction and intention to turnover of new professionals in student affairs administration were identified from the study and can be useful in the professional preparation and orientation of new professionals.

New professionals and supervisors who are knowledgeable and concerned about job dissatisfaction and intention to turnover can work to avoid the problem through practice of synergistic supervision. Supervisors should take seriously the important role they play in supervising new professionals. By employing synergistic supervisory tactics, supervisors are better able to recognize the signs of role ambiguity, role conflict, role orientation, role stress, and job burnout. Each of these has been linked to job dissatisfaction and intention to turnover. Synergistic supervisors are also able to assist their new professional supervisees in professional development and advancement. This will lead to a greater likelihood that new professionals persist and advance in the profession of student affairs administration.

Implications for the Profession of Student Affairs Administration

1. The study supports a framework for professional preparation programs and professional associations in student affairs administration that can be integrated into curriculum and professional development experiences used for the preparation of new professionals.

   There appears to be a void in the curriculum and related experiences of higher education and students affairs preparation programs in the area of staff supervision. With many topics to address, little room is left for topics such as supervision. For many masters’ students, supervisory topics covered in preparation programs may be premature, since many new professionals do not land in supervisory roles until later in their careers. Many doctoral students may have already had supervisory experience by the time they enter their programs or they may be in need of such knowledge and experience in preparation for completion of the doctorate. Professional associations in student affairs administration and higher education might also take stronger leadership in providing education and training for supervisory skills in the profession. The synergistic model of supervision would be a desirable model for training of new supervisors by either graduate programs or professional associations.

2. The use of synergistic supervision can be useful in promoting a more satisfied and committed workforce for the future of the profession of student affairs administration.

   By employing synergistic supervisory tactics that help to reduce job dissatisfaction and intentions to turnover of new professionals, student affairs leaders can foster the development of professionals who are prepared for advancement in the
profession of student affairs. By doing this they insure the strength of student services programs that promote student development opportunities in college.

3. The study provides confirming evidence that synergistic supervision is an effective management style in promoting job satisfaction and the reduction of intention to turnover of new professionals in student affairs administration.

This study contributes knowledge in the areas of synergistic supervision, job satisfaction and intention to turnover in students affairs administration, particularly for new professionals. The Synergistic Supervision Scale (SSS) developed by Saunders, Cooper, Winston, and Chernow (2000), was used in this study for the first time exclusively with new professionals in student affairs. Other administrations of this survey have involved professionals employed at all levels. The results of this study provide new data, important for the research and knowledge on new professional issues and concerns.

Recommendations

Based on a review of the literature and the present study on synergistic supervision, the following are recommendations for further research.

1. Conduct a longitudinal study with new professionals about their perceived level of synergistic supervision received, job satisfaction and intention to turnover. While the present study provides a one-time snapshot of perceptions of synergistic supervision, a longitudinal study could be helpful in identifying significant points and circumstances in which job dissatisfaction and intentions to turnover may arise. Longitudinal studies have been described as being useful for studying the dynamics of a topic over a period of time (Gay & Airasian, 2000). A cohort study would be further recommended for studying supervisory relationships for new professionals over time.

2. Conduct a study to examine more specific behavioral characteristics of supervisors and supervisees and the nature of their interactions. This should include; amount of time spent in one-on-one meetings, frequency of one-on-one meetings, topics discussed in one-on-one meetings, amount of time spent on professional development initiatives agreed upon by supervisor and supervisee, amount of resources and quantity of time spent on conference attendance or other similar activities with a professional development purpose. By focusing on specific characteristics of supervisors and their interactions with supervisees, the researcher can more clearly identify the particular characteristics and circumstances that are positively associated with supervision.

3. Replicate this study with new professionals who are not members of the American College Personnel Association or any professional association associated with their functional area or responsibility. Professional associations in the field are generally recognized as important for professionals in the early stages of their careers. By studying those new professionals who are not members of any associations in their functional area or the field of student affairs administration, the researcher could more clearly test the
supervisory relationship without the possible bias of membership in a professional association.

4. Further study the nature of the male/male supervisory relationship. To what extent are the theories presented by Kanter relevant for higher education or student affairs organizations? This relationship should be studied further because of the changing demographics of the student affairs profession. While little research has been done on male/male supervisory relationships in the field of student affairs, more investigation of this relationship has been conducted in the field of management. Of particular interest would be the extent to which “macho management” exists in today’s student affairs organizations.

5. Conduct an updated retention study of new professionals. While several studies exist in the higher education and student affairs literature in the area of retention, many were conducted in the 1980’s. An updated retention study of student affairs professionals would add significant information in understanding the effects of synergistic supervision on job satisfaction and intention to turnover. A new study could reveal the specific career points at which professionals are leaving the field and their reasons for departure. This may also be important in light of the demographic (gender, racial, etc.) shift that has occurred recently in the field of student affairs administration.
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For Research
Tallahassee, Florida 32306-2763
(850) 644-8673 - FAX (850) 644-4392

APPROVAL MEMORANDUM
Human Subjects Committee

Date: 11/4/2003

Trent Ashley Tull
3310 John Hancock Dr.
Tallahassee FL 32312

Dept.: Educational Leadership and Policy Studies

From: David Quadagno, Chair

Re: Use of Human Subjects in Research
The Relationship Between Perceived Level of Synergistic Supervision and Job Satisfaction of New Professionals in Students Affairs Administration

The forms that you submitted to this office in regard to the use of human subjects in the proposal referenced above have been reviewed by the Secretary, the Chair, and two members of the Human Subjects Committee. Your project is determined to be exempt per 45 CFR § 46.101(b) 2 and has been approved by an accelerated review process.
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If the project has not been completed by 11/3/2004 you must request renewed approval for continuation of the project.
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This institution has an Assurance on file with the Office for Protection from Research Risks. The Assurance Number is IRB00000446.
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SYNERGISTIC SUPERVISION QUESTIONNAIRE-ADDITIONAL DEMOGRAPHIC QUESTIONS
SYNERGISTIC SUPERVISION QUESTIONNAIRE

Sue A. Saunders
Diane L. Cooper
Roger B. Winston, Jr.
Erin Chernow

Demographic Information

Number of years (including the current year) in current position:

1 ( ) 2 ( ) 3 ( ) 4 ( ) 5 ( ) 6 or more ( )

What is your position category?

Entry Level Faculty Member
Mid Level College/University Administrator
Senior Level Graduate Student
Senior Student Affairs Officer Other

Number of years (including the current year) working at this institution:

1 ( ) 2 ( ) 3 ( ) 4 ( ) 5 ( ) 6 or more ( )

Please check the highest level of education completed.

( ) High School ( ) Masters degree
( ) Technical School/College Certificate ( ) Doctorate
( ) Associate degree ( ) Other: Specify: _________________
( ) Bachelor’s degree

If you hold an Associate or higher degree, please specify the field of your highest degree:

________________________________________

What is your supervisor’s position category:

Entry Level Faculty Member
Mid Level College/University Administrator
Senior Level Graduate Student
Senior Student Affairs Officer Other

How long has the above-identified person been your supervisor? [counting the current year]:

1 ( ) 2 ( ) 3 ( ) 4 ( ) 5 ( ) 6 or more ( )
Which sex are you? (check one): ( ) Female     ( ) Male

Age at last birthday: _______________

Please check the category that best describes your racial or ethnic background:
( ) White or Caucasian
( ) Black or African American
( ) Hispanic or Hispanic American
( ) Native American
( ) Asian or Pacific Islander
( ) Bi-racial or multiracial
( ) Other--Specify: _________________

ADDITIONAL DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION

In which functional area or office do you work? (Please indicate the area that is your primary responsibility or where you spend the greatest amount of time)

( ) Advising
( ) Admissions/Enrollment Management
( ) Adult Learner Services
( ) Assessment/Research
( ) Career Planning/Placement
( ) Commuter Services
( ) Counseling
( ) Disabled Student Services
( ) Financial Aid
( ) Food Services
( ) Greek Affairs
( ) Health/Drug and Alcohol
( ) International Students
( ) Intramural/Recreation Sports
( ) Judicial Affairs
( ) Leadership Development
( ) Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual & Transgender
( ) Student Services
( ) Multicultural Affairs
( ) Orientation
( ) Religious Programs
( ) Residence Life
( ) Service Learning
( ) Student Activities
( ) Student Affairs

74
( ) Teaching Faculty
( ) Women’s Resources
( ) Other

Work Setting:

( ) 2-year private
( ) 2-year public
( ) 4-year private
( ) 4-year public

Size of Institution:

( ) 1,999 & under
( ) 2,000-9,999
( ) 10,000-19,999
( ) 20,000 plus
Supervision Scale

Directions: For each item circle the one response that most closely reflects your experience with your current supervisor. Respond using the following scale:
A = Never (almost never)
B = Seldom
C = Sometimes
D = Often
E = Always (almost always)

A B C D E 1. My supervisor includes me in a significant way when making decisions that affect my area of responsibilities.

A B C D E 2. My supervisor works with me to gather the information needed to make decisions rather than simply providing me the information he/she feels is important.

A B C D E 3. My supervisor criticizes staff members in public.

A B C D E 4. My supervisor makes certain that I am fully knowledgeable about The goals of the division and institution.

A B C D E 5. My supervisor willingly listens to whatever is on my mind, whether it is personal or professional.

A B C D E 6. My supervisor shows interests in promoting my professional or career advancement.

A B C D E 7. My supervisor is personally offended if I question the wisdom of his/her decisions.

A B C D E 8. My supervisor shows that she/he cares about me as a person.

A B C D E 9. My supervisor speaks up for my unit within the institution.

A B C D E 10. My supervisor expects me to fit in with the accepted ways of doing things, in other words, “don’t rock the boat.”

A B C D E 11. My supervisor has favorites on the staff.
A = Never (almost never)     B = Seldom    C = Sometimes    D = Often    E = Always (almost always)


A  B  C  D  E  13. My supervisor takes negative evaluations of programs or staff and uses them to make improvements.

A  B  C  D  E  14. When faced with a conflict between an external constituent (for example, parent\ or donor) and staff members, my supervisor supports external constituents even if they are wrong.

A  B  C  D  E  15. My supervisor is open and honest with me about my strengths and weaknesses.

A  B  C  D  E  16. If I’m not careful, my supervisor may allow things that aren’t my fault to be blamed on me.

A  B  C  D  E  17. My supervisor rewards teamwork.

A  B  C  D  E  18. When the system gets in the way of accomplishing our goals, my supervisor helps me to devise ways to overcome barriers.

A  B  C  D  E  19. My supervisor looks for me to make a mistake.

A  B  C  D  E  20. My supervisor and I develop yearly professional development plans that address my weaknesses or blind spots.

A  B  C  D  E  21. When problem solving, my supervisor expects staff to present and advocate differing points of view.

A  B  C  D  E  22. In conflicts with staff members, my supervisor takes students’ sides (even when they are wrong).

Copyright © 1997. All rights reserved. Do not reproduce without written permission.
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PERMISSION FOR USE OF THE SYNERGISTIC SUPERVISION SCALE
April 15, 2003

Ms. Ashley Tui
3310 John Hancock
Drive, Tallahassee, FL 32312.

Dear Ashley,

This letter is to advise you that you have permission to use the Synergistic Supervision Scale by Sue A. Saunders, Diane L. Cooper, Roger B. Winston, Jr. and Erin Chernow (1997) for purposes of your dissertation research at Florida State University. I understand that you will be using the instrument to collect data in the fall of 2003.

I would appreciate receiving a copy of the results and interpretation sections of your dissertation if possible.

I wish you the best as you proceed with your study.

Sincerely,

Sue A. Saunders, Ph.D.
Dean of Student Affairs
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MEASURES OF JOB SATISFACTION
Measures of Job Satisfaction from the Michigan Organizational Assessment Questionnaire

1. All in all, I am satisfied with my job
2. In general, I don’t like my job ®
3. In general, I like working here
APPENDIX E
MEASURES OF INTENTION TO TURNOVER
Measures of Intention to Turnover from the Michigan Organizational Assessment Questionnaire

1. How likely is it that you will actively look for a new job in the next year?
2. I often think about quitting
3. I will probably look for a new job in the next year
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FIRST EMAIL MESSAGE SENT TO SUBJECTS
Dear Student Affairs Colleague,

You can now contribute to a new study on improving the success and retention of new professionals in the field of student affairs administration. As a Doctoral Candidate in the Higher Education Administration Program at Florida State University and a member of ACPA, I am currently conducting a dissertation research study to examine the relationship between supervision, job satisfaction and intention to turnover among new professionals.

I hope that you will decide to participate in this study. Participation will involve completing an online survey located at http://www.surveymonkey.com/s/asu?sl=6543292135&c=1000. The survey, consisting of 28 questions on supervision, job satisfaction and intention to turnover and demographic information, should take no longer than 6-8 minutes to complete.

ACPA Incentive prizes are being offered by the researcher for your participation in this study. Entry into the drawing for incentive prizes will require providing your name and email after completion of the online survey. If you choose to enter the drawing your name and contact information will remain confidential to the extent allowed by law.

Incentive Prizes Include:

- I paid registration to the 2004 ACPA National Conference to be held April 1-5, 2004 in Philadelphia ($225)
- I paid annual membership to ACPA ($110 for non member institution, $65 for member institution)
- 1 subscription to ACPA’s bi-monthly About Campus ($60)

To complete the survey, simply click on the following link: http://www.surveymonkey.com/s/asu?sl=6543292135&c=1000.

Thank you for your participation. If you have any questions or concerns about this study or your participation, please call me at 850-222-6586 or email me at atull@admin.fsu.edu.

Ashley Tull
Florida State University
APPENDIX G

SECOND EMAIL MESSAGE SENT TO SUBJECTS
Dear Student Affairs Colleague,

This message and survey link provides you a second chance to assist new professionals in student affairs administration and qualify for ACPA prizes. Every effort has been made to ensure that those who have completed this survey previously do not receive this message; however, if you are receiving this message and have already completed the survey, please delete this message and accept my apologies.

As a Doctoral Candidate in the Higher Education Administration Program at Florida State University and a member of ACPA, I am currently conducting a dissertation research study to examine the relationship between supervision, job satisfaction and intention to turnover among new professionals.

I hope that you will decide to participate in this study. Participation will involve completing an online survey located at http://www.surveymonkey.com/s/?c=543292135&c=1000. The survey, consisting of 28 questions on supervision, job satisfaction and intention to turnover and demographic information, should take no longer than 6-5 minutes to complete.

ACPA Incentive prizes are being offered by the researcher for your participation in this study. Entry into the drawing for incentive prizes will require providing your name and email after completion of the online survey. If you choose to enter the drawing your name and contact information will remain confidential to the extent allowed by law.

Incentive Prizes Include:

- 1 paid registration to the 2004 ACPA National Conference to be held April 1-5, 2004 in Philadelphia ($225)
- 1 paid annual membership to ACPA ($110 for non member institution, $65 for member institution)
- 1 subscription to ACPA’s b-monthly “About Campus” ($60)

To complete the survey, simply click on the following link: http://www.surveymonkey.com/s/?c=543292135&c=1000.

Thank you for your participation. If you have any questions or concerns about this study or your participation, please call me at 850-222-6586 or email me at atul@fsu.edu.

Ashley Tull

Florida State University
Dear Student Affairs Colleague,

This message and survey link provides you a third and final chance to assist new professionals in student affairs administration and qualify for ACPA prizes. Responses received by Friday, December 12, 2003 at 5:00 p.m. EST will be included in the drawing for prizes. Every effort has been made to ensure that those who have completed this survey previously do not receive this message; however, if you are receiving this message and have already completed the survey, please delete this message and accept my apologies.

As a Doctoral Candidate in the Higher Education Administration Program at Florida State University and a member of ACPA, I am currently conducting a dissertation research study to examine the relationship between supervision, job satisfaction and intention to turnover among new professionals.

I hope that you will decide to participate in this study. Participation will involve completing an online survey located at http://www.surveymonkey.com/s.aspx?hv=6543292135%c=1000. The survey, consisting of 28 questions on supervision, job satisfaction and intention to turnover and demographic information, should take no longer than 6-8 minutes to complete.

ACPA Incentive prizes are being offered by the researcher for your participation in this study. Entry into the drawing for incentive prizes will require providing your name and email after completion of the online survey. If you choose to enter the drawing your name and contact information will remain confidential to the extent allowed by law.

Incentive Prizes Include:

- 1 paid registration to the 2004 ACPA National Conference to be held April 1-5, 2004 in Philadelphia ($225)
- 1 paid annual membership to ACPA ($110 for non member institution, $65 for member institution)
- 1 subscription to ACPA's bi-monthly About Campus ($60)

To complete the survey, simply click on the following link: http://www.surveymonkey.com/s.aspx?hv=6543292135%c=1000.

Thank you for your participation. If you have any questions or concerns about this study or your participation, please call me at 850-222-6586 or email me at attull@admin.fsu.edu.

Ashley Tull
Florida State University
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INFORMED CONSENT LETTER
Dear Student Affairs Professional,

I am a Doctoral Candidate in the Higher Education Administration Program in the College of Education at Florida State University. I am currently conducting a dissertation research study to examine the relationship between synergistic supervision and job satisfaction among new professionals in student affairs administration.

I am requesting your participation in this study. Participation will involve completing the Synergistic Supervision Scale (a 22 item survey) and 6 questions related to job satisfaction. The completion of the survey should take no longer than 6-8 minutes to complete. The survey is confidential to the extent allowed by law. Although the results of this survey may be published, no study participants will be identified. All information obtained during the course of this study will remain confidential to the extent allowed by the law.

Your participation in this study is voluntary. If you choose not to participate or to withdraw at any point during the study, you may do so without penalty. The completion and mailing of this survey to the research implies your consent for participation in this study.

Incentive prizes are being offered by the researcher for your participation in this study. Entry into the drawing for incentive prizes will require providing your name and email after completion of the online survey. If you chose to enter the drawing your name and contact information will remain confidential to the extent allowed by law.

Incentive Prizes Include:
- 1 paid registration to the 2004 ACPA National Conference to be held April 1-5, 2004 in Philadelphia ($225)
- 1 paid annual membership to ACPA ($110 for non member institution, $65 for member institution)
- 1 subscription to ACPA’s bi-monthly About Campus ($60)

If you have any questions or concerns about this study or your participation, please call me at 850-222-6586 or email me at atull@admin.fsu.edu. You may also reach my supervising professor, Dr. Jon C. Dalton at 850-644-6446. Contact information for the FSU Institutional Review Board is as follows: 2035 E. Paul Dirac Drive, Box 15, 100 Sliger Building, Innovation Park, Tallahassee, FL 32306-2763. The Institutional Review Board may be reached by phone at 850-644-4392.

Sincerely,

Trent Ashley Tull
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SURVEY RESPONDENTS AREA OF HIGHEST EARNED DEGREE
(MSW) Masters of Social Work
Administration & Supervision
Adult and Higher Education
Applied Behavioral Science
B.A. Communication Studies and Psychology
B.A. in Human Development
BA in Sociology
Bachelor's in English Master’s in Counselor Education
Black Studies & Higher Ed/Student Affairs
Broad Field Social Science
BSBA in Marketing
Business
Business Administration
Business Administration and History
Clinical Counseling
Clinical Psychology
College Counseling
College Counseling & Student Affairs Administration
College Personnel Administration
College Student Personnel
College Student Affairs Administration (2)
College Student Affairs Leadership
College Student Affairs/Higher Education
College Student Development
College Student Development and Administration
College Student Development & Counseling
College Student Personnel Administration
College Student Personnel (31)
College Student Personnel (MS)
College Student Personnel Admin
College Student Personnel Administration
College Student Personnel Services
College Student Services and Administration
Communication Studies
Communications
Counseling (4)
Counseling Student Affairs
Counseling - Student Development and Higher Education
Counseling & Guidance Services
Counseling & Psychological Services
Counseling & Student Personnel
Counseling & Student Personnel - MS
Counseling and Personnel Services
Counseling and Student Affairs (2)
Counseling and Student Personnel (2)
Counseling and Student Personnel Psychology (2)
Counseling in Higher Education
Counseling psychology (10)
Counseling w/ emphasis in Higher Education
Counseling: Student Development
Counselor Education
Counselor Education - emphasis in College Student Development
Counselor Education: Student Personnel Services
Criminal Justice Masters
Cultural Foundations of Education
Curriculum Instruction & Supervision
Curriculum & Instruction - College Student Affairs
Curriculum Theory
Educational Psychology
M.Ed. in Student Affairs Administration
Education (9)
Education - College Student Personnel Administration
Education M.Ed.
Education - Student Affairs
Education Administration (1)
Education- Counseling & Guidance
Education: College Student Affairs Leadership
Educational Administration (3)
Educational Leadership Community College Emphasis
Educational Leadership - Student Personnel
Educational Psychology (3)
Educational psychology and research
Education
Elementary Education Language Arts
Elementary Education. Pursuing Masters in Higher Ed
English (2)
English Education
English Literature (2)
Experiential Education
Geology
Guidance and Counseling
Hearing and Speech Sciences
High Education Administration
Higher and Postsecondary Education
Higher Ed Administration (2)
Higher Ed and Student Affairs (3)
Higher Education Administration (34)
Higher Education Administration/Student Affairs (15)
Higher Education and Student Personnel (2)
Higher Education Counseling
Higher Education Student Affairs Administration
Higher Education Student Personnel
Higher Education/College Student Personnel
Higher Education/Student Affairs
Higher Education: Student Affairs
History
Human Development and Family Science
Human Resource Management
Human Resources
Human Services Counseling
Information Systems
Institutional Leadership & Policy
Interpersonal Communication
Law (2)
Leadership & Policy Studies
Liberal studies (2)
M Ed.
M. Ed. /Higher Education Administration
M.A. Student Affairs in Higher Education
M.A. Educational Leadership & Policy Analysis
M.A.E. Student Affairs in Higher Education
M.B.A.
M.Ed. - Counseling Psychology in College Student Personnel Administration
M.Ed. Counseling Psychology concentration in College Student Personnel Administration
M.Ed. in Higher Education and Student Affairs
M.Ed. in Student Affairs
M.Ed. College Student Affairs Administration
M.Ed. College Student Personnel (2)
M.Ed. Counseling
M.Ed. in College Student Affairs
M.Ed. in Higher Education/Student Affairs
M.Ed. Urban Education
M.Ed.-Student Development in Higher Education
M.S. College Student Personnel Administration
M.S. Health Promotion
M.S. Higher Education
MA Higher Education & Student Affairs
MA Student Affairs in Higher Ed
MA Counseling
MA in College Student Personnel
MA: College Student Personnel
MA: College Student Personnel Administration
Management-Organizational Development/Human Relations
Marketing
Master of Arts - Higher Education/Student Personnel
Master of Arts in Student Affairs
Master of Education Counseling/College Student Personnel
Master of Education in Adult Learning & Development
Master of Public Administration
Master of Science in Education with an emphasis in College Student Development and Administration
Master of Science: College Student Personnel
Master's in College Student Affairs Leadership / Currently Doctoral Student in Higher Adult and Lifelong Education
Masters in Educational Psychology
Masters in Higher Education & Student Affairs
Master's in Nursing
Masters in Public Administration
Masters in Student Personnel Administration and an MBA
Masters of Education - Educational Administration
Masters of Education in Student Affairs in Higher Education
Masters of Social Work
Masters: College Student Personnel
MBA (3)
M.Ed. Counselor Education
M.Ed. Educational Specialist
M.Ed.- Student Affairs in Higher Education
Mental Health Counseling
MS College Student Personnel
MS in Counseling (pending 2005)
MS in Counseling in Higher Education & Secondary Ed
MS in Education
MS-Counseling & Human Resource Development / Student Personnel; MA- History
Music History and Literature
Parks Recreation Tourism Management
PHD Higher Ed.
Philosophy
Political Science
Post Secondary Administration and Student Affairs
Postsecondary Education: Student Affairs
Professional Communication
Psychology (5)
Public Administration (2)
Public Health Administration
Public Relations (2)
Recreation and park management
Secondary Education
Social Justice Education
Social Theory
Social work (3)
Sociology (3)
Sociology/Psychology
Sociology/Substance Abuse Studies
Special Education (ED)
Student Affairs (6)
Student Affairs College Student Personnel
Student Affairs / Higher Education Administration
Student Affairs Administration (7)
Student Affairs Administration in Higher Education (2)
Student Affairs in Higher Education (10)
Student Affairs in Higher Education M.S.
Student Affairs in Higher Education (M.S.)
Student Affairs Masters
Student Affairs/Higher Education Administration
Student Counseling & Personnel Services
Student Development
Student Development MA
Student Development in Higher Education
Student Development in Postsecondary Education (8)
Student Personnel (2)
Student Personnel Administration (5)
Student Personnel and Higher Education Administration
Student Personnel in Higher Education (3)
Student Personnel Services (MA)
Theatre
Theology
Three degrees: Journalism PR and Media Production
Two Bachelor's degrees: Human Development and Psychology
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DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS FOR SURVEY AND DEMOGRAPHIC S
### Descriptive Statistics for Supervisees Responses to Survey Questions and Demographics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of years in position</td>
<td>435</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>2.6276</td>
<td>1.3143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisee position category</td>
<td>435</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>2.0943</td>
<td>1.6719</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Functional area</td>
<td>435</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>28.00</td>
<td>17.8391</td>
<td>7.6289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of years at institution</td>
<td>435</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1.8184</td>
<td>.3860</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highest degree attained</td>
<td>435</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>3.1379</td>
<td>1.4963</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor position category</td>
<td>435</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>3.1379</td>
<td>1.4963</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length of relationship</td>
<td>435</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1.6161</td>
<td>.4869</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor Gender</td>
<td>435</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1.4276</td>
<td>.4953</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor Race</td>
<td>435</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1.3080</td>
<td>.4622</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisee Race</td>
<td>435</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1.2207</td>
<td>.4152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1</td>
<td>432</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>3.9954</td>
<td>1.0172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q2</td>
<td>432</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>3.9491</td>
<td>1.0251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q3</td>
<td>432</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>3.9167</td>
<td>1.0432</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q4</td>
<td>432</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>3.9167</td>
<td>1.0432</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q5</td>
<td>432</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>4.1458</td>
<td>1.0056</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q6</td>
<td>432</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>3.8102</td>
<td>1.2171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q7</td>
<td>432</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>2.3380</td>
<td>1.1805</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q8</td>
<td>432</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>3.9954</td>
<td>1.0172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q9</td>
<td>432</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>3.8102</td>
<td>1.2171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q10</td>
<td>432</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>2.3380</td>
<td>1.1805</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q11</td>
<td>377</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>2.3380</td>
<td>1.1805</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q12</td>
<td>432</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>2.7963</td>
<td>1.0879</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q13</td>
<td>432</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>2.7963</td>
<td>1.0879</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q14</td>
<td>432</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>2.7963</td>
<td>1.0879</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q15</td>
<td>432</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>2.7963</td>
<td>1.0879</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q16</td>
<td>432</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>2.7963</td>
<td>1.0879</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q17</td>
<td>432</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>2.7963</td>
<td>1.0879</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q18</td>
<td>432</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>2.7963</td>
<td>1.0879</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q19</td>
<td>432</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>2.7963</td>
<td>1.0879</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q20</td>
<td>432</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>2.7963</td>
<td>1.0879</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q21</td>
<td>432</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>2.7963</td>
<td>1.0879</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q22</td>
<td>432</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>2.7963</td>
<td>1.0879</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q23</td>
<td>432</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>2.7963</td>
<td>1.0879</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q24</td>
<td>432</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>2.7963</td>
<td>1.0879</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q25</td>
<td>432</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>2.7963</td>
<td>1.0879</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q26</td>
<td>432</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>2.7963</td>
<td>1.0879</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q27</td>
<td>432</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>2.7963</td>
<td>1.0879</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q28</td>
<td>432</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>2.7963</td>
<td>1.0879</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TYPE</td>
<td>366</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3.6038</td>
<td>.5428</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIZE</td>
<td>363</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>2.6860</td>
<td>1.0003</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Valid N (listwise)** 314
APPENDIX L

RESPONDENT INSTITUTIONS
Adams State College
Albion College (2)
Alfred State College
American University
American University in Dubai
Appalachian State University
Arizona State University (2)
Arizona State University-East
Augustana College of Illinois
Austin Peay State University
Averett College
Avila College
Azusa Pacific University
Baldwin-Wallace College
Ball State University (2)
Barnard College
Bloomsburg University
Boise State University (2)
Bowling Green State University (2)
Brenau University
Bryn Mawr College
Butler University
Cal Poly Pomona
California Maritime Academy
California State University-Channel Islands
California State University-Stanislaus
California State-Fullerton
Capitol University
Carnegie Mellon University
Carroll College of Wisconsin
Catholic University of America
Cedarcrest College
Central Piedmont Community College
Clarke University
Clemson University (3)
College of Mount Saint Joseph
College of Saint Benedict
Colorado College (2)
Colorado State University (2)
Columbia University (2)
Columbus College of Art & Design (2)
Concordia College of Minnesota-Moorhead
Concordia University of Wisconsin
Cornell College
Cornell University
Creighton University
Dartmouth University (2)
Davenport University
DeVry University-Fremont
Drexel University
East Carolina University
East Stroudsburg University (2)
Eastern Connecticut State University
Eastern Michigan University
Eastern Washington University
Edgewood College (2)
Edinboro
Elmhurst College (3)
Emmanuel College
Emory University
Fairfield University
Fisher College
Florida Atlantic University
Florida International University
Florida State University
Fontbonne University
Francis Marion University
Franklin & Marshall College
Frostburg State University
George Mason University
George Washington University
Georgia Institute of Technology (2)
Georgia Southern University
Georgia State University
Georgian Court College
Goucher College
Grand Valley State University
Harrisburg Area Community College
Harvard University
Haverford College
Hofstra University (2)
Illinois State University
Indiana University of Pennsylvania
Indiana University School of Medicine
Indiana University-Bloomington
Iowa State University (8)
Itacha College (2)
James Madison University (2)
John Carroll University
Kalamazoo College
Kansas State University (3)
Keene State College
Kent State University (2)
Knox College
LaSalle University
Long Island University-C.W. Post
Longwood College (3)
Louisiana State University-Baton Rouge
Loyola College of Maryland (2)
Loyola University-Chicago
Lycoming College
Lynchburg College
Macalester College (3)
Maryland Institute College of Art
Massachusetts College of Pharmacy & Health Sciences
Massachusetts Institute of Technology
Metro State College
Miami University of Ohio (2)
Miami-Dade Community College
Midwestern State University
Minnesota State University-Mankato (2)
Missouri Western State College
Monmouth University
Monroe Community College
Montgomery County Community College
Moraine Valley Community College
Mount Saint Mary's College & Seminary
Nazareth College
Newman University
North Carolina State University
North Dakota State University (2)
Northeastern University
Northern Arizona University
Northern Illinois University
Northern Kentucky University
Nova Southeastern University
Ohio Northern University
Ohio State University-Columbus (16)
Ohio Wesleyan University
Old Dominion University (2)
Pennsylvania State University
Pennsylvania State University-University Park
Pratt Institute
Quinnipiac University (3)
Randolph-Macon Woman's College
Rider University
Rochester Institute of Technology
Rock Valley College
Rollins College
Rush University
Rutgers University (2)
Saint John's University of Minnesota
Saint John's University of New York
Saint Louis University
San Jose State University
Santa Clara University
Santa Fe Comm. College
Seattle University (4)
Shepard College
Shorter College
Skidmore College
South Dakota School of Mines & Technology
Southern Illinois University-Edwardsville
Southern Polytechnic State University
Southwest Missouri State University
St. Edwards Presbyterian College
St. John's University
St. Leo University
St. Olaf College
State University of New York-Stony Brook (4)
State University of New York-Buffalo (2)
Syracuse University (2)
Temple University
Texas A & M University
Texas A&M University-Galveston
Texas Christian University (2)
Texas Tech University (2)
Texas Woman's University (2)
Towson University
Transylvania University
Truman State University (3)
U.S. Naval Academy
Union College of New York
Univ. of Denver
University of Arizona (4)
University of California-Davis (2)
University of California-Los Angeles (2)
University of California-Santa Barbara (2)
University of California-Irvine
University of California-Riverside
University of California-San Diego
University of California-Santa Cruz (2)
University of Central Florida
University of Central Oklahoma
University of Colorado-Boulder
University of Connecticut (2)
University of Florida (4)
University of Georgia (2)
University of Guelph
University of Hawaii-Manoa
University of Houston
University of Illinois-Chicago (2)
University of Illinois-Urbana/Champaign (2)
University of Indiana (2)
University of Iowa (3)
University of Maine-Orono
University of Maryland
University of Maryland-Baltimore County
University of Maryland-College Park
University of Massachusetts-Lowell
University of Memphis
University of Miami (3)
University of Michigan (4)
University of Minnesota-Twin Cities (6)
University of Missouri
University of Missouri-Columbia (4)
University of Nebraska-Lincoln
University of Nevada-Reno (3)
University of Nevada-Las Vegas
University of New Hampshire (4)
University of North Carolina-Chapel Hill
University of North Carolina-Greensboro
University of North Carolina-Pembroke
University of North Dakota
University of Northern Colorado
University of Oregon (2)
University of Redlands
University of Richmond
University of Rochester
University of Saint Mary
University of Saint Thomas of Minnesota
University of San Francisco (2)
University of South Florida
University of Southern California
University of Southern Indiana
University of Southern Maine (2)
University of Southern Mississippi (2)
University of Tampa
University of Tennessee-Knoxville
University of Texas-Austin (2)
University of the Redlands (3)
University of Toledo
University of Vermont
University of Washington (3)
University of Wisconsin-La Crosse
University of Wisconsin-Madison (2)
University of Wyoming (2)
University of Indiana
Virginia Polytechnic State University (5)
Washington University-St. Louis (3)
Webster University Geneva Switzerland
Wesleyan College
West Chester University
Western Illinois University (2)
Western Kentucky University
Western Michigan University
Westminster College of Missouri
Williams College
Wilmington College of Ohio
Winona State University
Wittenburg University
Young Harris College
Youngstown State University
APPENDIX M

CORRELATION MATRIX
## Correlations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Number of years in position</th>
<th>Supervisee position category</th>
<th>Functional area</th>
<th>Number of years at institution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of years in position</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Supervisee position category</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.033</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td></td>
<td>.953</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td>.435</td>
<td>.435</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Functional area</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.029</td>
<td>0.013</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td></td>
<td>.547</td>
<td>.788</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td>.435</td>
<td>.435</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of years at institution</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>.475**</td>
<td>-.095*</td>
<td>-.037</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td></td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.048</td>
<td>.437</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td>.435</td>
<td>.435</td>
<td>.435</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Highest degree attained</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>.118*</td>
<td>.013</td>
<td>-.187**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td></td>
<td>.014</td>
<td>.781</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td>.435</td>
<td>.435</td>
<td>.435</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Supervisor position category</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>.036</td>
<td>.337**</td>
<td>-.116*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td></td>
<td>.460</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td>.435</td>
<td>.435</td>
<td>.435</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Length of relationship</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>.367**</td>
<td>-.089</td>
<td>.007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td></td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.153</td>
<td>.886</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td>.435</td>
<td>.435</td>
<td>.435</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Supervisor Gender</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>.008</td>
<td>-.035</td>
<td>.016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td></td>
<td>.867</td>
<td>.468</td>
<td>.733</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td>.435</td>
<td>.435</td>
<td>.435</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Supervisor Race</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.066</td>
<td>.046</td>
<td>-.006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td></td>
<td>.167</td>
<td>.334</td>
<td>.895</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td>.435</td>
<td>.435</td>
<td>.435</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Supervisee Gender</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.053</td>
<td>-.073</td>
<td>.101*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td></td>
<td>.266</td>
<td>.126</td>
<td>.035</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td>.435</td>
<td>.435</td>
<td>.435</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Supervisee Race</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>.037</td>
<td>.066</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td></td>
<td>.442</td>
<td>.168</td>
<td>.995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td>.435</td>
<td>.435</td>
<td>.435</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TYPE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>.101</td>
<td>.021</td>
<td>-.084</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td></td>
<td>.053</td>
<td>.688</td>
<td>.108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td>.365</td>
<td>.365</td>
<td>.365</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SIZE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.045</td>
<td>.096</td>
<td>-.112*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td></td>
<td>.398</td>
<td>.067</td>
<td>.033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td>.362</td>
<td>.362</td>
<td>.362</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SUPV</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>.084</td>
<td>.115*</td>
<td>.048</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td></td>
<td>.082</td>
<td>.017</td>
<td>.324</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td>.431</td>
<td>.431</td>
<td>.431</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of years in position</td>
<td>Supervisee position category</td>
<td>Functional area</td>
<td>Number of years at institution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOBSAT</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>-.002</td>
<td>.036</td>
<td>-.050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.974</td>
<td>.452</td>
<td>.304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>430</td>
<td>430</td>
<td>430</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TURNOV</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.127**</td>
<td>-.078</td>
<td>.051</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.009</td>
<td>.106</td>
<td>.290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>430</td>
<td>430</td>
<td>430</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Highest degree attained</td>
<td>Supervisor position category</td>
<td>Length of relationship</td>
<td>Supervisor Gender</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of years in position</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisee position category</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Functional area</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of years at institution</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highest degree attained</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor position category</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length of relationship</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td></td>
<td>.013</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td></td>
<td>.791</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td>435</td>
<td>435</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor Gender</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.018</td>
<td>.053</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td></td>
<td>.715</td>
<td>2.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td>435</td>
<td>435</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisory Race</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.112*</td>
<td>.014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td></td>
<td>.020</td>
<td>.763</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td>435</td>
<td>435</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor Gender</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.042</td>
<td>-.026</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td></td>
<td>.382</td>
<td>.951</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td>435</td>
<td>435</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisee Gender</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.046</td>
<td>-.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td></td>
<td>.336</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td>435</td>
<td>435</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisee Race</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td></td>
<td>.031</td>
<td>-.036</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td></td>
<td>.514</td>
<td>-.012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td>435</td>
<td>435</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TYPE</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td></td>
<td>.028</td>
<td>-.045</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td></td>
<td>.599</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td>365</td>
<td>365</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIZE</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td></td>
<td>.037</td>
<td>-.212*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td></td>
<td>.480</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td>362</td>
<td>362</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUPV</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td></td>
<td>.011</td>
<td>.198**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td></td>
<td>.824</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td>431</td>
<td>431</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Highest degree attained</td>
<td>Supervisor position category</td>
<td>Lognths of relationship</td>
<td>Supervisor Gender</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOBSAT</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.024</td>
<td>.088</td>
<td>.095</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.625</td>
<td>.069</td>
<td>.050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>430</td>
<td>430</td>
<td>430</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TURNOV</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>-.061</td>
<td>-.188**</td>
<td>.018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.209</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.714</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>430</td>
<td>430</td>
<td>430</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of years in position</td>
<td>Supervisor Race</td>
<td>Supervisee Gender</td>
<td>Supervisee Race</td>
<td>TYPE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisee position category</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Functional area</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of years at institution</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highest degree attained</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor position category</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length of relationship</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor Gender</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor Race</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisee Gender</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisee Race</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TYPE</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIZE</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUPRV</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Supervisor Race</td>
<td>Supervisee Gender</td>
<td>Supervisee Race</td>
<td>TYPE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOBSAT</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>-0.097*</td>
<td>-0.047</td>
<td>-0.090</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>0.045</td>
<td>0.334</td>
<td>0.062</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>430</td>
<td>430</td>
<td>430</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TURNOV</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>0.091</td>
<td>-0.034</td>
<td>0.058</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>0.060</td>
<td>0.486</td>
<td>0.234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>430</td>
<td>430</td>
<td>430</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variable</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>SIZE</td>
<td>SUPV</td>
<td>JOBSAT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of years in position</td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed) N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisee position category</td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed) N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Functional area</td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed) N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of years at institution</td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed) N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highest degree attained</td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed) N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor position category</td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed) N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length of relationship</td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed) N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor Gender</td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed) N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor Race</td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed) N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisee Gender</td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed) N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisee Race</td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed) N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TYPE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIZE</td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed) N</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUPV</td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed) N</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SIZE</th>
<th>SUPV</th>
<th>JOBSAT</th>
<th>TURNOV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>JOBSAT Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.038</td>
<td>.302**</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.473</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>363</td>
<td>431</td>
<td>431</td>
<td>431</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TURNOV Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>-.069</td>
<td>-.160**</td>
<td>-.493**</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.192</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>363</td>
<td>431</td>
<td>431</td>
<td>431</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**: Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).
*: Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).
APPENDIX N

ACPA DEMOGRAPHIC DATA
# ACPA Membership Demographics

**Dec. 2003**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Number Members</th>
<th>7139</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

## Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Actual Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>4119</td>
<td>67.70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>2460</td>
<td>34.46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transgender</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.04%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unreported</td>
<td>382</td>
<td>5.35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>2.45%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Ethnicity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Actual Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>636</td>
<td>8.91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian/Pacific Islander</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>3.39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>5047</td>
<td>70.70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic/Latino</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>3.43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiracial</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>1.48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>0.46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>1.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unreported</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>3.61%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Work Setting

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Work Setting</th>
<th>Actual Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Private 2-year</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>0.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private 4-year</td>
<td>1916</td>
<td>26.84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public 2-year</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>2.83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public 4-year</td>
<td>3083</td>
<td>42.91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>1.62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unreported</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>12.61%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Size of Institution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Size of Institution</th>
<th>Actual Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1,999 and under</td>
<td>684</td>
<td>9.58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,000 to 9,999</td>
<td>1522</td>
<td>21.32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000 to 19,999</td>
<td>1292</td>
<td>18.10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20,000 and over</td>
<td>1747</td>
<td>24.47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unreported</td>
<td>972</td>
<td>13.62%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Position

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Actual Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Advisor/Counselor</td>
<td>463</td>
<td>6.49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asst. Dean/Director</td>
<td>497</td>
<td>6.96%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assoc. Dean/Director</td>
<td>283</td>
<td>3.96%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>50.54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director</td>
<td>738</td>
<td>10.34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Member</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>3.04%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Student</td>
<td>1067</td>
<td>14.95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1597</td>
<td>22.37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>President</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.07%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unreported</td>
<td>412</td>
<td>5.77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vice President</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>4.09%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# ACPA Membership Demographics

## Dec. 2003

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Number Members</th>
<th>7139</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Degree</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor's</td>
<td>1467</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certificate</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctorate</td>
<td>1242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education Specialist</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master's</td>
<td>3667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unreported</td>
<td>280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Years in Field</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 - 5 years</td>
<td>3114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 - 10 years</td>
<td>1174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 - 15 years</td>
<td>752</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 - 20 years</td>
<td>546</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 - 25 years</td>
<td>484</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 plus years</td>
<td>414</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unreported</td>
<td>313</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Functional Area</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Advising</td>
<td>478</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admissions</td>
<td>151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admissions/Enrollment Management</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult Learner Services</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment/Research</td>
<td>155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career Plan/Placement</td>
<td>466</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commuter Services</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counseling</td>
<td>552</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disability Services</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Aid</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food Services</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gay/Lesbian/Bisexual Awareness</td>
<td>124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Preparation Prgm Coordinator</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greek Affairs</td>
<td>231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health/Drug &amp; Alcohol</td>
<td>167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Students</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intramural/Rec Sports</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judicial Affairs</td>
<td>312</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership Development</td>
<td>453</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multicultural Affairs</td>
<td>318</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orientation</td>
<td>383</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>307</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious Programs</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residence Life</td>
<td>2019</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### ACPA Membership Demographics

**Dec. 2003**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Number Members</th>
<th>Actual Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Service Learning</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>2.14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Activities</td>
<td>769</td>
<td>10.77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Affairs Administration</td>
<td>1191</td>
<td>16.68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Union</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>2.75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching Faculty</td>
<td>271</td>
<td>3.80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women's Resources</td>
<td>485</td>
<td>6.79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unreported</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>0.87%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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