

SUPERVISION SKILLS ACQUISITION: WHERE MASTER'S STUDENTS LEARN
SUPERVISION SKILLS DURING STUDENT AFFAIRS GRADUATE PREPARATION
PROGRAMS

by

BRANDON ARRIS FRYE

(Under the Direction of Merrily S. Dunn)

ABSTRACT

During February 2009, with the endorsement of the Association of College and University Housing Officers-International (ACUHO-I), a sample of new professionals completed the Student Affairs Supervisory Skill Learning Inventory (SASSLI), the data collection instrument for this investigation. The purpose of this study was to develop a list of critical supervisory skills for supervisors in student affairs. Further, the study determined which of those skills first-year, full-time, post-master's new professionals learned during their graduate preparation programs through classroom instruction, supervised practice experiences, and self-taught learning.

Additionally, the study identified the skills that new professionals listed as critical to effectively supervise staff members. Several statistically significant findings at both the $p < 0.05$ and $p < 0.001$ alpha levels were identified based on performed independent samples t tests between various demographic variables and the twelve scale scored variables that developed from the instrument. Findings support the need for a more systematic approach to educating student affairs master's students about the construct of supervision and supervision skills through classroom instruction, supervised practice experiences, and self-taught activities.

INDEX WORDS: Student Affairs, Supervision, Supervision Skills, New Professionals, Student Affairs Graduate Preparation Programs, Learning Skills, Master's Students, Classroom Instruction, Supervised Practice Experiences, and Self-taught Learning

SUPERVISION SKILLS ACQUISITION: WHERE MASTER'S STUDENTS LEARN
SUPERVISION SKILLS DURING STUDENT AFFAIRS GRADUATE PREPARATION
PROGRAMS

by

BRANDON ARRIS FRYE

B.S., Appalachian State University, 1999

M.A., Appalachian State University, 2001

A Dissertation Submitted to the Graduate Faculty of The University of Georgia in Partial

Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

ATHENS, GEORGIA

2009

© 2009

Brandon Arris Frye

All Rights Reserved

SUPERVISION SKILLS ACQUISITION: WHERE MASTER'S STUDENTS LEARN
SUPERVISION SKILLS DURING STUDENT AFFAIRS GRADUATE PREPARATION
PROGRAMS

by

BRANDON ARRIS FRYE

Major Professor: Merrily S. Dunn

Committee: Diane L. Dunn
Laura A. Dean
Gerard J. Kowalski

Electronic Version Approved:

Maureen Grasso
Dean of the Graduate School
The University of Georgia
August 2009

DEDICATION

This body of work is dedicated to my wife Jennifer Muckler Frye. Without her love and support I would not have been able to complete my doctoral program and I would not be half the man I am today. Jenny you are the love of my life and most of what is good in me is because of you. I look forward to the birth of our son, Solomon Trask Frye, in October 2009 and the time we will be able to spend together raising our family now that I have finished my Ph.D. I love you Jenny.

I also want to dedicate this dissertation to my brother Jeremy Ryan Frye. Jeremy you are my best friend and I hope you know how much you mean to me. We went through some tough times growing up but you have always been there for me and it makes me so proud to see the man that you have become. You have always told me that you looked up to me; however, you need to keep in mind that I also look up to you. Who would have thought back when we were growing up in the small town of Claremont, North Carolina that we would both now be called Dr. Frye. I love you little brother.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The completion of this dissertation would not have been possible without the support of numerous people. This section will acknowledge many of the individuals that played a critical role in aiding me in the completion of my dissertation and Ph.D. program. I owe each of them a great deal of thanks and I am sure that this acknowledgement section will not provide justice to the appreciation that I have for their friendship, support, mentoring, and patience they showed with me during my academic and personal journey over the last six years.

I must first thank Dr. Merrily Dunn, my major professor and guide through my graduate program, for helping me navigate the challenges of a being a doctoral student. Her sincerity, understanding, support, and positive energy motivated me and were critical in the completion of my academic program of study and this dissertation.

Many thanks must also be given to the rest of the members of my dissertation committee. Dr. Diane Cooper, you have been a true scholar and educator and have pushed me to become a more qualified researcher, author, and practitioner. Dr. Laura Dean, your eye for detail, attention to grammar, editing skills, and focus on quality scholarship was essential for me being able to complete my dissertation. Dr. Gerry Kowalski, your experience and perspective as a skilled student affairs practitioner helped me in being able to better tie my research to professional practice.

I owe a great deal of thanks to Dr. Richard Mullendore for encouraging me to start my doctoral program. His leadership and support during his tenure as Vice President for Student

Affairs at the University of Georgia (UGA) provided me with the encouragement that I needed to apply for graduate school at UGA. His support of my academic and professional career continued during his role as a mentor and professor during my time in graduate school.

In addition to the faculty members on my dissertation committee I also had several professors during my graduate school experience that provided challenge, support, and feedback that aiding in me successfully completing my academic program and made me a more skilled student affairs practitioner. Of specific note, I want to thank Dr. Thomas Burke, Dr. Jim Day, Dr. Greg Palardy, Dr. Trisha Reeves, and Dr. Bob Hill.

Two additional professors have served as mentors to me during my time in graduate school at the University of Georgia. Special thanks must be given to Dr. Rodney Bennett and Dr. Ann Crowther. Each of these mentors took time out of their busy careers to provide me with advice and support. They were both always candid with me and provided me with helpful information when I needed to work through challenges in my professional and personal life.

I am so thankful for the endorsement that the Association of College and University Housing Officers-International (ACUHO-I) provided for my dissertation research. Specific thanks must be given to Dr. Doug Hallenbeck for his support of my research and the assistance he provided to me in applying for the research endorsement of ACUHO-I. Without his help and the assistance of the many kind professionals within ACUHO-I my dissertation would not have been able to be completed in such a timely fashion. I give a heart felt thanks to all of the new professionals that made the choice to take the time to participate in my study.

I want to give a special thanks to Dr. Jan Barham, Kyle Tschepikow, and Mike Campbell for all the help they provided me in the development of my research questionnaire. Each of you

displayed professionalism, support, and kindness during my many visits to your Office to work on my instrument.

I would have not been able to complete my Ph.D. while working full-time without the support of my supervisors and colleagues at the University of Georgia. I want to thank Claudia Shamp, Dr. Alan Campbell, and Kim Ellis from the bottom of my heart for allowing me to have the opportunity to complete this degree while working under your supervision. I value your friendship and the trust that you have placed in me over the years. Each of you has helped to make me a better person and practitioner.

Two important components of a doctoral program are the interactions and relationships that occur and develop between students in the program. Many thanks must be given to the wonderful friends that I developed during my doctoral studies. Andy, Alicia, Jan, Jon, Michael, Rick, Regina, Karen, Krystal, Wanda, Diane, Sherri, Val, Brad, Ed, Jen, JD, and so many others have helped to make me a better person, scholar, and practitioner.

Special thanks must go to my friends that made up the “Friday Night Football” group. Many great Friday nights were spent watching some excellent Northeast Georgia high school football games with my friends Dr. Bryan Rush, Beau Seagraves, and Eric Atkinson. I will miss all the good BBQ, touchdowns, outstanding hits, cups of hot chocolate, laughs, cheers, and band music that we were able to hear and see over the last few years. As we all move on in our careers I will always fondly remember those Friday night escapes from school and work obligations.

I want to thank my friend Marc LaMotte for always being there and offering a supportive comment when things got rough. I have enjoyed the many trips to Barbaritos at lunch. Those little lunch breaks during the day were great escapes from the stresses of work and school.

I think every person needs a good and reliable friend in their life. I have been blessed with many during my time on this earth, but none like my friend Bobby Woodard. Bobby and I started our Ph.D program back in the Fall of 2003. Bobby and his wife Summer have been great friends to Jenny and I over the last six years and for that we are eternally grateful. Bobby you are a good man and my life is better because you are my friend.

I want to give a special thanks to my family, which has had a substantial influence on me and aided in my successful completion of this Ph.D. I want to thank my mother, Rosemary Isaac for all of the support and love over the years. I thank my sister Rachel Isaac for her positive energy and kind smile. I must thank my sister-in-law Jamie Frye and niece Bella Rose Frye for allowing me to pull my brother away over the last few years to go camping, watch football, and go hiking. Many thanks to Jeremy Frye the best brother a guy could ask for. A big thanks must also be given to Peggy Muckler my mother-in-law and all of the "Muckler Family" for their support over the years.

Finally, and most importantly I want to thank my lovely wife Jenny Frye and our pets Boone, Bear, and Abby. You guys are my life and I look forward to welcoming our new edition Solomon Trask Frye into the family this October 2009.

~Brandon A. Frye

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	v
LIST OF TABLES	xii
LIST OF FIGURES	xiii
CHAPTER	
ONE INTRODUCTION	1
Statement of the Problem	2
Purpose of the Study.....	5
Research Questions	6
Operational Definitions	6
Significance	10
Chapter Summary.....	11
TWO REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE	12
Student Affairs Graduate Preparation Programs	12
Skills.....	21
Supervision.....	30
New Professionals	37
Chapter Summary.....	42
THREE METHODOLOGY.....	44
Overview of the Design.....	44

Participants	44
Research Instrument Creation and Design	45
Reliability and Validity	56
Data Collection.....	57
Research Questions	59
Data Analysis	60
Chapter Summary.....	61
FOUR RESULTS.....	62
Participant Demographics	62
Research Question One	64
Research Question Two.....	71
Research Question Three.....	80
Research Question Four	90
Research Question Five.....	100
Research Question Six.....	105
Chapter Summary.....	106
FIVE SUMMARY, DISCUSSION, AND IMPLICATIONS	108
Summary of the Study.....	108
Demographic Information Summary.....	109
Discussion of Significant/Main Findings	110
Implications for Practice	120
Limitations.....	126
Suggested Future Research	126

Chapter Summary.....	128
REFERENCES	130
APPENDICES	147
A Paper Version of Questionnaire (Student Affairs Supervisory Skill Learning Inventory).....	147
B Email to Chief Housing Officers Requesting Assistance	157
C Reminder Email to Chief Housing Officers Requesting Assistance	158
D Email Request to Participate.....	159
E Reminder Email Request to Participate	161
F Final Reminder Email Request to Participate.....	163
G Letter of Support from Dr. Gerry Kowalski, University of Georgia	165
H Peer Review Survey Critique.....	166
I Phase One of Questionnaire Design Process	168
J Phase Six of Questionnaire Design Process.....	175
K Phase Seven of Questionnaire Design Process	182
L Phase Eight of Questionnaire Design Process	187
M Phase Nine of Questionnaire Design Process	190
N Phase Twelve of Questionnaire Design Process.....	193
O Participating ACUHO-I Institutions	203
P Demographic Information.....	206

LIST OF TABLES

	Page
Table 3.1: Identified Supervision Skills by Category with Number of Citations.....	49
Table 3.2: Overall Questionnaire Reliability	57
Table 4.1: Questionnaire Scales.....	65
Table 4.2: Scale Reliability.....	70
Table 4.3: Ranked Mean Scores and Standard Deviations for Supervision Skills Learned During Classroom Instruction	73
Table 4.4: Results of <i>T</i> Tests for Classroom Instruction Scales	77
Table 4.5: Ranked Mean Scores and Standard Deviations for Supervision Skills Learned During Supervised Practice Experiences	83
Table 4.6: Results of <i>T</i> Tests for Supervised Practice Experiences.....	87
Table 4.7: Ranked Mean Scores and Standard Deviations for Supervision Skills Learned During Self-taught Learning Experiences.....	92
Table 4.8: Results of <i>T</i> Tests for Self-taught Activities.....	96
Table 4.9: Suggested Critical Skills by Frequency.....	101
Table 4.10: Suggested Supervisory Skills	105

LIST OF FIGURES

	Page
Figure 4.1: Top Five Suggested Supervisory Skills.....	101

Supervision Skills Acquisition: Where Master's Students Learn Supervisory Skills During
Student Affairs Graduate Preparation Programs

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

Management of staff is one of the most challenging aspects of student affairs administration (Dalton, 2003). A critical element involved in the successful management of staff members is effective supervision. In student affairs, supervision is an expected competency at all organizational levels (Burkard, Cole, Ott & Stoflet, 2005; Davis, 2004; Lovell & Kosten, 2000; Radall & Colbetti, 1992; Saunders & Cooper, 1999; White, 2007; White, 2008). Stock-Ward and Javorek (2003) reported that “supervision in student affairs has the potential to facilitate individual growth, improve service, and change the nature of the entire field” (p. 89). While some would debate if effective supervision could change the entire field of student affairs, many researchers and practitioners agree on the importance of effective supervision and supervisory skill development (Dalton; Ricci, Porterfield, & Piper, 1987; Frye, 2006; Saunders, Cooper, Winston, & Chernow, 2000).

Few practitioners in student affairs have received adequate training as supervisors and many pay little attention to the role of supervision (Davis, 2004; Schuh & Carlisle, 1997; Stock-Ward & Javorek, 2003). Winston and Fitch (1993) noted that many entry-level supervisors in residence life lacked basic supervision skills, confidence in their ability to supervise, and in the absence of training they were likely to rely on their past experiences, good or bad. An entry-level supervisor who relies too heavily on negative past supervisory experiences could model

those negative supervision techniques to individuals he or she supervises and in turn potentially continue the cycle of ineffective supervisory practice.

Many student affairs practitioners have been supervised during their time in graduate preparation programs. However, Schneider (1998) stated, “while some graduate programs provide opportunities for on-the-job training through assistantships, trial by fire is often the primary training tool” (p. 37). The trial by fire method of learning or practice without the use of theory or research (Evans, Forney, & Guido-DiBrito, 1998) seems counterintuitive to a field which has worked diligently to be recognized as an emerging profession (Carpenter, Miller, & Winston, 1980; Carpenter & Stimpson, 2007; Winston, Creamer, and Miller, 2001).

One of the hallmarks of any profession is the formal graduate training of its practitioners (Young, 1994; Young & Janosik, 2007) and it is critical that the formal training be made up of specialized knowledge (Stamatakos, 1981). Just as counselors, educational psychologists, educators, and members of other recognized professions learn specific skills during graduate training to become effective practitioners for their fields of study, student affairs practitioners should learn the necessary skills during graduate school in order to practice in an effective manner. However, student affairs practitioners are exiting graduate preparation programs ill prepared in the area of supervision (Davis, 2002; Davis, 2004; Davis Barham & Winston, 2006; Wapel, 2006).

Statement of the Problem

Over the past thirty years, the preparation of student affairs professionals has been a topic of much debate among college student affairs preparation faculty, student affairs practitioners, and national/international professional associations (Wapel, 2006). Wapel stated, “the argument over what constitutes appropriate curriculum in student affairs preparation remains a topic of

controversy” (p. 1). It is essential that student affairs graduate preparation programs have curricula which support activities and learning opportunities that result in future practitioners learning skills that allow them to effectively carry out the responsibilities of their jobs (Wapel).

The most widely used standards for graduate preparation programs in student affairs are found in the guidelines of the Council for the Advancement of Standards in Higher Education (CAS) (Creamer & Winston, 2002). The CAS standards for master’s level preparation programs for student affairs practitioners lists three curricular elements: 1) foundation studies, 2) supervised practice, and 3) professional studies (CAS, 2006). The CAS standards detail that organizational administration, a foundational studies component, should be an element of the student affairs curriculum. Specifically, supervision is mentioned within this section; however, it only states that it “should be included [in the curriculum]” (p. 353).

Supervision is also discussed within the supervised practice section of the CAS Standards. Specifically, it states, “students must gain experience in...supervision” (CAS, p. 353). The lack of specific information within the CAS standards regarding supervision skills in student affairs graduate preparation programs provides graduate preparation program faculty with flexibility to determine the skills; however, it could create challenges for faculty in defining consistent supervision skills that can aid in promoting success as a supervisor.

Lack of specificity regarding supervision could lead to problems concerning the learning of supervisory skills during graduate preparation programs. Arminio and Creamer (2001) in their study of quality supervision in the field of student affairs identified that, “more and better graduate-level preparation is needed” (p. 42) in order to prepare graduate students and provide them with the skills necessary to serve as supervisors after they graduate and enter the

workforce. Improvement and change must occur in student affairs master's programs to better enable graduate students with the necessary supervision skills for success on-the-job.

One way to address this problem is through research. Empirical studies and literature regarding supervision in the field of student affairs were once described as limited (Carpenter, Torres, & Winston, 2001; Davis, 2002; Stock-Ward & Javorek, 2003; Winston & Creamer, 1998); however, research and scholarly writing regarding the topic has increased during recent years (e.g., Davis, 2004; Frye, 2006; Tull, 2006; White, 2007; White, 2008). The literature identifies that supervisory skills are utilized regularly by most student affairs practitioners (Saunders & Cooper, 1999), yet recent literature (e.g., Davis, 2004; Davis Barham & Winston, 2006; Wapel, 2006) identified that many new professionals lack the necessary skills to supervise individuals when they complete graduate school and start their careers in student affairs. Additionally, Wapel uncovered through a questionnaire in his study on skills and competencies essential for entry-level student affairs work, with the use of a seven-point Likert scale indicating the degree to which they attained the skills as part of their graduate preparation program and degree to which the skill or competency was necessary to perform their current job, that the skill of supervision is being attained by students at a lower degree during their graduate preparation programs but is being used in their post-graduation jobs at a higher degree.

Wapel's (2006) study articulates the need to look deeper into the area of skill development and more specifically, he recommended researching the role that the assistantship plays in skill acquisition. There are currently no published studies within the field of student affairs that identify a specific list of supervisory skills. Specifically, no studies have addressed what supervision skills first-year post master's new professionals learned during their preparatory programs through the most utilized instructional methods and learning activities such

as: 1) classroom instruction, 2) supervised practice (practicum, internship, and graduate assistantship), and 3) self taught learning. Additionally, the literature has not addressed which supervision skills new professionals list as critical for effective supervision of staff.

Greater attention should be devoted to the topic of supervision in graduate preparation programs (Davis Barham & Winston, 2006). Knowing more about this topic will improve the understanding of new professionals, training of new professionals through graduate instruction, and supervision within the field of student affairs. Time must be spent identifying specific supervision skills and determining which ones are critical for success as a new professional with supervisory responsibilities. Identification of these skills, how they are learned, and those described as critical by new professionals can lead to learning more about how supervision skills can be taught more effectively and comprehensively in graduate preparation programs.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to identify a set of supervision skills that student affairs practitioners and graduate preparation program faculty could utilize as a resource to improve the learning of these skills during student affairs graduate preparation programs. Secondly, the study determined which of the identified supervision skills first-year full-time post master's new professionals learned during their preparatory programs through the following instructional methods and learning activities: 1) class room instruction, 2) supervised practice (graduate assistantship, practicum, and internship), and 3) self-taught learning (on their own). Finally, the study identified which supervision skills the new professionals describe as critical to effectively supervise direct reports.

Research Questions

The central research questions (RQ) for this study were:

RQ 1: What are the supervision skills needed to be an effective supervisor as identified in the literature?

RQ 2: What supervision skills did first-year post-master's new professionals learn through classroom instruction during their graduate preparation programs?

RQ 3: What supervision skills did first-year post-master's new professionals learn through the supervised practice experience (graduate assistantship, internship, and practicum) during their graduate preparation programs?

RQ 4: What supervision skills did first-year post-master's new professionals learn through self-taught learning while in their graduate preparation programs?

RQ 5: What supervision skills are listed as critical for success as a supervisor by first-year post-master's new professionals?

RQ: 6: What supervision skills, if any, should be added to the listed skills identified by the researcher from the literature?

Operational Definitions

The following definitions guided the research and provided a foundation for the study:

Graduate Preparation Program

For the purpose of this study a graduate preparation program is an academic program at an institution of higher education that “assumes the task of formally preparing student affairs practitioners to enter the field [of student affairs]” (Creamer & Winston, 2002, p. 10). Typically, these programs are housed in one of three academic departments: (1) educational leadership and policy studies, or higher education, (2) counseling or educational psychology, or (3) adult

education (Creamer & Winston). The curriculum for the graduate preparation program could take three general approaches: (1) student affairs as a minor emphasis within a broader program, (2) student affairs as a concentration or major within a broader program, and (3) student affairs as a stand-alone program (Creamer & Winston).

Master's Student

The term master's student indicated a graduate student enrolled full or part-time in an accredited graduate preparation program leading to a master of arts, sciences, or education degree in student affairs or a related field of study, such as counseling, student development, higher education, or educational psychology.

New Professional

The term new professional has been defined in a variety of ways within the student affairs literature. Ostroth (1981) defined a new professional as individual who has a master's degree and no more than one year of full-time work experience. In 1990, Coleman and Johnson expanded on the definition of new professional by extending it to an individual who is in his or her first five years of full-time professional employment. Davis (2004) defined a new professional as an individual in the first three years of their full-time professional careers, a graduate of a professional preparation program in student affairs, and working in a traditional student affairs functional area. More recently, Frye (2006) defined the term as "a professional who has attained his or her master's degree in student affairs or a related field and is working in higher education/student affairs within his or her first to third year of full-time employment.

A new professional was operationally defined for this study as an individual who has attained his or her master's degree in student affairs or a related field of study (i.e., student development, educational psychology, counseling, or higher education) and is at a college or

university within his or her first twelve months of full-time post masters employment working in the housing and/or residence life functional unit.

Supervised Practice

There is no generally accepted term within the student affairs field to describe the supervised practice experience (Cooper, Saunders, Winston, Hirt, Creamer, & Janosik, 2002). Supervised practice is an educational experience that is part of an academic graduate program. The experience is experiential in nature and involves the student going into the field to apprentice, shadow, and learn from a more experienced professional. Graduate assistantships, internships, and practica are all forms of supervised practice; however, these types of supervised practice vary in terms of length, amount of supervision, credit hours, and purpose.

Self-taught Learning

For the purpose of this investigation self-taught learning, or learning on your own, was defined as a learning process that is initiated by the enrolled graduate student that was not an assigned class project, class reading, or lecture. The student must have taken self-directed initiative to go beyond the requirements of classroom instruction or supervised practice (practicum, internship, or graduate assistantship) to investigate and learn about a topic of interest. The primary purpose is for learning and development. Self-taught learning for this study will relate to the topic of supervision.

Classroom Instruction

This study defined classroom instruction as a formal class activity that occurs in an educational setting and is focused on “the purposeful direction of the learning process” (Huitt, 2003, ¶ 1). Classroom instruction can formally occur through professors, peers, or guest lecturers as well as through assigned classroom projects, papers, and exams. The end goal of

classroom instruction is to develop the potential and capacities of the students within the class (Huitt, 2001).

Learning/learned

Learning/learned was defined as “the relatively permanent change in an individual’s behavior or behavior potential (or capability) as a result of experience or practice” (Huitt, 2001, ¶ 9).

Supervision

Supervision is a management function that is intended to promote the achievement of institutional objectives and goals and enhances the professional and personal capabilities and skills of staff (Winston & Creamer, 1998). In addition for the purposes of this study supervision related to a work based relationship that is dependent on employment and a reporting line. Supervision must not be confused with advising. The two competencies are similar in nature; however, they are separate constructs. Specifically, “advising is the out-of-class activity provided to all students” (Frost, 1991) in which “a student’s development can be directly encouraged” (Love, 2003). Additionally, advising is based on a helping relationship (Love) with a student or student organization that is not determined by the employment of the individual or group.

Supervisor

A supervisor is an individual who has a responsibility as part of his or her job duties to enhance through a reporting structure the personal and professional skills and capabilities of staff members (i.e., paraprofessional, professional, support, administrative, etc.) that promotes the achievement of institutional goals and objectives (Winston & Creamer, 1998).

Supervision Skills

Supervision skills, as defined in this study, are abilities that aid in the completion of tasks associated with one's supervisory responsibilities. Phase one of this study identified supervision skills that student affairs professionals with supervisory responsibilities should possess. These skills are grouped into four categories and detailed in chapter three of this study.

Significance

Answering the research questions aids student affairs graduate preparation program faculty by identifying a list of supervision skills and determining which skills are learned through a variety of instructional methods. The developed list is a resource for student affairs graduate preparation faculty and supervised practice site supervisors. Identifying this information and answering the research questions can allow for the creation of a more effective curriculum for the development of supervision skills. Determining which supervision skills are attained through the various instructional methods and learning activities that new professionals are exposed to during their preparation programs aids student affairs faculty and supervised practice site supervisors in better shaping intentional opportunities that enhance the learning of supervision skills for student affairs graduate students. The findings add to existing literature on supervision, student affairs new professionals, supervision skill development, and student affairs graduate preparation programs. This may lead to future research on these topics, potentially enhancing the student affairs literature and providing information that can improve the quality of supervision within the field of student affairs. Finally, mid-managers within student affairs can utilize the results in working with entry-level supervisors to identify possible deficiencies in or lack of supervision skills that may be in need of development or improvement.

Chapter Summary

Supervision is a complex task for which many new professionals lack the necessary skills to effectively carry out. Current research (Davis, 2004; Wapel, 2006) supports this concept and has identified that master's students are exiting preparatory programs ill prepared and lacking many necessary skills to practice effectively. Many new professionals feel they did not learn enough about supervision or attain the adequate skill level to be effective as supervisors (Wapel). This chapter argued that more research is necessary to fully understand the level and degree of preparation of entry-level supervisors within the field of student affairs. Specifically, the chapter detailed the need to identify a comprehensive list of supervision skills, determine which skills were learned during specific educational learning activities during preparatory programs, and detail which supervision skills new professionals describe as critical.

CHAPTER TWO

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

This study involved four primary constructs: 1) student affairs graduate preparation programs, 2) supervisory skill development, 3) supervision, and 4) new professionals. Each of these areas has been investigated individually within student affairs and other fields of study, and scholarly work has evolved from each topic. For the purpose of this chapter the primary constructs were reviewed to provide background literature that built the foundation for this investigation.

Student Affairs Graduate Preparation Programs

Graduate Preparation

Professional preparation and graduate education are paramount for individuals in many professions (Young & Janosik, 2007). Hesburgh, Miller, and Wharton (1973) describe professional education as the introduction and updating of skills, theory, and perspectives for individuals in their field of study. The major purposes of most graduate preparation programs include: 1) the development of professional and research skills among students and 2) to assist those individuals in becoming socialized into the academic culture of their academic program and field (Brown-Wright, 1997). Unless individuals can successfully complete the course of training for their profession, they will likely not achieve full status as a member of that field (Stuit, Dickson, Jordan, & Schloerb, 1949; Young & Janosik). As with many fields, graduate preparation programs generally assume the task of formally preparing practitioners to enter the field of student affairs (Creamer & Winston, 2002).

Development of Student Affairs and Student Affairs Graduate Preparation Programs

Many scholars would debate the exact beginning of what is now considered the field of student affairs (Rentz, 1996). Rhatigan (2000) describes student affairs as “largely an American higher education invention” (p. 5). More specifically, others (i.e., Brown, 1926; Brubacher & Rudy, 1958) link the start of student affairs to the first documented Dean of Men position, which was developed in 1890 at Harvard University. The early deans of men and deans of women were recruited from the faculty, and college and university presidents typically chose faculty members who were respected by students, popular as instructors, and interested in student success (Sandeen, 1991). Most of the early deans of women and deans of men did not have a great deal of administrative experience, and there was substantial difference in the way they conducted business and completed their jobs (Sandeen).

Many factors aided in the development of the dean of students position and the field of student affairs. Rhatigan (2000) noted the following factors that contributed to the growth of student affairs: 1) the growth and development of land-grant colleges and universities, 2) expanding enrollments, 3) intellectual, social, and political ferment in the United States, 4) the increase in the number of women entering educational institutions, 5) an emphasis on vocation, and 6) the introduction of the elective system in higher education. In addition, a focus on science and the scientific method; industrialization and growth; and the changing role of students on college and university campuses (Rhatigan) influenced the development of student affairs.

With all of the change and growth occurring during the early 1900s in the U.S. higher education system, “it was not long before efforts were underway to develop formal graduate programs designed to prepare those who aspired to become deans [of men and women]” (Sandeen, 1991, p. 14). A Diploma for Dean of Women is considered the first master’s degree in

what is now known as student affairs and was granted at the Teachers College at Columbia University in 1914 (Lloyd-Jones, 1949). In time, following the first Diploma for Dean of Women, graduate preparation programs to educate early deans of women and deans of men were developed at Syracuse, Minnesota, Northwestern, and many other institutions (Sandeen, 1991). The development of graduate preparation programs in student affairs has evolved over the last 90 years in conjunction with the growth and development of the field.

Student Affairs Preparation Programs

Professional graduate education in the field of student affairs has been described as the introduction and updating of knowledge, theory, skills, and perspectives for master's students in student affairs (Hesburgh, Miller, & Wharton, 1973; Young & Janosik, 2007). Professional preparation for student affairs practitioners has been a topic of great concern among faculty, professional associations, and student affairs practitioners for many years (Hyman, 1985; Hyman, 1988; Smith, 2005). Researchers (Evans, 1983; Taub & McEwen, 2006) have noted that student affairs graduate students often have an unrealistic view of the field and typically only have a vague understanding of their reasons for pursuing a master's degree in student affairs (Taub & McEwen). Student affairs preparation programs should be intentionally assessed on a consistent basis in order to ascertain the efficacy of the curriculum as it relates to practice in the profession (Herdlein, 2004). Herdlein noted that, "it is unclear whether graduate programs in student affairs have been satisfactory in preparing student affairs administrators in the rapidly changing environment of higher education" (p. 51). During the last 30 years, faculty members and practitioners have debated over which type of program, particular courses, and experiential learning opportunities were most appropriate for: 1) determining and teaching critical competencies for practitioners, 2) effective in exchanging and creating knowledge, 3) building

avenues for application of theory, and 4) developing skills to be effective as a student affairs practitioner (Herdlein).

Types of Student Affairs Preparation Programs

For those individuals entering the field of student affairs, there are many approaches to professional preparation (Creamer & Winston, 2002). Creamer and Winston noted that there is great variance in the breath and level of intensity within student affairs preparation programs and that “program orientation is determined to a certain extent by the academic department within which the program resides” (p. 13). Typically, the curriculum for student affairs preparation programs follows three general approaches: 1) student affairs as a minor emphasis within a larger program, 2) student affairs as a major or concentration area within a broader program, and 3) student affairs as a stand-alone program (Creamer & Winston). When student affairs is typically only a minor concentration within a broader program the majority of the courses do not focus specifically on student affairs or even college students (Creamer & Winston). In those programs where student affairs is only a concentration within a larger program of study only about one-half to one-third of the course work is specific to student affairs practice. Typically, when student affairs serves as a concentration in a program the remaining course work is focused on general educational administration, higher education administration and history, or counseling (Creamer & Winston). In the case of stand alone programs, student affairs is the central focus of the program and at least two-thirds of the courses are specific for students preparing to be practitioners in student affairs (Creamer & Winston).

Council for the Advancement of Standards (CAS) for Student Affairs Preparation Programs

Over the last 30 years student affairs practitioners and graduate preparation program faculty have sought consensus on the suggested standards for student affairs practice. Arminio

(2006) notes that standards for graduate education of student affairs professionals are relatively recent and grew from the 1960s. Most new professionals have earned master's degrees from reputable student affairs preparation programs (Winston and Miller, 1991) and most of these programs adhere to the CAS Standards (Smith, 2005).

CAS was founded as a profession-wide collaborative body for the field of student affairs with the purpose of developing, promulgating, and implementing standards and initiatives for student affairs (CAS, 2006). "The primary value of the CAS preparation standards is to assist in assuring that an academic program is offering what the profession, through representative consensus, has deemed necessary to graduate prepared student affairs professionals" (Arminio, 2006, p. 347). The standards for graduate students in student affairs preparation programs were created as a guide for student affairs faculty members and to equip master's students with the minimum level of education necessary for student affairs practice (McEwen & Talbot, 1998; Young & Janosik, 2007). The CAS standards and guidelines for master's level preparation of student affairs practitioners include three curricular components: 1) foundation studies, 2) professional studies, and 3) supervised practice (CAS). Foundational studies pertain to the philosophical and historical foundations of student affairs and higher education (Arminio, 2006). Professional studies pertain to the following topics: 1) student characteristics, 2) student development theory, 3) individual and group interventions, 4) the effects of college on students, 5) the organization and administration of student affairs units, and 6) research, assessment, and evaluation practices (Arminio). Supervised practice includes practica, internships, and graduate assistantships under professionally supervised work conditions (Arminio).

Research using the CAS standards for student affairs preparation at the master's level came soon after the publication of the original standards in 1986 (Young & Janosik, 2007). Von

Destinon (1986) compared the curriculum of the master's program in student services at the University of Arizona with the then newly formed CAS standards. Young and Elfrink (1991) examined the importance of value education in student affairs preparation programs, as recommended in the CAS standards. More recently, Smith's (2005) dissertation examined the CAS standards for student affairs graduate preparation programs and expectations of supervisors of entry-level professionals in residence life and housing to determine the level of congruence between them. Most recently, Young and Janosik's (2007) research investigated the degree to which recent graduates from student affairs graduate programs reported learning about the important foundational elements of the field and if there were potential differences in learning between those elements from programs that do and do not meet CAS standards.

Instructional Methods and Activities for Student Affairs Preparation Programs

“Greater consistency in program curricula has been developed through more universal acceptance of guidelines provided by the Council for the Advancement of Standards” (Herdlein, 2004). What are not as consistent are the specific approaches and methods that have been utilized to educate graduate students in preparation programs. Student Affairs graduate preparation programs provide multiple approaches to practitioner preparation (Kuk & Donovan, 2002). Graduate students in these preparation programs are exposed to wide-ranging and highly complex information and material (Creamer & Winston, 2002). “Training and preparation for professional practice, historically and continuing to this day, are rooted in both experience and practice and in formal graduate work” (McEwen & Talbot, 1998, p. 127). For prospective student affairs practitioners, most graduate-level, comprehensive, preparation programs use multiple tactics or strategies for teaching subject matter (Cooper, Saunders, Winston, Hirt, Creamer, & Janosik, 2002). Content material is typically taught or learned through the following

instructional methods or learning activities: 1) classroom instruction, 2) supervised practice (graduate assistantship, internship, and practica), and 3) self-taught (self-directed) learning.

Classroom Instruction

The review of curriculum and instruction is an ongoing activity for the majority of the academic world (Kretovics, 2002). Academic programs within institutions of higher learning are expected to keep their curricula current with the demands of external stakeholders and accrediting bodies (Kretovics & McCambridge, 1998). Since the first academic preparation program for what is now considered student affairs began at Teachers College, Columbia University in 1913, debate has ensued regarding curriculum and the proper methods to instruct graduate students (Herdlein, 2004). Herdlein noted that the topic of graduate program efficacy has been a salient issue and an area of interest to researchers. Research on student affairs graduate student instruction over the years has been quite varied; yet, specific research on the actual process of classroom instruction methods is more limited. However, there have been related scholarly works of mention. Engstrom (1999) suggested the promotion of scholarly writing in female graduate students to enhance the graduate curricula.

When looking outside of the student affairs literature in the field of educational psychology one begins to find more information regarding classroom instruction. Huitt's (2003) research regarding the reasons for studying educational psychology notes that classroom instruction is "the purposeful direction of the learning process" (¶ 1). In his review of classroom instruction Huitt (2001) noted that the primary goal of classroom instruction is to develop the potential and capacities of the students within a class.

Supervised Practice: Practicum, Internship, and Graduate Assistantship

Amey (1998) noted that a student affairs master's degree provides an orientation to the field through classroom instruction and initial professional work experiences, often in the form of paid assistantships and for-credit internships and practicum experiences. These supervised practice experiences are typically the place within the student affairs curriculum where theory, application of skills, personality attributes, technical knowledge, institutional resources, human foibles, and campus politics come together (Cooper, Saunders, Winston, Hirt, Creamer, & Janosik, 2002). Supervised practice experiences are often called practica, "courses emphasizing the practical application of theory in which a student gains on-the-job experience," (Creamer & Winston, 2002, p. 17) or internships, "practical experiences of serving as an intern under the supervision of a seasoned practitioner" (Creamer & Winston, p. 17). Additionally, they could be referred to as externships, field experiences, work-study programs or shadowing programs (Creamer & Winston)

Historically, supervised practice experiences have played an essential role in the preparation of student affairs practitioners (Hirt & Janosik, 2002). Most graduate preparation programs have offered such experiences for decades, and they are typically viewed as essential components of the student affairs curriculum (Hirt & Janosik; Winston, Lathrop, Lease, Davis, Newsome, & Benny, 2001). Supervised practice experiences are a vital part of the preparation program experience and differ from classroom-based instruction because these experiences occur in actual professional work settings where "translating textbook examples and theories to real world situations can be challenging" (Amey, 1998, p. 5).

Graduate Assistantship

Institutions of higher education should pay close attention to graduate student training (American Association of University Professors [AAUP]; Leatherman & Magner, 1996).

Graduate assistantships have been cited in the literature as having a major influence on graduate students' leadership development (Rodgers, 1992). Although several conference papers related to the role, expectations, and responsibilities of graduate assistants have been presented (Koehnecke, 1991), empirical study on the topic of graduate assistants is almost nonexistent (Brown-Wright, Dubick, & Newman, 1997). As of yet, only a smattering of attention and research has focused specifically on the development of graduate assistants as future student affairs professionals (Cooper & Miller, 1998).

Many graduate preparation programs in student affairs administration work in conjunction with other campus professionals to offer student graduate assistantships positions (Hirt & Janosik, 2002). In exchange for working 10 to 20 hours per week in an office, students in GA work positions are provided with a stipend and potentially tuition remission, depending on the institution (Hirt & Janosik). GA positions can serve as opportunities for students to hone their skills and apply information attained from classroom instruction (Hirt & Janosik).

In applicable literature, Cooper and Saunders (2003) identified that differences exist between supervising graduate assistants and graduate interns. They explained that the assistantship was a form of supervised practice that graduate students typically encountered as part of graduate preparation programs; however, the graduate assistant's supervision should be viewed similarly to that of a new full-time professional. Cooper and Saunders' recommendation is based on the following reasons: 1) the graduate assistants work assignments are determined by the supervisor, 2) the assistantship experience requires more hours per week for a longer period

of time than does other forms of supervised practice, and 2) the assistantship is typically awarded to the graduate student as part of his or her admission to graduate school and based on a work assignment to a particular unit rather than an academic requirement.

Self-taught Learning

If the student affairs field is going to succeed, entry-level professionals (Smith, 2005) and student affairs master's students must be trained adequately. However, it is not always clear whether the combination of in-class-instruction and out-of-class experiences adequately prepares graduate students to hit the ground running once they start their first post-master's position (Amey, 1998). At times, it becomes necessary for new professionals and graduate students to take ownership and direct their unique educational experience (Winston & Hirt, 2003). Smith reported that current student affairs professionals and student affairs preparation faculty have an obligation to ensure that graduate students and entry-level professionals have the skills and competencies they need to be successful. Yet, responsibility for the development of master's students cannot rest solely in the hands of student affairs faculty members and supervised practice supervisors (Winston & Hirt). New professionals and student affairs graduate students need to challenge and push themselves to learn competencies and acquire the necessary skills for effective practice (Winston & Hirt) through self-taught learning methods and activities.

Skills

Employer Expectations

Most professions with an extensive history should be able to identify traits, qualities, knowledge bases, and skills necessary for success (Lovell & Kosten, 2000). One way to identify those traits, qualities, and skills is through understanding employer expectations. Meeting employer expectations is critical for most individuals in many professions. Anecdotally,

employer expectations can also set the tone for curriculum development within institutions of higher learning. Student affairs is a field in which employer expectation plays a role in the accomplishment of college and university business and activities. Possessing both practical and theoretical experience makes it easier for new professionals in student affairs to meet the expectations of their employers (Smith, 2005; Winston & Miller, 1991). Employers have expectations, some realistic and others not, that new professionals must meet (Smith).

Type of Skills

When discussing the topic of skills it is necessary to review the various types of professional skills an employee would be expected to have learned through professional training. Additionally, it is necessary to address how those skills are defined and categorized in the literature in order to gain a full understanding of the construct. This section will detail the various categories and types of skills employers could expect professionals to have learned and highlight how those skills are defined based on a review of the literature within and outside of higher education and student affairs.

Skills by Category

Much of the seminal research regarding competencies, skills, and abilities, for administrators began with the work of Robert L. Katz in 1955. His research and work has had a major influence within the field of student affairs. Several recent investigations (e.g., Davis, 2004; Porter, 2005) within student affairs have utilized his work as a model and or a theoretical framework for their investigations. Katz (1955) identified a hierarchy of different skills necessary for administrators at varying levels of an organization (Porter). He defined the term skill as “an ability which can be developed, not necessarily inborn, and which is manifested in performance, not merely in potential” (Katz, 1955, pp. 34).

Katz's classic approach is based on the skills that executives exhibit in effectively performing their jobs (Porter, 2005). Katz identified three fundamental skill areas for executives, managers, and supervisors: technical, administrative, and interpersonal. However, according to Katz (1955), in practice these skills are so interrelated that it is difficult to determine where one begins and the other ends.

In 1993, Paul Sandwith developed and proposed a competency model for management training. Sandwith's research proposed that the activities of administrators could no longer be confined to Katz's (1955) three categories. He made this proposal because of the advanced research in managerial work and changes in the type of training needed for administrators (Porter, 2005). Sandwith expanded on Katz's research and added leadership skills and conceptual skills to Katz's original list of technical, administrative, and interpersonal skill sets. He identified five skill categories/competency domains: 1) technical, 2) administrative, 3) interpersonal, 4) leadership, and 5) conceptual (Sandwith).

The business related writings of Humphrey and Stokes (2000) supported Katz's (1955) work when they proposed that it was necessary for business professionals to possess the necessary people, technical, and administrative skills in order to effectively supervise staff in the new millennium. In student affairs related literature, Porter (2005) utilized Sandwith's 1993 competency classification model to establish a competency model for the chief college housing officer. More recently, in business related literature Leonard and Hilgert (2004) grouped skills in the following six major classifications: 1) technical, 2) human relation, 3) administrative, 4) conceptual, 5) political, and 6) emotional intelligence.

In order to gain a fuller picture of the categories and types of skills one must have an understanding of how each category has been defined in the literature. Katz (1955) defined

people/human skill as “the executive’s ability to work effectively as a group member and to build cooperative effort within the team he [she] leads” (p. 34). Katz’s perspective painted human skill as one that deals primarily with people, how individuals view each other within an organization, and subsequent individual behaviors (Porter, 2005). Certo (1994) in a similar way highlighted that human relation skills are the ability to work effectively with other individuals in a work environment. In 1995 Ricks, Ginn, and Daughtrey defined human skill as the “ability to understand, communicate with, work with, and interact harmoniously with people” (p. 21). They proposed that human skills were the most important skill a manager could possess and that those skills enable managers to understand others as well as themselves. Humphrey & Stokes (2000) noted that human relation skills have always been of keen importance for supervisors, and these skills will become even more important in the future. In 2004 Leonard and Hilgert highlighted that human relation skills include the ability to motivate team members and have an open-mind.

Having technical skills implies a proficiency and understanding in a specific kind of activity, particularly one involving procedures, processes, methods, or techniques (Katz, 1955) Katz went on to say that “technical skill involves specialized knowledge, analytical ability within that specialty, and facility in the use of tools and techniques of the specific discipline” (p. 34). Taking a slightly different approach to defining technical skills, Sandwith (1993) detailed that technical skills refer to the actual work of the business, and the methods or processes involved in evaluating and completing the work. Utilizing a similar definition to Katz’s 1955 work, Certo (1994) defined technical skills as the “specialized knowledge and expertise used to carry out particular techniques or procedures” (p. 4). Leonard and Hilgert (2004) took a more general

approach and defined technical skill as the ability to complete the tasks in a supervisor's area of responsibility.

Humphrey and Stokes (2000) noted that the continually changing work environment will require individuals to be more active in processing information and that supervisors will need keen administrative skills to succeed. In business related literature Leonard and Hilgert (2004) detailed that administrative skills were the ability to organize, plan, and coordinate the activities of a work team. While in the student affairs literature, according to Porter (2005) administrative skill involves the supervision of personnel (e.g., hiring, training, orientation, evaluation, discipline, safety standards, etc.) and management of fiscal resources (e.g., budgeting, accounting practices, cost-benefit analysis, etc.).

Conceptual skills are those that provide an administrator with the ability to see the organization as an entire enterprise, recognizing that various functions are interdependent and that a change to a single functional area could affect the entire organization (Katz, 1995). Katz claims that the overall success of a company is dependent on the administrator's conceptual skill since it is the "unifying, coordinating ingredient of the administrative process and of undeniable over-all importance" (p. 36) in moving the organization toward a common objective (Porter). Leonard and Hilgert (2004) took a slightly different approach by highlighting that conceptual skill is an ability to interpret, obtain, and apply information needed to make sound business decisions.

Certo (1994) defined decision making skills as "the ability to analyze information and reach good decisions" (p. 5). Leonard and Hilgert (2004) proposed that political skills are the savvy to ascertain the not so visible rules of an organization and the ability to recognize the various roles that people play in getting things done within the work environment. They went on

to describe emotional intelligence skills as the use of one's emotions to help guide organizational behavior and thinking in ways to enhance desired results. When Sandwith (1993) defined the category of leadership skills he described them as a "strategic link between the conceptual domain and the other domains" (p. 47). According to Sandwith leadership skills include leading by example, empowering others, coaching, having a vision, and creating an environment of trust among employees.

Student Affairs Skills

The effectiveness of student affairs' overall contribution to higher education is essentially dependent on the abilities, knowledge, values, and skills of its practitioners (Kuh & Komives, 1987; Saunders & Cooper, 1999) "Student affairs practitioners are expected to possess a wide array of skills, some of which are acquired directly through professional preparation and others are acquired prior to beginning a professional preparation program" (Creamer & Winston, 2002, p. 7). The question of what knowledge and skills graduates of student affairs preparation programs should have as they begin their first post-master's professional position in the field is a fundamental question that is at the center of student affairs master's level preparation programs (Kuk & Donovan, 2002). During graduate school master's students can learn and develop skills through classes offered in the graduate curriculum, graduate assistantship positions, and professional associations, as well as with self-taught/directed activities.

Lovell and Kosten (2000) noted that multiple studies have been conducted regarding the kinds of skills, competencies, and traits necessary for success as a student affairs professional. Taking a broad approach to learning more about skill development Lovell and Kosten reviewed, through meta-analysis, a 30 year time span of research in order to identify the knowledge, personal traits, and skills important to successful student affairs practice. Lovell and Kosten

noted that, “to be successful as a student affairs administrator, well developed administration, management, and human facilitation skills are key” (p. 566). This study will not attempt to restate or replicate the work of Lovell and Kosten; however, this section will provide an overview of relevant investigations and scholarly works on the topic of skills related to entry-level/new professionals, graduate preparation programs/master’s students, and supervision.

Skills of Entry-level/New Professionals

While researching entry-level skills of student affairs professionals, Winston and Miller (1991) identified the following skills that employers classified as very important for entry-level student affairs professionals to have learned/acquired: a) teach students to be responsible for their decisions; b) the ability to confront unhealthy, destructive, or counterproductive behavior of students; c) assist students in identifying desirable behaviors and those behaviors that should be adapted; d) understand institutional policies, objectives, and expectations; e) assess student needs; f) use effective communication skills; g) make appropriate referrals when necessary; h) develop positive public relations; i) promote effective teamwork; j) bridge the gap between theory and practice; k) utilize effective decision making strategies; l) perform duties in accordance with ethical and professional standards; m) perform duties in accordance with professional practice standards; n) evaluate program effectiveness. Winston and Miller noted that even though entry-level staff members are more qualified than in previous years, they may still lack the necessary skills essential for practice in the profession.

Kretovic’s (2002) research on entry-level professionals identified that institutional type and demographics play roles in employer expectations of entry-level staff regarding demonstrated helping and computer skills. More recently, Burkard, Cole, Ott, and Stoflet (2005) examined the views of 104 middle and senior-level student affairs practitioners, through a Delphi

method, to gain a better understanding of the positions, responsibilities, theories, and competencies important for new professionals in student affairs. Of particular note, one specific implication for the profession regarding competency/skill development detailed that graduate preparation programs “may want to include instruction on advanced counseling/human relation competencies (i.e., collaboration, consultation, group facilitation, conflict resolution/mediation, supervision, and crisis intervention” (pp. 302-303).

Graduate Preparation Programs and Skills

Having reviewed graduate preparation programs earlier in this chapter, this paragraph will focus specifically on skill development within student affairs graduate preparation programs. Barr (1993) suggested the following list of specific core competencies and skills to be taught as part of student affairs preparation programs for administrators working in entry, middle, and upper-level management: 1) program planning, 2) theory, 3) budgeting and fiscal management, 4) outcomes assessment and evaluation, 5) conflict and crisis management, 6) ethical and legal knowledge, and 7) campus and community relations.

When researching graduate preparation programs and skill development for residence hall directors Palmer (1995) suggested that so many knowledge areas and skills are essential for an effective entry-level housing or residence life professional that it could be beyond the capability of master’s preparation programs. Pope and Reynolds (1997) proposed the following list of skills to be utilized in preparation programs within seven competency areas: 1) leadership, management, and administrative skills (e.g., resource use, program planning, supervision); 2) theory translation skills; 3) interpersonal and helping skills (e.g., advising, group dynamics, conflict and crisis management, community and campus relations, and counseling); 4) decision-making skills (e.g., knowledge of ethical standards, problem solving) and legal and ethical

knowledge; 5) teaching and training skills (e.g., consultation, staff development, workshop presentations); 6) evaluation and assessment skills (e.g., self-study, program evaluation); and multicultural awareness. In more recent research on graduate preparation programs, Herdlein (2004) surveyed 50 chief student affairs officers (CSAO) regarding the relevance of graduate preparation of new professionals and concluded that “the need to develop knowledge and skills in administration and supervision is clearly evident in the current study as well as the historic literature in the field” (p. 69).

Supervision Skills

The construct of supervision will be detailed in the next section of this chapter; however, this section will specifically address the development of supervision skills. Two recent investigations are important to highlight. First, in business related literature Humphrey & Stokes (2000) surveyed 500 organizations in the United States to identify the job skills each organization believed its supervisors would need to be successful in the future. A list of job skills was provided on the survey and respondents (one representative per company) could write in additional job skills they considered important. The following nine skills that received the greatest number of responses on the survey were: 1) communication, 2) coaching, 3) team, 4) project management, 5) computer skills, 6) continuous improvement, 7) writing skills, 8) business analysis skills, and 9) resource management skills. Humphrey and Stokes noted, “We believe that supervisors in the twenty-first century will need greater expertise and experience in decision making, financial analysis, writing letters and memos, and leading people” (p. 2).

Secondly, in student affairs related literature Wapel (2006) in his assessment of skills and competencies necessary for entry-level student affairs work identified that many new professionals lacked the skills to supervise individuals when they completed their graduate

preparation programs and started their careers in student affairs. Specifically, as highlighted in the introductory chapter of this investigation, Wapel uncovered that the skill of supervision was being attained by master's students at a lower degree during their graduate preparation programs but was being used in their post-graduation job at a high degree. However, he did not identify a specific subset of skills, defined by many in the business world (e.g., Humphrey & Stokes, 2000; Leonard & Hilgert 2004; Ricks, Ginn, & Daughtrey, 1995) that make up the larger construct of supervision. Additionally, Wapel did not address the methods (i.e. classroom instruction, supervised practice, etc) through which the skill of supervision was attained by the graduate students during their preparation programs; however, he did recommend that future research be conducted on the impact the graduate assistantship has on overall skill development and attainment.

Supervision

Management Practices

Student affairs professionals are expected to fulfill a number of professional roles within their institutions; some of the more critical roles are educator, manager, and leader (Creamer & Winston, 2002; Creamer, Winston, & Miller, 2001). To gain a better understanding of the supervision construct it is necessary to define and review the concept of management practices. The business literature outside of student affairs has done a better job of defining management. Ricks, Ginn, & Daughtrey (1995) detailed that management is the process of working through and with other individuals within an organization, and using available resources to meet the objectives and goals of the organization. More recently, Leonard and Hilgert (2004) highlighted the importance of motivation when they proposed that management was, the process of getting things completed through the utilization of people by motivating and guiding their efforts toward

common goals and objectives. Within student affairs, Sandeen (1991) defined an effective student affairs manager as “a leader whose vision and enthusiasm should cause others to support student life” (p. 89). Sandeen added that a successful manager must value hard work, pay attention to detail, and be intentional when planning.

According to Leonard and Hilgert (2004) the concept of management practices can be documented throughout human history. However, they note, “the systematic study of management has largely been a twentieth-century phenomenon” (p. 6). When reviewing the development and evolution of management practices, many scholars use the early to mid-1900s to the latter part of the twentieth century as a timeline (Ricks, Ginn, & Daughtrey, 1995, p. 4). Leonard and Hilgert document that there is not a great deal of agreement on the nomenclature and number of the various management theories; however, they identified four that deserved mention: (1) the scientific management approach, (2) the functional/administrative approach, (3) the human/relations/behavioral approach (4) the quantitative or systems approach. A brief review of the major schools of management theory and practices can provide a necessary foundation for better understanding supervisory concepts (Leonard & Hilgert).

Scientific management began in the late nineteenth century and found its focus in the first quarter of the twentieth century, placing emphasis on improving workplace efficiency (Ricks, Ginn, & Daughtrey, 1995). The *functional/administrative* approach originated in France from an engineer named Henri Fayol and focused on five functions critical to managers: 1) planning (developing and implementing a course of action), 2) organizing (designing, clearly defining, and structuring tasks), 3) commanding (directing employee’s actions), 4) coordinating (manipulating organizational elements toward common goals), and 5) controlling (making sure plans are completed) (Ricks, Ginn, & Daughtrey). Ricks, Ginn and Daughtrey noted that the

human relations/behavioral approach is focused on the behavior of individuals within the organization and gives attention to the human side of organizational management. The *quantitative-technological approach* utilizes mathematical modeling as a foundation to management and is typically found in large organizations where costs, sales, and production data are analyzed using computer technology and mathematical modeling. (Leonard & Hilgert, 2004)

General Supervision Challenges

Janosik and Creamer (2003) noted that supervision of people is of critical importance to an organization and a key ingredient in any staffing plan. At the very heart of organizational leadership is human resource management and the supervisor's role revolves around the success of working with people (Humphrey & Stokes, 2000). Humphrey and Stokes proposed that supervisors are the backbone of most organizations and their leadership is typically the difference between accomplishing and not completing goals. They go on to add that "in the past individuals often became supervisors because they had superior performance records as frontline employees or possessed a wealth of technical expertise" (p. 2). Sadly, however, these same individuals were typically promoted to their new supervisory positions without receiving formal training (Humphrey & Stokes).

Defining Supervision

Upon reviewing the literature to define the task of supervision one can find a vast array of different perspectives. Many definitions can be found within the fields of business, K-12 education, human resources, educational psychology and student affairs to name a few. Humphrey & Stokes (2000) note that in the early 1900s supervisors were traditionally defined as individuals engaged in hands-on management, constantly monitoring employees and focused on detecting employee performance lapses and immediately applying corrective action when

necessary. Dalton (2003) shared that perspective when he classified supervision as a direct function of management. Taking a more general administrative approach to defining supervision, Certo (1994) proposed that a supervisor is a manager at the first level of organizational management. Leonard and Hilgert (2004) made a similar statement when they defined supervision as “first-level managers who are in charge of entry-level and other departmental employees” (p. 4). White (2007) focused his definition of supervision on production outcomes and stated that supervision is a critical element “in the productivity and effectiveness of any organization” (p. 10).

Moving away from management focused definitions; supervision has also been defined as a central and essential learning experience (Borders & Leddick, 1988) for administrators. Winston and Hirt (2003) imply that supervision should be a cumulative and on-going process and not solely just an event. Ladew (1998) documented the importance of leadership in supervision when he proposed that a successful supervisor is first and foremost a leader. He added that in their relationship with their employees, “they inspire increased efficiency, productivity, initiative, ownership and creativity by providing direction, acknowledgment, and challenge and support” (p. 7). Glickman, Gordon, & Ross-Gordon (1998) discussed the connecting role of the supervisor when they described them as the glue of a successful organization.

Supervision Outside of Student Affairs

Other fields of study have been more active in conceptualizing models and researching supervision. In particular, psychology and counselor education have contributed to a large body of supervision literature since the 1960s (Stock-Ward & Javorek). Additionally, the literature from the business field has addressed the topic of supervision (e.g., Certo, 1994; Humphrey &

Stokes, 2000; Ricks, Ginn, & Daughtrey, 1995). Certain aspects of this literature and research can be indirectly and loosely applied to student affairs; however, not all of the concepts are applicable. White (2007) notes that “turning to outside disciplines to gain knowledge of supervision may create difficulty for professionals as the organizational culture of colleges and universities can differ significantly from that of other organizations” (p. 4).

Supervision in Student Affairs and Higher Education

Winston and Miller (1991) suggest that 75% to 85% of the total budget of most institutions of higher learning is typically allotted for personnel costs. The individuals completing the work on college and university campuses are critically important to enabling institutions of higher education to accomplish goals in order to achieve their missions. The management of these individuals is paramount in order for institutions to accomplish those goals. Due to their role of linking (Glickman, Gordon, & Ross-Gordon, 1998) and guiding individuals at various levels of departments and units on college and university campuses, supervisors become a necessary piece of the human resource management puzzle.

As noted earlier in this chapter, supervision is typically considered an administrative management task, a task considered as one of the more difficult for student affairs professionals (Dalton, 2003). Tull (2006) echoes Dalton’s comments by identifying that staff supervision is one of the more complex and important activities for which leaders are responsible. Stock-Ward and Javorek (2003) add that supervision is a key component of the work for many student affairs practitioners. However, Schneider (1998) explains that “since academic preparation, practical experience, values, cultural background, and style preferences differ from person to person, supervision is a complex process” (p. 37). Frye & Dean (2007) note that the activity of supervision can at times present challenges and create tension for student affairs practitioners.

To add to these challenges and tension, supervisors must possess a wide variety of skills to accomplish their jobs with efficiency (Frye & Dean). However, there may be few organizations as deprived of traditional supervisory training as colleges and universities (Harned & Murphy, 1998).

Supervisory Styles and Approaches

Supervisory styles vary considerably for practitioners within the field of student affairs (Smith, 2005). Peterson and Tracy (1979) identified three classic styles of supervisors: one-dimensional, two-dimensional, and facilitating development. One-dimensional supervision involves a manager who makes all the decisions for supervisees, leaving them little discretion for individual decisions and taking initiative. Two-dimensional supervision involves the following two components: 1) initiating structure, which refers to duties such as encouraging overtime work, assigning work, critiquing poor work, and pressing supervisees for levels of greater effort, and 2) consideration, which involves aiding others with personal problems, being receptive to conflict, and consulting supervisees about change within the organization. The facilitating development style involves behaviors such as designing challenging positions, assigning challenging work tasks, and asking employees to set high goals.

An alternative approach was taken by Winston and Creamer (1998) when they proposed a new model of supervision which they called synergistic supervision. According to Winston and Creamer, supervision should be perceived as a helping process provided by the college or university to benefit and support staff rather than a mechanism for punishing practitioners for poor work performance. The characteristics of synergistic supervision include the following characteristics: 1) dual focus 2) joint effort 3) two-way communication 4) focus on competence

4) goal setting and attainment, 5) being a systematic and ongoing process; and 6) an orientation towards employee growth and development (Winston & Creamer).

Stock-Ward and Javorek (2003) proposed a more recent approach when they applied a counseling psychology and counselor education model of supervision as a framework for student affairs practitioners to use to build and enhance their supervisory skills. Using the Integrated Developmental Model, Stock-Ward and Javorek proposed a three-leveled approach for working with supervisees. Their study examined the considerations of the supervisors of new student affairs professionals when selecting specific supervisory approaches and the strategies used to evaluate supervision outcomes. Through interviews it was revealed that the context of the work environment, role of the supervisory situation, the previous experiences of the supervisor, the individual development of the new professional, and the expectations of the supervisor were all lenses through which supervisors selected their various supervisory approaches (White, 2007).

Quality Supervision

According to Borders (1994), good supervisors are: 1) comfortable with the authority and evaluative functions of their jobs, 2) give intentional, frequent, and clear evaluation of their employee's performance, 3) enjoy the task of supervision, 4) are committed to helping employees develop, and 5) are prepared and involved in their supervisory sessions. Arminio and Creamer (2001) found that quality supervision includes the interpretation of the institutional culture and developing and implementing a vision of where the institution is going. Dalton (2003) proposed that "good supervisors provide an appropriate level of direction and feedback to help employees to achieve greater levels of self-direction" (p. 413). Additionally, he added that quality supervision provides the appropriate levels of direction and support at times when they are needed by the supervisee and does not get in the way of a quality employee.

Training Supervisors

Supervisory development and training continues to be a central concern in organizations of all types (Kirkpatrick, 2001). More specifically, supervision has been identified as an essential skill for all professionals entering the field of student affairs; however, an intentional and systematic approach to supervisor training does not currently exist (Davis, 2004). Additionally, supervisors in student affairs often “have little formal managerial training or expertise” (Harned & Murphy, 1998, p. 45) and have limited role models at their institution (Harned & Murphy). A result from this is that student affairs professionals are not prepared to enter the field and supervise employees (Davis, 2004).

Stock-Ward and Javorek (2003) proposed an increased emphasis on training student affairs professionals to enhance effective supervision. Research indicates that supervisors lack the training on how to supervise staff members (Davis, 2002; Winston & Creamer, 1997). Winston and Creamer found in their investigation that only about half of the student affairs practitioners in the respondent group of their study indicated that they received any formal training in providing supervision to their employees. Once they have started their new job, supervisors need to continue their learning process related to the topic of supervision (Certo, 1994). Since student affairs professionals come from a variety of academic disciplines, on-the-job training in supervision will be very important and exposure to various styles of supervision should be a regular part of the job for any individual serving as a supervisor (Stock-Ward & Javorek, 2003).

New Professionals

The field of student affairs has a large cohort of new professionals that enter its ranks yearly (Davis Barham & Winston, 2006). New professionals within student affairs working full-

time with five or fewer years of experience in their first post master's position represent a substantial population in the field and are estimated at 15% to 20% of the student affairs workforce (Cilente, Hennings, Skinner Jackson, Kennedy, & Sloane, 2006). New professionals are the present and future of the student affairs field, and as such, a more thorough examination is needed of their life experiences and work (Davis Barham & Winston).

A large proportion of new professionals in student affairs enter the field through master's programs in college student personnel, higher education, student affairs, or a related field of study (Renn, Jessup Aner, & Hodges, 2007; Cilente et al., 2006). These professionals also come from a variety of academic backgrounds, from every type of institution, and work in all types of settings, including for-profit institutions, community colleges, and online institutions (Cilente et al.; Hirt, 2006; Renn & Hodges, 2007). It has been noted that graduate preparation programs are an important site for the development of new professionals' ideals and ideas (Renn & Hodges, 2007).

“New professionals in student affairs start their careers in a number of various functional areas with an array of titles and with a number of different responsibilities” (Smith, 2005, p. 2). Smith referred to new professionals as front line staff members that have daily contact and interaction with students and staff. As in many fields, new professionals in student affairs provide a great deal of the direct delivery of services and programs to students (Davis Barham & Winston, 2006).

Supervisors of new professionals must clearly communicate their expectations and new professionals must comprehend what these expectations are and what is being asked of them (Smith, 2005). In her dissertation, Davis (2004) provided specific research on new professionals by examining the factors that contributed to the ways that new professionals diagnosed their

needs in a work environment. Results from the study showed that new professionals lacked the ability to diagnose their needs and lacked training and skills in areas deemed critical for job success.

In a related investigation, Cilente et al. (2006) with the support of the American College Personnel Association's Standing Committee for Graduate Students and New Professionals conducted a national study utilizing mixed methods design to determine the self-reported professional development needs of new professionals. The professional development needs ranked highest by respondents on the electronic survey were: 1) building multicultural competencies, 2) comprehending job expectations, 3) promoting student learning, 4) developing supervision skills, 5) advancement in the field of student affairs, and 6) having adequate support (Cilente et al.).

Supervising New Professionals

New professionals and their supervisors are critical players in the student affairs profession, and those in each group need special support and guidance (Harned & Murphy, 1998). Janosik, Creamer, Hirt, Winston, Saunders, & Cooper (2003) noted, that effective supervision of new professionals is critical to meeting the goals of the institution, the successful implementation of the programs and services linked to goals, and the development of students through out-of-class learning opportunities. Additionally, effective supervision of new professionals is a way that the profession can reduce the propensity of new professionals departing the field of student affairs (Tull, 2006).

No professional relationship has the potential for a more sustained impact than that of the new professional and his or her direct supervisor (Harned & Murphy, 1998). "To the new

professional a supervisor is the embodiment of the institution” (p. 49). Typically, supervisors of new professionals are often mid-level managers within the institution (Harned & Murphy).

Supervisors have the potential to become a mentor for staff entering student affairs (Harned & Murphy, 1998) “Supervisors of new professionals must take the task seriously...and take the time and energy to tailor the experiences of new professionals for maximum impact.” (p. 52). During most cases more directed supervision is usually needed for new professionals and requires individualization and a considerable amount of time (Dalton, 2003).

In an attempt to gauge the scope of possible issues and challenges that practitioners experience when supervising new professionals in student affairs, Winston (2001) conducted an informal poll of supervisors of new professionals. Winston posted the questions to two listservs known to have a large number of mid-level practitioners as subscribers. The professionals were asked to identify challenges associated with supervising new professionals. A small number of usable responses were received; however, several themes were identified from the responses. The six themes were: (a) institutional culture and politics, (b) patience, (c) change in the work ethic, (d) big picture, (e) dealing with errors, and (f) time. The investigation did discover challenges that supervisors experience when supervising new professionals; however, the population of the study was mid-managers who were serving as supervisors.

More recently in looking at the supervision of new professionals, White (2008) researched the perceptions of new student affairs professionals regarding synergistic supervision efforts of their supervisors. The purpose of the investigation was to better understand how a new professional’s locus of control, organizational commitment, the leader-member exchange, sex construction of the vertical supervision dyad, and length of time in the supervisory relationship related to their perceptions of the synergistic behaviors of their immediate supervisors.

Challenges for New Professionals

Kisner (1993) noted, that at times the practitioners who have prepared themselves in student affairs graduate preparation programs experience conflict between what they have learned in graduate school and what they experience in their post-master's jobs. Approximately ten years later, in applicable research, Tull (2003) highlighted that new professionals enter student affairs organizations each year and encounter a host of challenges, expectations, and responsibilities that are all new to them. Saunders and Cooper (2003) identified that most new professionals are experiencing both professional and personal transitions as they enter the field. "New professionals are busy learning the specific tasks required of their position, making personal transitions, and going through numerous balancing adjustments during the first few months on the job" (Amey, 1998, p. 17).

In related literature, challenges of new professionals were addressed by Conneely (2002) in the book, *Planning a Career in College and University Housing*. The main purpose of the publication was to provide new professionals with a resource for navigating a career in student affairs. The book specifically relates to new professionals' desiring to work in housing and residence life. In the chapter addressing the new professional settling into his/her institution, Sutton and Bailey (2002) detailed that the new professional often experiences confusion and ambiguity during his/her first professional job experience. Secondly, Sutton and Bailey highlighted that settling into a new institution can be an emotionally overwhelming experience for most new professionals. Finally, in the chapter addressing life outside of work, Dunn (2002) stated, "settling into a life outside of work once you have moved into a new position is complicated" (p. 120).

Challenges for New Professionals as Supervisors

“Based on the literature, most new professionals will enter positions where they are responsible for some level of supervision be it student staff, support staff, or graduate level staff” (Davis, 2004). The ability for new professionals to supervise is critical to their success (Davis). However, Davis noted that new professionals are entering student affairs with little training and proficiency in the area of supervision.

In a recent study, Frye (2006) identified the perceived challenges that new professionals working within a student affairs functional area experience when supervising graduate assistants. Utilizing qualitative methods, he interviewed five new professionals who supervised as least one graduate assistant. The six identified challenges were: (1) inability to define supervisory relationship, (2) age, (3) friendship with the graduate assistant, (4) professional and educational background, (5) feedback and evaluation, and (6) developmental and transitional issues. The findings of the investigation suggested that new professionals are experiencing a number of challenges when supervising graduate assistants. Additionally, it was determined that many of the challenges can be linked and intertwined with one another.

Chapter Summary

This chapter explored four primary constructs: 1) student affairs graduate preparation programs, 2) skills, 3) supervision, and 4) new professionals. An argument was crafted with the literature that shows a specific need for continued research on new professionals, graduate preparation programs, and the topic of supervision. As was addressed in this chapter, new professionals are the future of the student affairs field and many of them are entrusted with the challenging role of serving as supervisors. For many, they enter the field through graduate preparation programs where they were taught a variety of competencies and skills through

classroom instruction, supervised practice, and self-directed learning activities. However, as noted by Waple (2006) many new professionals are not learning and acquiring the necessary skills for effective student affairs practice. Specifically, they are ill prepared as supervisors and lack many of the necessary skills to supervise staff.

CHAPTER THREE

METHODOLOGY

The purpose of this study was to develop a list of critical supervisory skills for supervisors in student affairs. Further, the study determined which of those skills first-year full-time post master's new professionals learned during their graduate preparation programs through the following instructional methods and learning activities: 1) class room instruction, 2) supervised practice (graduate assistantship, practicum, and internship), and 3) self-taught learning. Additionally, the study identified the skills new professionals list as critical to effectively supervise staff members. This chapter: 1) explains the design of the study, 2) describes the participants, 3) reviews data collection procedures, 4) describes the creation and design of the research instrument, 5) lists the research questions, and 6) details the data analysis plan.

Overview of the Design

This study was non-experimental in design and did not impose a treatment. Quantitative methods, collecting data in numerical format, were utilized to best answer the research questions posed for this investigation (Drew, Hardman, & Hosp). The instrumentation for this investigation, a locally developed questionnaire, will be detailed later in this chapter.

Participants

The target population for this investigation consisted of new professionals, operationally defined for this study as individuals who have attained their master's degree in student affairs or a related field of study (i.e., student development, educational psychology, higher education,

counseling, etc.) and are employed at a college or university within their first year of full-time post-master's employment working in a housing and or residence life functional unit. New professionals that have attained a graduate degree in student affairs or a related field were selected as the population for this investigation because they completed a graduate preparation program and described a more comprehensive picture of the graduate preparation program experience.

Research Instrument Creation and Design

A review of literature for this investigation did not uncover a research instrument or components of an existing questionnaire that would best acquire the information necessary to complete this study. In order to obtain the necessary data for this investigation the researcher developed a questionnaire (*Appendix A*) to be the primary instrument for data collection. The questionnaire went through a multiphase design process that is described later in this section.

The instrument is composed of three parts: 1) a four-point Likert-like scale comprising 58 of the questions, 2) two open-ended questions, and 3) ten demographic questions for a total of 70 questions. The participants were asked to indicate the appropriate degree that they learned each supervisory skill during their graduate preparation program for each instructional activity (classroom instruction, supervised practice, and self-taught). They selected from the following scale (not at all, minimally, adequately, and very well). The questionnaire took approximately 20 minutes to complete, based on beta testing.

Phase one of the study and instrument design process identified the supervision skills that served as the foundation for the questionnaire. In order to identify the skills the researcher conducted a literature review of scholarly resources and mined them for stated supervision skills. To enhance content validity those skills explicitly identified in the cited sources ($n=56$) were

selected to form the initial list of 101 supervision skills (*Appendix I*). The 56 sources were from the following academic disciplines: Adult Education ($n=1$), Business ($n=19$), Counseling ($n=1$), Educational Leadership ($n=5$), Human Services ($n=1$), and Student Affairs ($n=29$).

Phase two of the instrument design process consisted of alphabetizing the skills and phase three focused on grouping the skills based on number of citations. Phase four consisted of narrowing the list by combining skills that had similar meanings. Phase four cut the list of supervision skills from 101 to 89. In phase five of the instrument design process the supervision skills were grouped based on number of citations per skill. Phase six (*Appendix J*) consisted of eliminating all skills only referenced in one ($n=14$) or two ($n=9$) of the selected scholarly sources. During this phase the list of supervision skills decreased from 89 to 66.

Phase seven (*Appendix K*) resulted in grouping the skills by category and number of references and determining percentages for those groups based on frequency of citation. In the eighth phase (*Appendix L*) of the design process the researcher assigned the skills ($n=66$) based on his knowledge of the topic to the following categories: administrative, interpersonal, conceptual, and technical. These categories were specifically referenced in the reviewed literature (i.e., Katz, 1955; Porter, 2005; Sandwith, 1993). Four of the 66 skills were category titles so the list was cut to 62 skills.

Phase nine (*Appendix M*) consisted of a multi-part peer review process that enhanced the content validity of the categorized skills. First, the researcher utilized two fellow doctoral students from the Student Affairs Administration Program at the University of Georgia (UGA). Both peer reviewers have served as supervisors and have significant student affairs work experience. The peer reviewers grouped the list of supervision skills and categorized them based on their expertise and knowledge of supervisory practices. Thirty-nine percent ($n=24$) of the 62

skills were categorized similarly by the researcher and both peer reviewers. Fifty-five percent ($n=34$) of the total 62 skills were categorized in a similar manner by the researcher and peer reviewer A or the researcher and peer reviewer B. Six percent ($n=4$) of the skills were categorized differently by the researcher and both peer reviewers. Ninety-four percent ($n=58$) of the skills were categorized similarly by the researcher and both peer reviewers or by the researcher and a combination of one of the two peer reviewers. In the two cases where both peer reviewers selected the same category and it differed from the researcher's categorization, the skill was moved to the category selected by both peer reviewers. In the two cases where the researcher and both peer reviewers utilized different categories for a skill, the researcher consulted with his major professor to aid in assignment of the skill. The researcher's major professor assigned them to the category assigned by the researcher.

The second phase of the peer review process consisted of the researcher presenting the categorized skills to seven members and the instructor of his ECHD 9770 dissertation writing class for feedback and suggestions. The list of categorized skills was adapted based on the feedback from the class. Only minimal changes were made during this phase of the peer review process.

Phase ten consisted of the design of a draft questionnaire. The first step of this phase required the researcher to consult with the Office of Student Affairs Assessment at UGA regarding online survey design software and online survey construction. After learning about designing an on-line survey the researcher developed a draft paper questionnaire that was based on the identified and categorized supervision skills from phase nine of the instrument design process.

Phase eleven required the researcher to utilize five doctoral students and a faculty member from his ECHD 9970 Dissertation Writing Seminar class in Student Affairs Administration Program at UGA as peer reviewers for the draft questionnaire. Peer reviewers utilized a critique form (*Appendix H*) to provide feedback on the draft survey. The critique form was adapted by the researcher from Cox and Brayton Cox's (2008) questionnaire self-assessment checklist. The researcher utilized the feedback from the peer review critiques to improve instrument content validity, aid in instrument flow, and the enhancement of user friendliness.

The twelfth phase (*Appendix N*) consisted of developing the question stems for the questionnaire and refining the definitions for the identified supervisory skills. During this phase the skills with similar definitions were combined taking the list of skills from 62 to 58. Additionally, the question stems were added to the draft survey during phase twelve.

During phase thirteen the instrument was beta tested with seven participants ($n=7$). Six of the participants were second-year master's students from the College Student Affairs Administration (CSAA) Program at UGA. The majority of the pilot test participants worked in the Department of University Housing at UGA. Second-year master's students were selected as the beta test population in order to minimize the potential of dual responses, because new professionals working in housing will serve as the population for this study. The Director of Assessment and Staff Development at UGA also served as a beta test participant. The beta test participants provided the researcher with feedback on questionnaire content, flow, design, jargon, redundancy, confusing terms, and length of time to complete the questionnaire. The questionnaire was revised based on beta test participant feedback. Specifically, a few question stems were re-worded and the directions were shortened and simplified based on the beta test feedback.

After review by the researcher's dissertation advisory committee the final phase of the survey design process consisted of making revisions based on their feedback and then converting the paper survey to an electronic web-based format utilizing the Perseus Software Solutions for the Web design software. The web-based survey received a final peer review by a doctoral student from the researcher's graduate program.

Summary of the Categorized Supervisory Skills

A total of 58 supervisory skills were identified by the researcher from 56 scholarly sources and were grouped into four categories that were developed from the literature (i.e., Katz, 1955; Porter, 2005; Sandwith, 1993) and refined through a multilevel peer review and a beta test process. The categories were interpersonal, technical, administrative, and conceptual. Table 3.1 lists the identified supervisory skills by category and details the number of citations per skill.

Table 3.1

Identified Supervision Skills by Category with Number of Citations

Skill	Citations	# of Citations
<u>Category 1: Interpersonal</u>		
(Active) listening	Armino & Creamer (2001); Bulin (1995); Certo (1994); Cole (2002) Fuller (1994); Garubo & Rothstein (1998); Glickman, Gordon, & Ross-Gordon (1998); Kirkpatrick (2001); Moglia (1997)	9
Advisement	Bulin (1995); Carelli (2004) Evans (1992); Harned & Murphy (1998); Kirkpatrick (2001); Koren (1996); Winston & Creamer (1998); Winston & Hirt (2003)	7

Coaching	Carelli (2004); Cole (2002); Glickman, Gordon, & Ross-Gordon (1998); Humphrey & Stokes (2000); Kelly (1984); Kirkpatrick (2001); Ladew (1998); Leonard & Hilgert (2004); Ricks, Ginn, & Daughtrey (1995); Saunders, Cooper, Winston, & Chernow (2000); Winston & Hirt (2003)	11
Collaboration	Frye & Dean (2007); Glickman, Gordon, & Ross-Gordon (1998); Moglia (1997); Pajak (1990); Stock-Ward & Javorek (2003)	5
Communication	Armino & Creamer (2001); Bulin (1995); Bunker & Wijnberg (1998); Carelli (2004); Carr (1989); Certo (1994); Cole (2002); Dalton (2003); Daresh (1989); Evans (1992); Fuller (1994); Garubo & Rothstein (1998); Glickman, Gordon, & Ross-Gordon (1998); Greer & Plunkett (2000); Haynes (1991); Humphrey & Stokes (2000); Jennings (1993); Kirkpatrick (2001); Koren (1996); Ladew (1998); Leonard & Hilgert (2004); Marsh (2001); Mills (2000); Moglia (1997); Pajak (1990); Ricks, Ginn, & Daughtrey (1995); Schneider (1998); Smith (2005); Stock-Ward & Javorek (2003); Von Der Embse (1987); Winston & Creamer (1997); Winston & Creamer (1998); Winston & Creamer (2002)	33
Conflict resolution	Bulin (1995); Certo (1994); Cole (2002); Creamer & Winston (1999); Daresh (1989); Evans (1992); Fuller (1994); Garubo & Rothstein (1998); Glickman, Gordon, & Ross-Gordon (1998); Hayes (1990); Haynes (1991); Kirkpatrick (2001); Winston & Creamer (1998)	13
Diversity promotion	Bulin (1995); Certo (1994); Cole (2002); Creamer & Winston (1999); Dalton (2003); Ricks, Ginn, & Daughtrey (1995); Winston & Hirt (2003)	7
Empowerment	Cole (2002); Ladew (1998); Kirkpatrick (2001)	3
Feedback	Cole (2002); Dalton (2000); Haynes (1984)	3
Human relations	Cole (2002); Dalton (2000); Daresh (1989); Evans (1992); Kirkpatrick (2001); Koren (1996); Ladew (1998); Leonard & Hilgert, 2004; Moglia (1997); Ricks, Ginn, & Daughtrey (1995); Stokes & Humphrey (2000); Von Der Embse (1987)	12
Mentoring	Carr (1989); Cole (2002); Grote (1996); Harned & Murphy (1998); Ladew (1998); Ricks, Ginn, & Daughtrey (1995); Winston & Hirt (2003)	7

Motivational	Arminio & Creamer (2001); Bulin (1995); Carr (1989); Cole (2002); Creamer & Janosik (2003); Dalton (2003); Daresh (1989); Evans (1992) Frye & Dean (2007); Fuller (1994); Grote (1996); Haynes (1991); Javorek (2003); Jennings (1993); Kirkpatrick (2001); Koren (1996); Leonard & Hilgert (2004); Mills (2000); Moglia (1997); Ricks, Ginn, & Daughtrey (1995); Stock-Ward & Javorek (2003); Upcraft (1988)	22
Relationship building	Bunker & Wijnberg (1998); Carelli (2004); Carroll (1996); Cole (2002); Davis (2004); Evans (1992); Frye & Dean (2007); Garubo & Rothstein (1998); Harned & Murphy (1998); Ignelzi & Whitley (2004); Janosik & Creamer (2003); Moglia (1997); Pajak (1990); Ricks, Ginn, & Daughtrey (1995); Schuh & Carlisle (1991); Smith (2005); Winston & Creamer (1997); Winston & Creamer (1998); Winston & Creamer (2002)	19
Role modeling	Arminio & Creamer (2001); Carroll (1996); Certo (1994); Dalton (2003); Ladew (1998); Molia (1997); Stock-Ward & Javorek (2003); Winston & Creamer (1997); Winston & Creamer (2002); Winston & Hirt (2003)	10
Stress management	Certo (1994); Dalton (2003); Haynes (1991); Ladew (1998)	4
Supporting	Davis (2004); Glickman, Gordon, & Ross-Gordon (1998); Ladew (1998); Schneider (1998); Schuh & Carlisle (1991); Smith (2005) Stock-Ward & Javorek (2003)	7
Team building	Bulin (1995); Bunker & Wijnberg (1998); Carelli (2004); Carr (1989); Carroll (1996); Certo (1994); Cole (2002); Dalton (2003); Daresh (1989); Evans (1992); Fuller (1994); Glickman, Gordon, & Ross-Gordon (1998); Haynes (1984); Haynes (1991); Hirt & Winston (2003); Kirkpartick (2001); Ladew (1998); Marsh (2001); Moglia (1997); Winston & Creamer (1997)	20

Category 2: Technical

Analytical	Cole (2002); Glickman, Gordon, & Ross-Gordon (1998); Winston & Creamer (1998)	3
Clarifying objectives and goals	Bunker & Wijnberg (1998); Carroll (1996); Glickman, Gordon, & Ross-Gordon (1998); Janosik & Creamer (2003); Ricks, Ginn, & Daughtrey (1995)	5
Diagnostic	Davis (2002); Davis (2004); Davis Barham & Winston (2006); Kirkpatrick (2001)	4

Need assessment	Cole (2002); Harned & Murphy (1998); Kirkpatrick (2001)	3
Performance appraisal and skill assessment	Bulin (1995); Carelli (2004); Carroll (1996); Cole (2002); Creamer & Janosik (2003); Creamer & Winston (1999); Dalton (1996); Daresh (1989); Evans (1992); Frye & Dean (2007); Garubo & Rothstein (1998); Glickman, Gordon, & Ross-Gordon (1998); Greer & Plunkett (2000); Grote (1996); Haynes (1984); Haynes (1991); Janosik & Creamer (2003); Jennings (1993); Kirkpatrick (2001); Koren (1996); Ladew (1998); Marsh (2001); Moglia (1997); Schneider (1998); Schuh & Carlisle (1991); Smith (2005); Upcraft (1998); Winston & Creamer (1998); Winston & Creamer (2002); Winston & Hirt (2003)	30
Program evaluation	Armino & Creamer (2001); Cole (2002) Hirt & Winston (2001)	3
Self-assessment	Bulin (1995); Carroll (1996); Glickman, Gordon & Ross-Gordon (1998); Cole (2002)	4
Teaching (instruction)	Arminio & Creamer (2001); Carroll (1996); Garubo & Rothstein (1998); Haynes (1991); Kirkpatrick (2001); Koren (1996); Moglia (1997); Winston & Creamer (1998); Winston & Creamer (2002)	9
Technological	Fuller (1994); Humphrey & Stokes (2000); Ladew (1998)	8
Writing	Carroll (1996); Evans (1992); Humphrey & Stokes (2000); Kirkpatrick (2001); Moglia (1997); Ricks, Ginn, & Daughtrey (1995); Winston & Creamer (1998)	7

Category 3: Administrative

Budgeting	Carelli (2004); Cole (2002); Evans (1992); Koren (1996); Ladew (1998); Moglia (1997); Ricks, Ginn, & Daughtrey (1995)	7
Controlling (rule enforcement)	Bulin (1995); Certo (1994); Haynes (1991); Jennings (1993); Ladew (1998); Ricks, Ginn, & Daughtrey (1995)	6
Crisis management	Fuller (1994); Ladew (1998) Moglia (1997)	3
Delegation	Bulin (1995); Carelli (2004); Carr (1989); Certo (1994); Cole (2002); Fuller (1994); Hayes (1990); Koren (1996); Ladew	14

	(1998); Leonard & Hilgert (2004); Moglia (1997); Ricks, Ginn, & Daughtrey (1995); Schneider (1998); Winston & Hirt (2003)	
Directing	Armino & Creamer (2001); Dalton (2003); Emanuel, Gould, & Simpson (1985); Glickman, Gordon, & Ross-Gordon (1998); Ladew (1998); Schuh & Carlisle (1991); Winston & Hirt (2003)	7
Discipline	Bulin (1995); Certo (1994); Haynes (1984); Haynes (1991); Kirkpatrick (2001); Moglia (1997)	6
Distribution (coordination) of work activities	Cole (2002); Haynes (1991); Marsh (2001); Winston & Creamer (1997)	4
Interviewing	Evans (1992); Bulin (1995); Carelli (2004); Certo (1994); Cole (2002); Moglia (1997); Ricks, Ginn, & Daughtrey (1995)	7
Job analysis and description development	Evans (1992); Jennings (1993); Kirkpatrick (2001); Ricks, Ginn, & Daughtrey (1995)	4
Meeting management and facilitation	Bulin (1995); Certo (1994); Cole (2002); Fuller (1994); Glickman, Gordon, & Ross-Gordon (1998); Haynes (1991); Kirkpatrick (2001); Ladew (1998); Leonard & Hilgert (2004)	9
Monitoring work	Carroll (1996); Marsh (2001); Von Der Embse (1987); Winston & Creamer (1997)	4
Organizing	Bulin (1995); Carelli (2004); Emanuel, Gould, & Simpson (1985); Evans (1992); Fuller (1994); Haynes (1991); Jennings (1993); Koren (1996); Moglia (1997); Ricks, Ginn, & Daughtrey (1995); Stock-Ward & Javorek (2003); Winston & Creamer (1998)	12
Project management	Haynes (1984); Haynes (1991); Stokes & Humphrey (2000)	3
Recruitment	Bulin (1995); Cole (2002); Evans (1992); Ricks, Ginn, & Daughtrey (1995)	4
Resource management and acquisition	Bulin (1995); Cole (2002); Fey & Carpenter (1996); Harned & Murphy (1998); Humphrey & Stokes (2000); Kirkpatrick (2001); Ladew (1998); Pajak (1990); Ricks, Ginn, & Daughtrey (1995); Saunders & Cooper (1999); Saunders, Cooper, Winston, Chernow (2000)	11

Staffing	Bulin (1995); Carr (1989); Cole (2002); Emanuel, Gould, & Simpson (1985); Garubo & Rothstein (1998); Haynes (1991); Kirkpatrick (2001); Leonard & Hilgert (2004); Ricks, Ginn, & Daughtrey (1995); Schneider (1998); Von Der Embse (1987)	6
Time management	Bulin (1995); Certo (1994); Cole (2002); Emanuel, Gould, & Simpson (1985); Evans (1992); Fuller (1994); Haynes (1991); Ladew (1998); Leonard & Hilgert (2004); Ricks, Ginn, & Daughtrey (1995); Winston & Creamer (1998)	11
Training	Certo (1994); Carelli (2004); Cole (2002); Dalton (1996); Evans (1992); Fuller (1994); Haynes (1991); Kirkpatrick (2001); Ladew (1998); Moglia (1997); Ricks, Ginn, & Daughtrey (1995); Schneider (1998); Smith (2005); Stock-Ward & Javorek (2003); Upcraft (1988)	15

Category 4: Conceptual

Change management	Daresh (1989); Evans (1992); Kirkpatrick (2001); Ricks, Ginn, & Daughtrey (1995); Ladew (1998)	5
Decision making	Bulin (1995); Certo (1994); Evans (1992); Fuller (1994); Jennings (1993); Kirkpatrick (2001); Leonard & Hilgert (2004); Moglia (1997); Ricks, Ginn, & Daughtrey (1995)	9
Employee professional development and performance improvement	Bunker & Wijnberg (1998); Haynes (1991); Humphrey & Stokes (2000); Kirkpatrick (2001); Ricks, Ginn, & Daughtrey, 1995	16
Environmental management	Bulin (1995); Ladew (1998); Ricks, Ginn, & Daughtrey (1995) Saunders, Cooper, Winston, & Chernow (2000)	4
Forecasting	Bulin (1995); Evans (1992); Ricks, Ginn, & Daughtrey (1995)	3
Goal setting, development, and implementation	Carelli (2004); Cole (2002); Creamer & Janosik (2003); Creamer & Winston (1999); Dalton (1996); Dalton (2003); Evans (1992); Frye & Dean (2007); Fuller (1994); Janosik & Creamer (2003); Ladew (1998); Marsh (2001); Moglia (1997); Saunders, Cooper, Winston, & Chernow (2000); Smith (2005); Winston & Creamer (1997); Stock-Ward & Jaorek (2003); Winston & Creamer (1998); Winston & Hirt (2003)	19
Innovation/	Evans (1992); Hirt & Winston (2003); Winston & Creamer	4

Creativity	(1998); Winston & Hirt (2003)	
Interpretation	Dalton (2003); Greer & Plunkett (2000); Schneider (1998)	3
Leadership	Bulin (1995); Certo (1994); Dalton (2000); Daresh (1989); Evans (1992); Haynes (1991); Jennings (1993); Kirkpatrick (2001); Koren (1996); Ladew (1998); Moglia (1997); Ricks, Ginn, & Daughtrey (1995); Schuh & Carlisle (1991); Winston & Creamer (1998)	14
Planning (general and strategic)	Arminio & Creamer (2001); Bulin (1995); Bunker & Wijnberg (1998); Carr (1989); Emanuel, Gould, & Simpson (1985); Evans (1992); Frye & Dean (2007); Glickman, Gordon, & Ross-Gordon (1998); Harned & Murphy (1998); Haynes (1991); Jennings (1993); Kirkpatrick (2001); Koren (1996); Ladew (1998); Leonard & Hilgert (2004); Ricks, Ginn, & Daughtrey (1995); Smith (2005); Stock-Ward & Javorek (2003); Von Der Embse (1987); Winston & Creamer (2002); Winston & Hirt (2003)	21
Problem solving	Bulin (1995); Bunker & Wijnberg (1998); Carelli (2004); Certo (1994); Cole (2002); Emanuel, Gould, & Simpson (1985); Evans (1992); Garubo & Rothstein (1998); Glickman, Gordon, & Ross-Gordon (1998); Marsh (2001); Moglia (1997); Pajak (1990); Ricks, Ginn, & Daughtrey (1995); Saunders, Cooper, Winston, & Chernow (2000); Von Der Embse (1987); Winston & Creamer (1997); Winston & Creamer (2002)	17
Reorganization	Dalton (2003); Marsh (2001); Winston & Creamer (2002)	3
Vision development	Armino & Creamer (2001); Dalton (2003); Pajak (1990)	3

The majority of the supervision skills were identified from the student affairs ($n=29$) and business ($n=19$) academic disciplines. The range for the number of citations per skill was from 33 to three citations. The 11 skills with the highest number of citations were: communication ($n=33$), performance appraisal and skills assessment ($n=30$), motivational ($n=22$), planning

(general and strategic) ($n=21$), team building ($n=20$), goal setting, development, and implementation ($n=19$), relationship building ($n=19$), problem solving ($n=17$), training ($n=15$), delegation ($n=14$), and leadership ($n=14$). The majority of the highest cited skills were from the administrative category ($n=7$) and interpersonal category ($n=4$). The administrative category had the largest number of skills ($n=18$).

Reliability and Validity

All research is concerned with producing reliable and valid knowledge in an ethical manner (Merriam, 1998). The researcher employed the following methods to enhance the validity and reliability of the questionnaire and investigation: 1) multiple levels of peer review, described earlier in the methods section, were utilized to develop the questionnaire, 2) as highlighted at the beginning of this chapter, scholarly literature was utilized to ground the research instrument and enhance content validity, 3) a beta test of the questionnaire was conducted with six participants ($n=6$), and 4) a Cronbach's alpha coefficient was calculated to determine instrument reliability. Huck (2000) noted that reliability is the extent to which a study can yield the same response over time with repeated trials. Morgan and Griego (1998) highlighted that Cronbach's alpha is the most utilized type of internal consistency reliability and details how well a set of items quantify a single unidimensional latent construct. The Cronbach's alpha has a range of 0.00 to 1.00. Instruments that score closer to 1.00 are viewed as more reliable (Huck). The questionnaire for this study had a high level of reliability with a Cronbach's alpha reliability coefficient of 0.985 (see Table 3.2). It must be noted that the Cronbach's alpha for this questionnaire accounts for all items, excluding demographic and the open-ended questions.

Table 3.2

Overall Questionnaire Reliability

<u>Cases</u>				
Items	Valid	Excluded	Total	Alpha
174	72	34	106	0.985

Data Collection

To best identify new professionals who have supervisory responsibilities as part of their jobs the researcher requested the assistance and endorsement of the Association of College and University Housing Officers-International (ACUHO-I). This organization facilitated participant recruitment from its membership. “The endorsement of key individuals or organizations has a major effect on the attitude of people being asked to participate in the survey and is helpful in achieving a high response rate” (Berdie, Anderson, & Neibuhr, 1986, p. 9). ACUHO-I, a professional organization for college and university housing/residence life units and their employees, currently has a membership of over 900 colleges and universities (member institutions) that span the United States (U.S.) and Canada.

The researcher followed the protocol as detailed by ACUHO-I in order to gain organizational support and permission to have access to the directory the association maintains of Chief Housing Officers (CHO) for each member institution. After support was granted by ACUHO-I the researcher sent an email (*Appendix B*) on February 17, 2009 to the CHOs ($n=849$)

of member institutions ($n=853$) requesting their assistance with identifying individuals within their functional units that met the criteria of the population for this investigation.

The initial electronic message to the CHOs ($n=849$) contained the purpose of the study, a description of the target population of participants, and a request for their support of the investigation in identifying the necessary population. The CHOs were asked to email the researcher a list of email addresses of employees who work within their units and met the criteria for the population being investigated by March 4, 2009. A reminder email request (*Appendix C*) was sent on February 23, 2009 to the 76% of CHOs that had not responded ($n=649$) to the initial email request. A total of 35% ($n=296$) of the CHOs or their designees responded to the two email requests. Of the number of responses ($n=296$) a total of 69% ($n=203$) did not have individuals working within their units who met the criteria for participation in the study. However, 31% of the CHOs ($n=95$) from 95 member institutions (*Appendix P*) provided the researcher with the names and email addresses of 196 potential participants.

After the names and corresponding email addresses were received the researcher entered them into an Excel spreadsheet and emailed the potential participants ($n=196$) by utilizing the Perseus survey design program to request their participation in the investigation. The email invitation to participate (*Appendix D*) was sent on March 9, 2009 and contained a brief overview of the study (purpose, significance, etc.), requested their participation, detailed consent procedures, highlighted the criteria for participation, and provided a link to a web-based electronic questionnaire. In six instances, the email address that was provided by the respective chief housing officer was not correct. The researcher determined this when he received email responses from 6 institutions email servers that detailed there were errors with those messages. In those instances, the researcher cross referenced the potential participants name, email address,

and institution of employment in order to link the email address to an individual and institution. After this was completed the researcher looked up the correct email addresses on the institution's web-page. All of the six error email addresses were corrected and the researcher emailed those potential participants on March 10, 2009. Seven of the 196 potential participants emailed the researcher detailing that they did not meet the criteria for participation in the study. Those individuals were removed from the potential participant list and this action changed the number of potential participants to 189.

A follow-up reminder email (*Appendix E*) was sent on March 17, 2009 to the updated potential participants list ($n=189$). On March 23, 2009 a final email reminder and request to participate (*Appendix F*) was sent to the potential participants. The web-based questionnaire was taken down on March 30, 2009 and was no longer accessible for potential participants. A total of 57% ($n=108$) completed the online survey. All quantitative data was transferred electronically to the researcher and was copied from its original form in Microsoft Excel to the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) version 16. Once copied to SPSS 16.0, the values were labeled and coded and the data were analyzed. The responses for the two open-ended questions were copied from their original form and pasted into Microsoft Word in order to complete the data analysis process for those questions. The specific data analysis methods are addressed later in this chapter.

Research Questions

The following research questions guided the study:

RQ 1: What are the supervision skills needed to be an effective supervisor as identified in the literature?

RQ 2: What supervision skills did first-year post-master's new professionals learn through classroom instruction during their graduate preparation programs?

RQ 3: What supervision skills did first-year post-master's new professionals learn through the supervised practice experience (graduate assistantship, internship, and practicum) during their graduate preparation programs?

RQ 4: What supervision skills did first-year post-master's new professionals learn through self-taught learning while in their graduate preparation programs?

RQ 5: What supervision skills are listed as critical for success as a supervisor by first-year post-master's new professionals?

RQ 6: What supervision skills, if any, should be added to the listed skills identified by the researcher?

Data Analysis

As documented in chapter three the researcher utilized a literature review and document analysis methods to answer RQ 1. Fifty-six ($n=56$) scholarly sources were reviewed and mined for explicitly stated supervision skills. Statistical analyses were conducted to answer the quantitative elements of this exploratory investigation. SPSS version 16.0 was utilized as the software to answer RQ 2, RQ 3, and RQ 4. Descriptive statistics were computed in order to determine a rank ordering of means of the responses and independent-samples t tests were utilized when a comparison of means was made between two different groups to answer RQ 2, RQ 3, and RQ 4. To analyze RQ 5 and RQ 6 the researcher transferred open-ended response data to Microsoft Word and grouped and counted responses to determine the number and type of responses per question.

Chapter Summary

Quantitative methods were utilized to gather the data through a locally designed instrument. The instrument went through a multi-phase peer reviewed design process to ensure content validity and internal consistency reliability. With the endorsement of the Association of College and University Housing Officers-International (ACUHO-I) the researcher analyzed the responses of 106 new professionals, as operationally defined for this study, to gain an understanding of the supervision skills that were learned through various learning activities during their graduate preparation programs. Analysis of the scaled items and demographics was conducted by utilizing SPSS version 16.0 and grouping/counting was completed to answer the research questions that related to the open-ended items on the questionnaire. Results are reported in chapter four.

CHAPTER FOUR

RESULTS

A total of 196 email addresses and names of potential participants meeting the criteria for this investigation were received from 95 chief housing officers (CHO) at 95 institutions. After the initial invitation to participate was emailed to the potential participants seven of those individuals emailed the researcher and stated that they did not meet the criteria for the investigation. Of the potential participants ($n=189$) a total of 108 individuals completed the web-based electronic survey for an initial 57% response rate.

Upon review of the collected data two participants did not meet the criteria for the study because they had over 12 months of post-masters full-time work experience. Those participants were removed from the data set and the total of potential participants became 187 and the number of participants became 106. The final response rate for the questionnaire was 57%.

After data were collected they were transferred to SPSS version 16.0 and/or Microsoft Word for analysis. All values, minus the two open-ended responses, were coded in SPSS. Questions that were not answered were coded as missing. The analyzed data are the focus of this chapter. Specifically, the chapter will present the demographics of the study participants and report the findings for the six research questions. Discussion of the significant findings will be reviewed in chapter five of this study.

Participant Demographics

The study participants varied by sex, ethnicity, preparation program type, graduate assistantship status during their preparation program, level of supervision in their post-masters

job, full-time work experience prior to entering their preparation program, and months of post-masters employment . Approximately 38.7% ($n=41$) of the respondents identified themselves as male, 57.5% ($n=61$) identified as female, 0.9% ($n=1$) identified as transgender, and 2.8% ($n=3$) did not provide any information regarding sex. Caucasians made up 76.4% ($n=81$) of the study participants, African Americans represented 9.4% ($n=10$), Asian/Pacific Islanders made up 5.7% ($n=6$) of the respondents, and 1.9% ($n=2$) identified as Multiracial. Hispanic/Latino/Latina represented 0.9% ($n=1$) of the study participants, Native Americans represented 0.9% ($n=1$), 1.9% ($n=2$) identified as other, and 2.8% ($n=3$) did not respond to the ethnicity question.

Respondents differed in regards to the preparation program that they completed. A total of 52.8 % ($n=56$) completed a stand alone student affairs program, 27.4% ($n=29$) participants completed a program where student affairs was a concentration within a larger academic program, 7.5% ($n=8$) completed programs where student affairs was a minor, 2.8% ($n=3$) did not respond to the question, and 9.4% ($n=10$) responded they completed other programs that were related to student affairs. The following were represented as the other programs: College Student Development and Counseling ($n=1$), Counseling ($n=2$), Counseling in College Student Personnel/Development ($n=2$), Organization and Leadership ($n=1$), Public Administration ($n=1$), Social Work ($n=1$), Student Affairs as a track within a broader Student Affairs Program ($n=1$), and Sociology ($n=1$).

A total of 98.1% ($n=104$) participants held a graduate assistantship (GA) during their graduate preparation programs. Approximately 0.9% ($n=1$) of the questionnaire respondents did not hold a GA during their graduate preparation program and 0.9% ($n=1$) did not provide a response to the holding a GA question. Ninety-one (85.8%) of the respondents held a GA within a housing/residence life functional unit. A total of 13 (12.3%) respondents did not hold a

housing/residence life GA. Ninety-two (86.8%) of the participants had supervisory responsibilities during graduate school and approximately 10.4% ($n=11$) did not supervise any staff during their preparation programs. A total of three (2.8%) participants did not respond to the question related to this demographic variable.

In regards to months of post-masters work experience, approximately 84.9% ($n=90$) had worked between 6-9 months and a total of 9.4% ($n=10$) worked between 10-12 months. Approximately 1.9% ($n=2$) worked between 0-2 months, 0.9% ($n=1$) worked between 3-6 months, and 2.8% ($n=3$) did not answer the work experience question.

A total of 38.7% ($n=41$) participants worked full-time prior to starting their graduate preparation programs. Nearly, 60.3% ($n=64$) of the participants did not work full-time prior to starting their preparation programs. Of the participants that worked prior to starting their preparation program 46.3% ($n=19$) did not supervise any staff members in their full-time pre-masters job. However, a total of 53.7% ($n=22$) participants did supervise individuals in their full-time jobs prior to starting their graduate preparation program.

Approximately 94.3% ($n=100$) of the participants currently supervise undergraduate staff, 24% ($n=26$) supervise receptionists/secretaries, and 49.1% ($n=52$) supervise graduate students. Additionally, 9.4% ($n=10$) supervise maintenance/custodial staff, and 3.8% ($n=4$) listed other.

Appendix P provides a detailed summary table of demographic information.

Research Question One

Research question one (RQ 1) focused on identifying the supervisory skills needed to be an effective supervisor as detailed in the literature. Answering this question was essential in order to develop the questionnaire for this investigation. The process for identifying the

supervisory skills was detailed in the research instrument design section of chapter three. This section will detail the psychometric properties of the developed instrument.

As detailed in chapter three, the questionnaire had a high level of reliability with an overall Cronbach's alpha reliability coefficient of 0.985. However, additional analysis was conducted on the questionnaire to determine the reliability of the instrument's scales. The questionnaire scales are composed of questions related to supervisory skills, which have been divided into the following four categories: interpersonal, technical, administrative, and conceptual (see Table 4.1).

Table 4.1

Questionnaire Scales

Category/Scale	Items	Skills
<u>Interpersonal</u>	1. Serve as an advisor to supervisees	1. Advisement
	2. Position staff members related to their strengths in order to accomplish unit goals	2. Coaching
	3. Promote collaboration between the staff members that you supervise	3. Collaboration
	4. Effectively use communication skills to supervise staff	4. Communication
	5. Resolve staff conflicts	5. Conflict resolution
	6. Promote diversity within one's staff by facilitating the interaction of people who are different	6. Diversity promotion

7. Empower supervisees to reach goals	7. Empowerment
8. Provide clear feedback to supervisees	8. Feedback
9. Utilize active listening skills to determine supervisee concerns	9. Active listening
10. Serve as a mentor (guide) to supervisees	10. Mentoring
11. Utilize effective techniques to motivate supervisees	11. Motivational
12. Utilize human relations (people) skills to supervise staff to meet unit goals	12. Human relations
13. Use appropriate approaches to aid supervisees in building relationships (networking)	13. Relationship building
14. Serve as a positive example to staff by modeling appropriate professional behavior	14. Role modeling
15. Implement strategies to minimize the level of stress for your staff	15. Stress management
16. Support (nurture) supervisees	16. Supporting
17. Build effective work teams	17. Team building
<u>Technical</u>	
1. Use analytical (logical) reasoning methods to make work related decisions	1. Analytical
2. Clarify unit objectives and goals for supervisees	2. Clarifying objectives and goals
3. Diagnose work related challenges in an expedient manner	3. Diagnostic
4. Utilize appropriate strategies to identify staff needs	4. Need assessment
5. Conduct periodic staff performance appraisals to evaluate staff skill levels	5. Performance appraisal and skill assessment
6. Utilize assessment techniques to determine	6. Program evaluation

program effectiveness

- | | |
|--|---------------------------|
| 7. Make use of appropriate self-assessment techniques to maximize work related performance | 7. Self-assessment |
| 8. Instruct (teach) employees | 8. Teaching (instruction) |
| 9. Utilize appropriate technology to better meet unit goals | 9. Technological |
| 10. Author appropriate correspondence related to supervisory duties | 10. Writing |

Administrative

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1. Utilize appropriate budget management techniques | 1. Budgeting |
| 2. Enforce departmental rules (procedures) | 2. Controlling (rule enforcement) |
| 3. Aid supervisees with crisis management through the use of appropriate leadership techniques | 3. Crisis management |
| 4. Delegate appropriate tasks to supervisees | 4. Delegation |
| 5. Direct staff in order to complete work related tasks | 5. Directing |
| 6. Administer employee disciplinary procedures | 6. Discipline |
| 7. Coordinate supervisee work activities | 7. Distribution (coordination) of work |
| 8. Interview candidates for jobs | 8. Interviewing |
| 9. Develop job descriptions | 9. Job analysis and description development |
| 10. Manage staff meetings | 10. Meeting management and facilitation |
| 11. Monitor staff work assignments | 11. Monitoring work |
| 12. Organize staff to maximize accomplishment of unit goals | 12. Organizing |

	13. Effectively manage projects to accomplish work related goals	13. Project management
	14. recruit candidates to fill open positions	14. Recruitment
	15. Manage the acquisition of resources (i.e., human, fiscal, time, facilities) to meet unit goals	15. Resource management and acquisition
	16. Implement staff selection methods	16. Staffing
	17. Effectively manage time to complete supervisory responsibilities	17. Time management
	18. Direct staff training programs	18. Training
<u>Conceptual</u>	1. Aid staff to effectively manage change	1. Change management
	2. Ability to implement decisions you make in a supervisory capacity	2. Decision making
	3. Utilize appropriate techniques to aid in the development of supervisees	3. Employee professional development and performance improvement
	4. Assist staff with the management of various environmental (intrinsic and extrinsic) factors	4. Environmental management
	5. Utilize forecasting (prediction) techniques to anticipate unit staffing needs	5. Forecasting
	6. Implement developed unit goals	6. Goals setting, development, and implementation
	7. Use appropriate techniques to promote supervisee creativity (innovation)	7. Innovation (creativity)
	8. Interpret institutional policies (procedures) to address staff concerns	8. Interpretation
	9. Practice applicable strategies to serve as a leader to supervisees	9. Leadership

10. Make use of appropriate strategic planning techniques	10. Planning (general and strategic)
11. Use appropriate techniques to solve work related problems	11. Problem solving
12. Reorganize staff responsibilities to achieve unit goals	12. Reorganization
13. Develop a vision for your area of responsibility	13. Vision development

Note. Each of the four categories are scaled for the three learning activities (classroom instruction, supervised practice, and self-taught) for a total of 12 scales

A Cronbach's alpha was computed on each scale for the three different learning activities: classroom instruction, supervised practice experiences, and self-taught activities, and in doing that a total of twelve Cronbach's alphas were determined for the twelve scales. Table 4.2 details the Cronbach's alpha for each of the scales. As noted in chapter three, the Cronbach's alpha has a range of 0.00 to 1.00 and scores closer to 1.00 are viewed as more reliable. Each of the twelve scales for the questionnaire had Cronbach alpha scores above 0.850 with a range of 0.949 to 0.852. The scale with the highest Cronbach alpha score was the interpersonal category based on classroom instruction with a 0.949. The scale with the lowest Cronbach alpha score was the technical category based on self-taught learning activities at 0.852. Scale scores were computed after Cronbach's alphas were determined.

Table 4.2

Scale Reliability

Items	<u>Cases</u>		Total	Alpha
	Valid	Excluded*		
<u>Interpersonal, Classroom Instruction</u>				
17	100	6	106	0.949
<u>Interpersonal, Supervised Practice Experiences</u>				
17	100	6	106	0.942
<u>Interpersonal, Self-taught Learning</u>				
17	96	10	106	0.926
<u>Technical, Classroom Instruction</u>				
10	100	6	106	0.907
<u>Technical, Supervised Practice Experiences</u>				
10	100	6	106	0.870
<u>Technical, Self-taught Learning</u>				
10	97	9	106	0.852
<u>Administrative, Classroom Instruction</u>				
18	92	14	106	0.946
<u>Administrative, Supervised Practice Experiences</u>				
18	92	14	106	0.914
<u>Administrative, Self-taught Learning</u>				
18	95	11	106	0.938

Conceptual, Classroom Instruction

13	102	4	106	0.943
----	-----	---	-----	-------

Conceptual, Supervised Practice Experiences

13	102	4	106	0.928
----	-----	---	-----	-------

Conceptual, Self-taught Learning

13	98	8	106	0.911
----	----	---	-----	-------

**Note.* Listwise deletion based on all variables in the procedure

Because the Cronbach's alpha held up for each of the twelve scales the researcher was able to compute independent samples t tests with reliable scales and in turn this enhanced the overall reliability of the study. The calculated scale scores were utilized to aid in answering research questions two, three, and four. Specifically, independent samples t tests were computed by utilizing each scaled score as a dependent variable and various demographic variables as the independent variable. Results from the completed independent samples t tests are communicated later in this section.

Research Question Two

Research question 2 (RQ 2) called for determining what supervisory skills first-year post-master's new professionals learned through classroom instruction during their graduate preparation programs. To answer this question SPSS 16.0 was utilized to compute descriptive statistics in order to rank mean scores and independent-samples t tests were conducted with demographic variables and scale scores to compare the mean scores of two groups. Table 4.3 highlights the ranked mean scores and standard deviations for each supervisory skill based on

classroom instruction. Participants were asked to respond to 58 questions on a four-point Likert-like scale. When coding, a one denoted “not at all”, a two denoted “minimally”, a three denoted “adequately”, and a four denoted “very well.” Mean scores closer to four denoted a higher level of learning of the supervisory skill.

All the mean scores for each skill learned through classroom instruction were below a 3.0, which was the “adequate” level of learning. Only 20.6% ($n=12$) of the 58 supervision skills had mean scores above 2.50. The top ten highest ranked mean scores were: program evaluation ($M=2.90$, $SD=0.91$), (active) listening ($M=2.89$, $SD=1.02$), analytical ($M=2.85$, $SD=0.96$), role modeling ($M=2.83$, $SD=1.0$), communication ($M=2.70$, $SD=0.94$), diversity promotion ($M=2.67$, $SD=0.10$), team building ($M=2.65$, $SD=0.943$), clarifying objectives and goals ($M=2.58$, $SD=1.02$), vision development ($M=2.57$, $SD=0.98$), and problem solving ($M=2.56$, $SD=0.95$). A total of 50% ($n=5$) of the top ten highest ranked supervisory skills by mean scores were from the interpersonal category.

Approximately 17.2% ($n=10$) of the identified supervision skills learned through classroom instruction had mean scores below 2.0, which was the “minimal” level of learning. The ten skills with the lowest mean scores were: monitoring work ($M=1.81$, $SD=0.85$), recruitment ($M=1.83$, $SD=0.88$), meeting management and facilitation ($M=1.83$, $SD=0.84$), staffing ($M=1.84$, $SD=0.92$), job analysis and description development ($M=1.88$, $SD=0.97$), discipline ($M=1.89$, $SD=0.92$), training ($M=1.90$, $SD=0.873$), distribution (coordination) of work activities ($M=1.94$, $SD=0.86$), forecasting ($M=1.96$, $SD=0.95$), and organizing ($M=1.99$, $SD=0.92$). A total of 90% ($n=9$) of the bottom ten ranked supervisory skills by mean scores were from the administrative category.

Table 4.3

Ranked Mean Scores and Standard Deviations for Supervision Skills Learned During Classroom Instruction

Rank	Skill	Mean	Std. Deviation
1	Program evaluation	2.90	0.913
2	(Active) Listening	2.89	1.019
3	Analytical	2.85	0.964
4	Role modeling	2.83	1.001
5	Communication	2.70	0.944
6	Diversity promotion	2.67	0.990
7	Team building	2.65	0.943
8	Clarifying objectives and goals	2.58	1.024
9	Vision development	2.57	0.976
10	Problem solving	2.56	0.946
11	Employee professional development and performance improvement	2.54	0.972
12	Leadership	2.51	0.999
13	Crisis management	2.48	1.043
14	Self-assessment	2.46	0.985
15	Supporting	2.45	1.007
16	Teaching	2.44	0.974
17	Conflict resolution	2.42	0.889

18	Need assessment	2.42	0.932
19	Diagnostic	2.41	0.951
20	Planning (general and strategic)	2.41	0.975
21	Human relations	2.39	0.989
22	Technology	2.39	0.899
23	Environmental management	2.39	0.962
24	Collaboration	2.36	0.954
25	Empowerment	2.35	0.997
26	Relationship building	2.32	1.026
27	Writing	2.30	0.912
28	Goal setting and implementation	2.29	0.976
29	Mentoring	2.28	1.023
30	Motivational	2.28	0.980
31	Project management	2.26	0.981
32	Feedback	2.25	0.957
33	Performance appraisals and skill assessment	2.24	1.029
34	Controlling (rule enforcement)	2.22	0.917
35	Coaching	2.20	0.863
36	Budgeting	2.19	1.025
37	Time management	2.17	0.964
38	Interpretation	2.17	0.853
39	Change management	2.15	0.890

40	Stress management	2.14	0.908
41	Advisement	2.12	0.844
42	Reorganization	2.11	0.907
43	Resource management and acquisition	2.10	0.945
44	Directing	2.10	0.887
45	Decision making	2.09	0.930
46	Innovation (creativity)	2.08	0.936
47	Interviewing	2.06	1.018
48	Delegation	2.03	0.897
49	Organization	1.99	0.916
50	Forecasting	1.96	0.949
51	Distribution (coordination) of work activities	1.94	0.857
52	Training	1.90	0.873
53	Discipline	1.89	0.923
54	Job analysis and description development	1.88	0.968
55	Staffing	1.84	0.920
56	Meeting management and facilitation	1.83	0.837
57	Recruitment	1.83	0.879
58	Monitoring work	1.81	0.849

Note. Response options: 1=not at all, 2=minimally, 3= adequately, 4=very well

As detailed earlier, independent samples *t* tests were utilized to aid in answering RQ 2. The following demographic variables were used as the independent variables for the *t* tests: sex, ethnicity (white/practitioners of color), full-time pre-master's work experience, having supervisory responsibilities during full-time pre-master's employment, and holding a housing/residence life graduate assistantship during graduate school. The dependent variables were the scaled scores for the interpersonal, technical, administrative, and conceptual categories based on classroom instruction. Table 4.4 details the results of the independent samples *t* tests.

After analysis it was determined that none of the calculated independent samples *t* tests related to the scaled scores and the following variables: sex, ethnicity, full-time pre-master's work experience, or supervisory responsibilities during a full-time pre-master's job, yielded statistically significant results at the $p < .05$ or $p < .01$ alpha levels. This finding indicated that there was not a statistically significant difference between the mean scores of each of the variables listed above based on each of the scaled scores (interpersonal, technical, administrative, and conceptual).

Based on the results, only two (interpersonal and conceptual) of the 12 scales for classroom instruction yielded statistically significant results when demographic variables were compared with independent samples *t* tests. An independent samples *t* test with the interpersonal classroom instruction scale and the variable for holding a housing/residence life graduate assistantship (GA) during a master's preparation program showed statistically significant findings at the $p < 0.05$ alpha level. Specifically, the results indicated that there was a statistically significant difference in mean scores related to learning, based on the interpersonal classroom instruction scale, between individuals that held housing/residence life graduate assistantships during their master's preparation program and those master's students that did not hold

housing/residence life assistantships ($t=2.34, p=0.02$). Additionally, the results of the independent samples t test indicated that there was a statistically significant difference in mean scores at the $p<0.05$ alpha level related to learning, based on the conceptual classroom instruction scale, between individuals that held housing graduate assistantships during their master's preparation program and those master's students that did not hold housing/residence life graduate assistantships ($t=2.25, p=0.03$).

Table 4.4

Results of T Tests for Classroom Instruction Scales

Variable	<i>n</i>	Mean	<i>SD</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>p</i>
<u>Sex</u>						
Interpersonal	---	---	---	1.15	97	0.25
Male	39	45.4	12.5			
Female	60	42.3	13.3			
Technical	---	---	---	0.78	96	0.44
Male	41	26.0	6.42			
Female	57	24.9	7.31			
Administrative	---	---	---	1.79	89	0.76
Male	39	39.6	11.4			
Female	52	35.2	12.1			

Conceptual	---	---	---	1.71	99	0.09
Male	41	31.9	8.77			
Female	60	28.7	9.62			
<u>Ethnicity</u>						
Interpersonal	---	---	---	0.51	99	0.61
Of color	23	44.5	14.3			
White	78	42.9	12.7			
Technical	---	---	---	1.22	98	0.41
Of color	21	26.9	6.07			
White	79	24.8	7.22			
Administrative	---	---	---	-0.24	90	0.81
Of color	18	36.3	11.5			
White	74	37.0	12.2			
Conceptual	---	---	---	-0.60	100	0.55
Of color	21	28.7	9.73			
White	81	30.1	9.39			
<u>Pre-Master's Full-Time Work Experience</u>						
Interpersonal	---	---	---	0.32	98	0.97
Yes	37	43.4	11.2			
No	63	43.3	14.2			
Technical	---	---	---	-0.85	97	0.40
Yes	39	24.5	6.78			
No	60	25.7	7.24			

Administrative	---	---	---	-0.02	90	0.99
Yes	36	36.8	10.8			
No	56	36.9	12.9			
Conceptual	---	---	---	-0.07	100	0.94
Yes	38	29.7	8.96			
No	64	29.8	9.78			

Supervisory Responsibilities Pre-Master's Full-Time Job

Interpersonal	---	---	---	0.18	35	0.86
Yes	15	43.8	11.3			
No	22	43.1	11.3			
Technical	---	---	---	0.69	37	0.49
Yes	17	25.4	7.39			
No	22	23.8	6.36			
Administrative	---	---	---	0.25	34	0.80
Yes	15	37.4	8.54			
No	21	36.4	12.3			
Conceptual	---	---	---	0.13	36	0.90
Yes	17	29.9	9.33			
No	21	29.6	8.90			

Graduate Assistantship Housing/Residence Life

Interpersonal	---	---	---	2.34	97	0.02*
Yes	87	44.5	13.1			
No	12	35.3	10.2			

Technical	---	---	---	1.15	96	0.26
Yes	86	25.6	7.10			
No	12	23.1	6.13			
Administrative	---	---	---	1.57	89	0.12
Yes	79	37.8	12.1			
No	12	32.1	10.2			
Conceptual	---	---	---	2.24	99	0.03*
Yes	88	30.7	9.32			
No	13	24.5	8.70			

* $p < .05$.

Research Question Three

The goal of research question three (RQ 3) was to identify the supervision skills that first-year post-master's new professionals learned through supervised practice experiences (graduate assistantship, internship, and practicum) during their graduate preparation programs. Similar to RQ 2, SPSS 16.0 was utilized to determine descriptive statistics to rank order mean scores and compute independent-samples *t*-tests on applicable demographic variables and scale scores. Participants were asked to respond to 58 questions/items on a four-point Likert-like scale. When coding, a one denoted "not at all", a two denoted "minimally", a three denoted "adequately", and a four denoted "very well." Mean scores closer to four denoted a higher level of learning of the

supervisory skill. Table 4.5 documents the ranked mean scores and standard deviations for each skill based on supervised practice learning experiences.

Approximately 53.4% ($n=31$) of the identified supervisory skills learned through supervised practice experiences had mean scores of a 3.0 or above, which was the “adequate” level of learning. The mean score range for supervisory skills learned through supervised practice experiences was 3.44 to 2.18 with 80% ($n=43$) of the mean scores above 2.8. The top ten ranked mean scores were: interviewing ($M=3.44$, $SD=0.76$), controlling/rule enforcement ($M=3.41$, $SD=0.77$), performance appraisals and skill assessment ($M=3.36$, $SD=0.87$), role modeling ($M=3.36$, $SD=0.74$), crisis management ($M=3.33$, $SD=0.85$), communication ($M=3.27$, $SD=0.82$), meeting management and facilitation ($M=3.22$, $SD=0.95$), conflict resolution ($M=3.21$, $SD=0.84$), collaboration ($M=3.17$, $SD=0.74$), and team building ($M=3.16$, $SD=0.78$). A total of 50% ($n=5$) of the top ten highest ranked mean scores for supervisory skills learned through supervised practice experiences were from the administrative category. The other 50% ($n=5$) of the top ten highest ranked mean scores for supervisory skills learned through supervised practice experiences were from the interpersonal category.

All of the supervisory skills learned through supervised practice experiences had mean scores above 2.0, which was the “minimal” level of learning. The ten skills with the lowest mean scores were: job analysis and description development ($M=2.18$, $SD=1.01$), forecasting ($M=2.36$, $SD=0.93$), technological ($M=2.57$, $SD=0.85$), planning-general and strategic ($M=2.60$, $SD=0.89$), goal setting and implementation ($M=2.62$, $SD=0.79$), change management ($M=2.64$, $SD=0.84$), resource management and acquisition ($M=2.68$, $SD=0.85$), environmental management ($M=2.69$, $SD=0.77$), budgeting ($M=2.70$, $SD=1.04$), and innovation/creativity ($M=2.72$, $SD=0.75$). A total of 60% ($n=6$) of the top ten lowest ranked mean scores for

supervisory skills learned through supervised practice experiences were from the conceptual category followed by 30% ($n=3$) from the administrative category.

Table 4.5

Ranked Mean Scores and Standard Deviations for Supervision Skills Learned During Supervised Practice Experiences

Rank	Skills	Mean	Std. Deviation
1	Interviewing	3.44	0.761
2	Controlling (rule enforcement)	3.41	0.773
3	Performance appraisals and skill assessment	3.36	0.869
4	Role modeling	3.36	0.736
5	Crisis management	3.33	0.853
6	Communication	3.27	0.815
7	Meeting management and facilitation	3.22	0.951
8	Conflict resolution	3.21	0.844
9	Collaboration	3.17	0.743
10	Team building	3.16	0.777
11	Delegation	3.13	0.751
12	Advisement	3.11	0.858
13	Discipline	3.11	0.954
14	(Active) Listening	3.11	0.812
15	Training	3.10	0.902
16	Staffing	3.09	0.898
17	Mentoring	3.08	0.813

18	Diversity promotion	3.07	0.808
19	Problem solving	3.06	0.698
20	Feedback	3.06	0.846
21	Directing	3.06	0.786
22	Diagnostic	3.06	0.735
23	Supporting	3.05	0.733
24	Human relations	3.05	0.768
25	Analytical	3.04	0.835
26	Clarifying objectives and goals	3.03	0.798
27	Teaching (instruction)	3.02	0.847
28	Leadership	3.01	0.734
29	Employee professional development and performance improvement	3.01	0.760
30	Time management	3.01	0.834
31	Need assessment	3.00	0.728
32	Writing	2.98	0.903
33	Distribution (coordination) of work activities	2.97	0.818
34	Decision making	2.96	0.862.
35	Empowerment	2.95	0.813
36	Project management	2.95	0.726
37	Interpretation	2.91	0.781
38	Motivational	2.89	0.847
39	Coaching	2.88	0.840

40	Program evaluation	2.88	0.844
41	Recruitment	2.88	0.957
42	Monitoring work	2.88	0.816
43	Relationship building	2.87	0.893
44	Reorganization	2.86	0.817
45	Vision development	2.85	0.821
46	Organization	2.85	0.744
47	Stress management	2.80	0.863
48	Self-assessment	2.78	0.824
49	Innovation (creativity)	2.72	0.746
50	Budgeting	2.70	1.042
51	Environmental management	2.69	0.767
52	Resource management and acquisition	2.68	0.846
53	Change management	2.64	0.842
54	Goal setting and implementation	2.62	0.794
55	Planning (general and strategic)	2.60	0.889
56	Technological	2.57	0.847
57	Forecasting	2.36	0.927
58	Job analysis and description development	2.18	1.007

Note. Response options: 1=not at all, 2=minimally, 3= adequately, 4=very well

Independent samples *t* tests were utilized to help answer research question three. The following demographic variables were utilized as the independent variables for the independent samples *t* tests: sex, white/practitioners of color, full-time pre-master's work experience, supervisory responsibility during full-time pre-master's employment, and holding a housing/residence life graduate assistantship. The dependent variables were the scaled scores for the interpersonal, technical, administrative, and conceptual categories based on supervised practice experiences. Table 4.6 details the results of the independent samples *t* tests.

After the results were reviewed it was concluded that none of the calculated independent samples *t* tests yielded significant findings at the $p < .05$ or $p < .01$ alpha levels related to each of the scaled scores and the following variables: sex, white/practitioners of color, or full-time pre-master's work experience. The independent samples *t* tests with these variables indicated that there was not a statistically significant difference between the mean scores of each of the variables listed above based on all of the scaled scores (interpersonal, technical, administrative, and conceptual).

A statistically significant difference at the $p < .05$ alpha level resulted when an independent samples *t* test was conducted with supervisory responsibilities in a full-time pre-master's job variable and the technical supervised practice experience scale variable. Specifically, the results indicated that there was a statistically significant difference between the mean scores of participants that had supervisory responsibilities in a full-time pre-master's job and those that did not ($t=2.07$, $p=0.04$), based on the technical supervised practice experience scale.

When independent samples *t* test were performed with the variable of the individuals holding a housing/residence life graduate assistantship during their master's preparation program

and each of the supervised practice experiences scales (interpersonal, technical, administrative, and conceptual) results indicated several statistically significant findings at the $p < 0.05$ and $p < 0.01$ alpha levels. The results detailed that there was a statistically significant difference in mean scores (level of learning) based on the technical supervised practice experiences scale variable between participants that held a housing/residence life graduate assistantship during their preparation program and those participants that did not, ($t=2.45$, $p=0.016$). Additionally, statistically significant differences in mean scores resulted with the housing/residence life graduate assistantship variable and the interpersonal supervised practice scale variable ($t=3.86$, $p=0.00$), the administrative supervised practice scale variable ($t=3.34$, $p=0.01$), and the conceptual supervised practice scale variable ($t=2.88$, $p=0.005$) when looking at those participants that held a housing/residence life graduate assistantship and those that did not.

Table 4.6

Results of T Tests for Supervised Practice Experiences

Variable	<i>n</i>	Mean	<i>SD</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>p</i>
<u>Sex</u>						
Interpersonal	---	---	---	0.83	97	0.41
Male	40	45.4	8.13			
Female	59	51.6	11.0			
Technical	---	---	---	-0.17	96	0.87

Male	41	29.8	4.42			
Female	57	30.0	6.10			
Administrative	---	---	---	0.12	92	0.90
Male	41	54.3	9.71			
Female	53	54.0	11.4			
Conceptual	---	---	---	0.36	99	0.72
Male	41	36.9	6.40			
Female	60	36.4	8.00			
<u>Ethnicity</u>						
Interpersonal	---	---	---	0.83	98	0.41
Of color	21	53.7	11.3			
White	79	51.6	9.70			
Technical	---	---	---	0.42	98	0.67
Of color	22	30.2	4.72			
White	78	29.7	5.82			
Administrative	---	---	---	0.24	93	0.81
Of color	19	54.4	11.3			
White	76	53.7	10.9			
Conceptual	---	---	---	-1.70	100	0.98
Of color	22	38.8	8.00			
White	80	35.7	7.50			
<u>Pre-Master's Full-Time Work Experience</u>						
Interpersonal	---	---	---	0.58	98	0.56

Yes	39	52.8	10.3			
No	61	51.6	9.90			
Technical	---	---	---	-0.09	97	0.93
Yes	38	29.7	6.10			
No	61	29.8	5.40			
Administrative	---	---	---	-0.20	93	0.85
Yes	37	53.5	11.3			
No	58	54.0	10.9			
Conceptual	---	---	---	-0.26	100	0.80
Yes	39	36.1	7.67			
No	63	36.5	7.69			

Supervisory Responsibilities Pre-Master's Full-Time Job

Interpersonal	---	---	---	0.73	37	0.47
Yes	17	54.2	6.80			
No	22	51.7	12.5			
Technical	---	---	---	2.07	36	0.04*
Yes	16	32.0	4.63			
No	22	28.0	6.60			
Administrative	---	---	---	0.24	35	0.81
Yes	16	54.1	8.40			
No	21	53.1	13.2			
Conceptual	---	---	---	1.13	37	0.27
Yes	17	37.7	4.94			

No	22	34.9	9.18			
<u>Graduate Assistantship Housing/Residence Life</u>						
Interpersonal	---	---	---	3.86	97	0.00**
Yes	87	53.6	9.14			
No	12	42.6	10.1			
Technical	---	---	---	2.45	96	0.016*
Yes	86	30.4	4.91			
No	12	26.4	7.65			
Administrative	---	---	---	3.34	92	0.001**
Yes	82	55.4	9.39			
No	12	45.0	14.3			
Conceptual	---	---	---	2.88	99	0.005**
Yes	88	37.3	6.82			
No	13	31.1	10.0			

* $p < .05$.
** $p < .01$.

Research Question Four

Research question four (RQ 4) was very similar to RQ 2 and RQ 3. Specifically, RQ 4's objective was to determine what supervisory skills first-year post-master's new professionals learned through self-taught learning activities while in their graduate preparation programs. Descriptive statistics were computed in order to rank mean scores and independent samples t

tests were also utilized to answer this question. When coding, a one denoted “not at all”, a two denoted “minimally”, a three denoted “adequately”, and a four denoted “very well.” Mean scores closer to four denoted a higher level of learning. Table 4.7 details a rank order of the mean scores and standard deviations for the supervision skills based on self-taught learning activities.

Approximately 39.6% ($n=23$) of the identified supervisory skills learned through self-taught experiences had mean scores of a 3.0 or above, which was the “adequate” level of learning. The mean score range for supervisory skills learned through self-taught experiences was 3.58 to 2.07 with approximately 72.4% ($n=41$) of the mean scores above 2.8. The top ten ranked mean scores for supervisory skills learned through self-taught activities were: role modeling ($M=3.58$, $SD=0.68$), meeting management and facilitation ($M=3.29$, $SD=0.82$), communication ($M=3.26$, $SD=0.78$), crisis management ($M=3.24$, $SD=0.81$), (active) listening ($M=3.19$, $SD=0.66$), mentoring ($M=3.18$, $SD=0.81$), conflict resolution ($M=3.17$, $SD=0.68$), time management ($M=3.16$, $SD=0.75$), interviewing ($M=3.15$, $SD=0.83$), and human relations ($M=3.15$, $SD=0.78$). A total of 60% ($n=6$) of the top ten highest ranked mean scores for supervisory skills learned through self-taught activities were from the interpersonal category. The other 40% ($n=4$) of the top ten highest ranked mean scores for supervisory skills learned through self-taught activities were from the administrative category.

All of the supervisory skills learned through self-taught experiences had mean scores above 2.0, which was a “minimal” level of learning. The ten skills with the lowest mean scores were: job analysis and description development ($M=2.07$, $SD=0.93$), forecasting ($M=2.24$, $SD=0.90$), planning-general and strategic ($M=2.42$, $SD=0.79$), goal setting and implementation ($M=2.48$, $SD=0.83$), environmental management ($M=2.51$, $SD=0.85$), budgeting ($M=2.59$,

$SD=0.89$), resource management and acquisition ($M=2.59$, $SD=0.82$), self-assessment ($M=2.60$, $SD=0.88$), change management ($M=2.64$, $SD=0.76$), and program evaluation ($M=2.65$, $SD=0.84$). A total of 50% ($n=5$) of the top ten lowest ranked mean scores for supervisory skills learned through supervised practice experiences were from the conceptual category. Approximately 30% ($n=3$) were from the administrative category and 20% ($n=2$) were from the technical category.

Table 4.7

Mean Scores and Standard Deviations for Supervision Skills Learned During Self-taught Learning Experiences

	Skills	Mean	Std. Deviation
1	Role modeling	3.58	0.678
2	Meeting management and facilitation	3.29	0.824
3	Communication	3.26	0.776
4	Crisis management	3.24	0.810
5	(Active) listening	3.19	0.655
6	Mentoring	3.18	0.810
7	Conflict resolution	3.17	0.675
8	Time management	3.16	0.754
9	Interviewing	3.15	0.833
10	Human relations	3.15	0.773
11	Controlling (rule enforcement)	3.14	0.756

12	Diversity promotion	3.12	0.722
13	Team building	3.12	0.687
14	Advisement	3.08	0.772
15	Leadership	3.06	0.777
16	Supporting	3.06	0.752
17	Analytical	3.06	0.798
18	Problem solving	3.05	0.759
19	Collaboration	3.05	0.833
20	Directing	3.05	0.733
21	Training	3.02	0.820
22	Delegation	3.02	0.714
23	Empowerment	3.00	0.714
24	Feedback	2.96	0.749
25	Coaching	2.93	0.812
26	Distribution (coordination) of work activities	2.92	0.809
27	Need assessment	2.92	0.763
28	Motivational	2.91	0.755
29	Teaching (instruction)	2.90	0.761
30	Stress management	2.88	0.816
31	Vision development	2.88	0.783
32	Performance appraisals and skill assessment	2.87	0.925
33	Diagnostic	2.85	0.694

34	Decision making	2.84	0.801
35	Technological	2.84	0.841
36	Monitoring work	2.84	0.797
37	Staffing	2.83	0.898
38	Employee professional development and performance improvement	2.82	0.789
39	Relationship building	2.81	0.848
40	Clarifying objectives/goals	2.81	0.829
41	Recruitment	2.81	0.971
42	Project management	2.79	0.791
43	Writing	2.79	0.867
44	Discipline	2.79	0.900
45	Interpretation	2.73	0.744
46	Innovation (creativity)	2.73	0.914
47	Reorganization	2.72	0.750
48	Organizing	2.68	0.706
49	Program evaluation	2.65	0.837
50	Change management	2.64	0.755
51	Self-assessment	2.60	0.876
52	Resource management and acquisition	2.59	0.815
53	Budgeting	2.59	0.899
54	Environmental management	2.51	0.853
55	Goal setting and implementation	2.48	0.827

56	Planning (general and strategic)	2.42	0.786
57	Forecasting	2.24	0.903
58	Job analysis and description development	2.07	0.926

Note. Response options: 1=not at all, 2=minimally, 3= adequately, 4=very well

To aid in answering research question four independent samples *t* tests were utilized. The following demographics served as the independent variables for the *t* tests: sex, ethnicity (white/practitioners of color), full-time pre-master's work experience, supervisory responsibility during full-time pre-master's employment, and holding a housing/residence life graduate assistantship. The dependent variables were the scaled scores for the interpersonal, technical, administrative, and conceptual categories based on self-taught learning activities. Table 4.8 details the results of the independent samples *t* tests.

After analysis the results indicated that none of the calculated independent samples *t* tests yielded significant results at the $p < .05$ or $p < .01$ alpha levels between the 12 scaled scores and the following variables: sex, ethnicity, or full-time pre-master's work experience. The independent samples *t* tests on these variables indicated that there was not a statistically significant difference between the mean scores of each of the variables listed above based on each of the scaled score variables (interpersonal, technical, administrative, and conceptual).

A statistical significance was detected after independent samples *t* tests were performed on the supervisory responsibilities in the full-time pre-master's job variable and each of the following scale variables: interpersonal ($t=2.18$, $p=0.036$), technical ($t=2.81$, $p=0.008$), and

conceptual ($t=2.92, p=0.006$). More specifically, there was a high statistical difference ($p<0.01$) between the mean scores of those participants that had supervisory responsibilities during their full-time pre-master's jobs and those that did not, based on the self-taught technical and self-taught conceptual scale variables. Additionally, there was a statistical difference ($p<0.05$) between the mean scores of those participants that had supervisory responsibilities during their full-time pre-master's jobs and those that did not, based on the self-taught interpersonal scale variable.

After independent samples t tests were performed on the housing/residence life graduate assistantship variable and the self-taught scale score variables (interpersonal, technical, administrative, and conceptual) results indicated a statically significant difference ($p<0.05$) between the mean scores of those participants that held a housing/resident life graduate assistantship and those individuals that did not, based on the following self-taught scale score variables: interpersonal ($t=2.53, p=0.013$), technical ($t=2.28, p=0.025$), and conceptual ($t=2.53, p=0.013$). No statistically significant results were found based on the self-taught administrative scale variable.

Table 4.8

Results of T Tests for Self-taught Activities

Variable	n	Mean	SD	t	df	p
----------	-----	------	------	-----	------	-----

Sex

Interpersonal	---	---	---	1.35	93	0.18
Male	38	50.8	7.12			
Female	57	48.5	8.61			
Technical	---	---	---	-3.64	94	0.72
Male	40	27.9	5.16			
Female	56	28.3	5.16			
Administrative	---	---	---	1.42	90	0.16
Male	38	53.4	8.12			
Female	54	50.7	10.3			
Conceptual	---	---	---	1.07	95	0.29
Male	38	36.1	6.40			
Female	59	34.6	7.40			

Ethnicity

Interpersonal	---	---	---	1.04	94	0.30
Of color	22	50.8	7.50			
White	74	48.7	8.44			
Technical	---	---	---	-1.22	96	0.29
Of color	21	27.0	5.50			
White	77	28.4	5.16			
Administrative	---	---	---	0.29	90	0.80
Of color	19	52.5	9.40			
White	73	51.8	9.63			

Conceptual	---	---	---	0.35	96	0.73
Of color	20	35.5	6.86			
White	78	34.9	7.38			

Pre-Master's Full-Time Work Experience

Interpersonal	---	---	---	-0.69	94	0.49
Yes	38	48.5	9.67			
No	56	49.7	7.21			
Technical	---	---	---	-1.55	95	0.13
Yes	39	27.1	5.63			
No	58	28.7	4.93			
Administrative	---	---	---	-1.28	90	0.20
Yes	37	50.4	10.6			
No	55	52.9	8.71			
Conceptual	---	---	---	-0.59	96	0.56
Yes	38	34.4	7.88			
No	60	35.3	6.86			

Supervisory Responsibilities Full-Time Pre-Master's Job

Interpersonal	---	---	---	2.18	36	0.036*
Yes	17	52.1	6.23			
No	21	43.1	11.0			
Technical	---	---	---	2.81	37	0.008**
Yes	17	29.7	4.16			
No	22	25.0	5.84			

Administrative	---	---	---	1.73	35	0.09
Yes	17	53.5	7.78			
No	20	47.7	11.9			
Conceptual	---	---	---	2.92	36	0.006**
Yes	16	38.4	5.89			
No	22	31.5	7.97			
<u>Graduate Assistantship Housing/Residence Life</u>						
Interpersonal	---	---	---	2.53	94	0.013*
Yes	84	50.0	7.56			
No	12	43.8	10.9			
Technical	---	---	---	2.28	94	0.025*
Yes	84	28.5	4.83			
No	12	24.9	7.17			
Administrative	---	---	---	1.84	89	0.69
Yes	79	52.7	9.19			
No	12	47.3	10.8			
Conceptual	---	---	---	2.53	95	0.013*
Yes	84	35.7	6.82			
No	13	30.5	8.45			

* $p < .05$.

** $p < .01$.

Research Question Five

Research question five (RQ 5) asked what supervisory skills are listed as critical for success as a supervisor by first-year post-master's new professionals. To answer RQ 5 the researcher transferred open-ended response data from questionnaire item 59 to Microsoft Word. Once the open-ended responses were transferred to Microsoft Word similar responses were grouped and counted to determine frequencies.

Approximately 86% ($n=91$) of the 106 participants answered survey question 59. A total of 16% ($n=17$) of the 106 respondents left question 59 blank. The respondents listed 69 essential supervision skills. Respondents were not asked to provide definitions for the skills that they suggested.

A total of 36.2% ($n=25$) of the 69 critical skills that were suggested by the participants were not specifically in the list of supervisory skills identified by the researcher. Approximately 55% ($n=38$) of the 69 suggested critical skills were only listed by two or less participants per skill. The top five listed critical supervisory skills by the respondents, detailed in Figure 4.1, were: communication ($n=20$), use of theory ($n=18$), leading groups ($n=14$), conflict resolution ($n=10$), and listening ($n=10$). All but one (use of theory) of the top five suggested critical skills were on the researcher's list of identified supervisory skills. Table 4.9 details the frequencies of the suggested critical skills according to the number of responses.



Figure 4.1

Top Five Listed Critical Supervisory Skills

Table 4.9

Suggested Critical Skills by Frequency

Skill	n	Frequency**
Communication	20	19%
*Use of theory	18	17%
Leading groups	14	13%

Conflict resolution	10	9%
Listening	10	9%
Team work/development	9	8%
*Adaptability/flexibility	8	7%
*Counseling	8	7%
Feedback	8	7%
Motivation	8	7%
Staff development	8	7%
Supporting	8	7%
Time management	8	7%
*Documentation	6	6%
Evaluation of staff	6	6%
Human relations/people	6	6%
Instruction/teaching	6	6%
Mentoring/guiding	6	6%
Budget management	5	5%
*Challenging an employee	5	5%
Goal setting	5	5%
Planning	5	5%
Decision making	4	4%
Staffing	4	4%
Delegation	3	3%
*Holding staff accountable	3	3%

Problem solving	3	3%
*Programming	3	3%
*Reflection	3	3%
Training of staff	3	3%
Writing	3	3%
Ability to work with diverse people	2	2%
Building relationships	2	2%
Collaboration	2	2%
Crisis management	2	2%
*Employee learning outcome development	2	2%
Empowerment of staff	2	2%
Management	2	2%
*Mediation	2	2%
Meeting management	2	2%
*Multitasking	2	2%
Networking	2	2%
Organization	2	2%
*Recognition of staff	2	2%
Resource management	2	2%
*Seeing the big picture	2	2%
Vision/mission development	2	2%
*Acceptance	1	1%
*Accountability	1	1%

Advising	1	1%
*Applying different supervision styles	1	1%
*Assertiveness	1	1%
*Assessment of programs	1	1%
Coaching	1	1%
*Confrontation	1	1%
Employee career development	1	1%
*Grant writing	1	1%
*Identifying strengths of staff	1	1%
Interpretation	1	1%
Interviewing	1	1%
*Organizational development	1	1%
*Patience	1	1%
Policy interpretation	1	1%
*Re-framing	1	1%
Recruitment of staff	1	1%
Role modeling	1	1%
Self-assessment	1	1%
Strategic planning	1	1%
*Supervisor management	1	1%

*Note. Not listed on researcher's list of identified supervisory skills

**Note. Frequencies were rounded to the nearest whole number

Research Question Six

Research question six (RQ 6) asked participants what supervisory skills should be added to the listed skills identified by the researcher. Utilizing open-ended response data this question employed the same analysis methods as RQ 5. Specifically, all open-ended responses for questionnaire item 60 were transferred to Microsoft Word for grouping and counting. Approximately 43% ($n=46$) of the 106 respondents left question 60 blank and 13% ($n=14$) of the respondents stated that they did not have any suggested skills to add to the researcher's list. Of the 106 respondents 43.5% ($n=48$) provided 39 suggested skills. Fifty-six percent ($n=22$) of the suggested skills ($n=39$) were duplicates from the researcher's list of 58 identified supervisory skills.

A total of 17 supervisory skills were provided by participants that were not specifically listed on the researcher's list. Approximately 76.4% ($n=13$) of the skills were only suggested once. The most highly suggested supervisory skills or phrases were: creating shared vision ($n=4$), counseling ($n=3$), management of institutional politics ($n=3$), and utilization of multiple supervisory styles ($n=3$). Respondents were not asked to provide definitions for the skills they suggested. Many of the suggested skills were actually phrases or currently popular "buzz" terms in the student affairs and or business related fields. Table 4.10 details the frequencies of the suggested skills to be added to the researcher's list of supervisory skills.

Table 4.10

Suggested Supervisory Skills

Skill	Frequency
-------	-----------

*Creating shared vision	4
Counseling	3
Manage institutional politics	3
*Utilization of multiple supervisory styles	3
*Managing difficult students	1
*Diversity management	1
Facility management	1
*Knowledge of legal issues	1
Orientation of staff	1
*Recognition of staff strengths	1
*Reflective practice	1
Researching	1
*Returning staff member management	1
Staff recognition	1
Supervisee goal setting	1
*Theory-to-practice	1
*Work with difficult people	1

**Note.* Denotes a phrase or current “buzz” term within student affairs or business related fields

Chapter Summary

Data were collected through a locally designed web-based electronic survey. The overall response rate for the questionnaire was 57%. The researcher utilized document analysis

methods, ranked mean scores, and conducted independent-samples t tests to answer the six research questions for this investigation. Results indicated that participant demographics differed on multiple variables. Specifically, this chapter highlighted the psychometric properties of the questionnaire and detailed that it was a reliable instrument based on high Cronbach's alpha scaled scores for the 12 instrument scales. Several statically significant results at both the $p<0.05$ and $p<0.001$ alpha levels were identified based on performed independent samples t tests between various demographic variables and the twelve scale scored variables. Additionally, results from the analysis of the open-ended questions detailed that the respondents identified 69 critical supervision skills and provided 17 suggested supervision skills to be added to the researcher's supervision skill list.

CHAPTER FIVE

SUMMARY, DISCUSSION, AND IMPLICATIONS

This investigation was developed to contribute to the literature related to supervision and enhance practice within the field of student affairs. Chapter five provides a brief summary of the investigation. Specifically, the researcher reviews the significant findings, discusses implications for student affairs practice, describes the limitations of the study, and shares his recommendations for future research related to this topic.

Summary of the Study

The primary purpose of this study was to determine which of the identified supervisory skills first-year full-time post master's new professionals learned during their preparatory programs through classroom instruction, supervised practice (graduate assistantship, practicum, and internship), and self-taught learning activities. Additionally, the study identified which supervisory skills the new professionals listed as critical to effectively supervise direct reports. Quantitative methods were utilized to best answer the six research questions posed for the investigation. The instrumentation for this study was a locally developed web-based questionnaire that went through a multi-phase design process. The researcher requested and received the endorsement of the Association of College and University Housing Officers-International (ACUHO-I) to aid in attaining participants (new professionals) for his investigation. The response rate for this investigation was 57%. Descriptive statistics and independent samples *t*-tests were performed. Open-ended response questions were answered

after data were transferred to Microsoft Word for grouping and counting. A summary of demographic information and review of significant findings are detailed below.

Demographic Information Summary

To gain a better understanding of the data it is first necessary to review a summary of the participant demographics for this investigation. Participants varied on multiple demographic variables. The participants that completed the questionnaire were from 95 different institutions that varied by type, size, location, and mission. All participants worked in a housing/residence life functional unit and the majority of the participants were female (57.5%) and Caucasian (76.4%).

Approximately 80% of the participants completed a student affairs preparation program or a program where student affairs was a concentration. A total of 98.1% held a graduate assistantship (GA) during their preparation program experience and 85.8% of those individuals held a GA in a housing/residence life functional unit. Additionally, 86.8% of the respondents had supervisory responsibilities during graduate school.

The majority of participants (84.9%) that completed the questionnaire had been in their first post-master's job between 6-9 months. Most participants (60.3%) did not work in a full-time position prior to starting their master's program. Approximately 38.7% of the participants worked full-time prior to starting graduate school and 53.7% had supervisory responsibilities as part of their pre-master's job. The majority of participants (94.3%) currently, at the time of data collection, supervised undergraduate staff and almost half (49.1%) supervised graduate level staff.

Discussion of Significant/Main Findings

The learning of supervision skills by students during student affairs graduate preparation programs was the primary topic for this investigation. Six research questions were developed for the study to better understand the topic. Quantitative methods were utilized to answer the research questions. Statistical and mathematical analyses were completed to determine results. This section will review and summarize the significant findings related to the research questions.

Research Question One

The researcher supports the position of Kuk and Donovan (2002) which articulated that defining and determining what skills master's students in student affairs preparation programs should learn is an important question to answer for student affairs practitioners and graduate preparation program faculty members. Supervision has been described as an essential skill for student affairs practitioners (Burkard, Cole, Ott & Stoflet, 2005; Davis, 2004; Lovell & Kosten, 2000; Radall & Colbetti, 1992; Saunders & Cooper, 1999; White, 2007; White, 2008); however, there are no research studies within student affairs that have separated the construct of supervision into micro components or skills. Research question one attempted to do that by identifying the supervisory skills needed for effective practice as a supervisor, as detailed in the literature.

The identified list of 58 supervisory skills presents a more comprehensive understanding of the task of supervision. Implications for student affairs practice will come from having identified and defined those skills. However, what is most encouraging to note is that there were twelve reliable scales developed from the Student Affairs Supervisory Skill Learning Inventory (SASSLI), the data collection instrument for this investigation.

The 12 scales were based on the four identified categories (interpersonal, technical, administrative, and conceptual) of supervisory skills and the three learning activities (classroom instruction, supervised practice experiences, and self-taught activities). The Cronbach's alpha for each scale was above 0.85. On the basis of these findings each scale is reliable. More specifically, the question items/skills are grouped accurately into the four categories (interpersonal, technical, administrative, and conceptual) identified by the researcher through his review of the literature.

The high Cronbach's alpha scores were encouraging because they allowed the researcher to develop scaled score variables based on the 12 reliable scales and enabled him to compute independent samples *t* tests between the scaled scores and demographic variables. In turn, it allowed the researcher to analyze whether two groups differed in their level of learning of the four categories of skills through each of the three learning activities. Implications related to the analysis of the scaled score variables and demographic variables will be presented later in this chapter.

Research Question Two

The researcher found, based on the computed mean scores, that most of the identified supervision skills were not being learned or were only minimally learned through classroom instruction. Mean scores below two indicated that the skills were not learned. Of particular note the supervision skills of monitoring work ($M=1.81$, $SD=0.85$), recruitment ($M=1.83$, $SD=0.88$), meeting management and facilitation ($M=1.83$, $SD=0.84$), staffing ($M=1.84$, $SD=0.92$), job analysis and description development ($M=1.88$, $SD=0.97$), discipline ($M=1.89$, $SD=0.92$), training ($M=1.90$, $SD=0.873$) were reported as not being learned by the respondents. The findings provide empirical support for Winston and Miller's (1991) position that new

professionals may lack some of the necessary skills essential for practice in the profession. This information is challenging because as Davis 2004 suggested “graduate preparation programs serve as the entry point for student affairs, and should provide the necessary tools for emerging professionals and take responsibility for its harvest” (p. 127).

The reason for the lack of learning associated with supervision skills through classroom instruction could be attributed to challenges associated with translating textbook examples, concepts learned through classroom instruction, and theories to real world situations (Amey, 1998). Additionally, faculty members are limited in the information they share in the classroom (Davis, 2004). Traditionally, the classroom is the location where theoretical concepts are presented; however, depending on a student’s learning style, formal classroom instruction might not be the most optimal learning activity for those individuals who acquire knowledge from experiential practice and would prefer to learn a concept through a graduate assistantship or through self-taught learning activities. In turn, this could result in an individual not learning a concept or skill as well in the formal classroom environment.

Findings from the computed independent samples *t* tests provided evidence that holding a housing/residence life graduate assistantship had a statistically significant influence on the learning of supervision skills in relation to classroom instruction and both the interpersonal and conceptual scales. Specifically, the interpersonal and conceptual scales for classroom instruction were statistically significant at the $p < 0.05$ level, which indicated that those graduate students that held a housing/residence life graduate assistantship (GA) during their preparation programs had higher mean scores related to supervision skills from the interpersonal and conceptual categories than the participants that did not hold a housing/residence life GA. These findings support the work of Hirt and Janosik (2002) highlighting the fact that graduate assistantships, a form of

supervised practice experience, play an essential role in the preparation of student affairs practitioners.

Research Question Three

Based on Wapel's (2006) study which recommended researching the role that the graduate assistantship, a form of supervised practice, plays in skill acquisition by master's students, the researcher formulated research question three to determine what supervisory skills first-year post-master's new professionals learned through supervised practice experiences during their graduate preparation programs. Independent samples *t* tests were performed with the scaled score variables and the holding a housing/residence life graduate assistantship variable. A rank ordering of mean scores was also completed.

Findings from the computed independent samples *t* tests provided evidence that holding a housing/residence life graduate assistantship had a significant influence on the learning of supervisory skills in relation to most of the supervisory skill categories (scales). Specifically, a statistically significant difference in mean scores was identified at the technical scale for supervised practice experiences at the $p < 0.05$ level; the interpersonal scale for supervised practice experiences at the $p < 0.01$ level; administrative scale for supervised practice experiences at the $p < 0.01$ level, and conceptual scale for supervised practice at the $p < 0.01$ level. Again, these findings support the work of Hirt and Janosik (2002) which stated that supervised practice experiences play an essential role in the preparation of student affairs practitioners. Additionally, it supports the work of Rodgers (1992) which articulated that graduate assistantships, a form of supervised practice, have a major influence on graduate students' development. Based on the findings from this investigation holding a housing and residence life graduate assistantship

provides an optimal framework and training experience for student affairs master's students in regards to learning supervision skills.

The researcher was encouraged to find, based on the computed mean scores, that 53.4% (n=31) of the 58 identified supervisory skills were being learned adequately through supervised practice experiences by student affairs master's students. Mean scores above three indicated that the skills were adequately learned. Of particular note the supervision skills of interviewing ($M=3.44$, $SD=0.76$), controlling/rule enforcement ($M=3.41$, $SD=0.77$), performance appraisals and skill assessment ($M=3.36$, $SD=0.87$), role modeling ($M=3.36$, $SD=0.74$), crisis management ($M=3.33$, $SD=0.85$), communication ($M=3.27$, $SD=0.82$), meeting management and facilitation ($M=3.22$, $SD=0.95$), conflict resolution ($M=3.21$, $SD=0.84$), collaboration ($M=3.17$, $SD=0.74$), and team building ($M=3.16$, $SD=0.78$) were reported as being learned adequately. The majority of mean scores from the top 10 supervision skills based on supervised practice experiences were from the administrative category.

Research Question Four

At times, it becomes necessary for new professionals and graduate students to take ownership and direct their unique educational experience by utilizing self-taught learning activities (Winston & Hirt, 2003). To better understand the concept of self-taught learning research question four asked what supervision skills first-year post-master's new professionals learn through self-taught activities while completing their graduate preparation programs. Mean scores were calculated and independent samples t tests were performed to determine results.

It was encouraging that the results indicated a statistically significant difference between the supervisory responsibilities in the full-time pre-master's job variable and each of the following scale variables: interpersonal ($t=2.18$, $p=0.036$), technical ($t=2.81$, $p=0.008$), and

conceptual ($t=2.92, p=0.006$). In other words, new professionals that worked prior to starting their master's programs and had supervision responsibilities during that job learned at a higher level through self-taught activities in the interpersonal, technical, and conceptual supervisory skill categories.

On the basis of these findings it appears that student affairs master's students with pre-master's full-time work experience where they served as supervisors benefited from those experiences when utilizing self-taught activities to learn supervision skills during their graduate preparation programs. The researcher presents the following possible reasons for these findings: 1) their role as a supervisor in a professional setting made them experienced and autonomous as supervisors and in turn more comfortable with learning the categorized supervisory skills during graduate school and 2) the new professionals experienced additional cognitive and affective development during the time between the completion of their undergraduate degree and starting their master's preparation program. The autonomy, maturity, and supervision experiences developed by new professionals who worked full-time prior to starting their graduate preparation program more than likely aided them in being more comfortable with learning through self-taught activities.

After independent samples t tests were performed on the housing/residence life graduate assistantship variable and the self-taught scale score variables (interpersonal, technical, administrative, and conceptual) results indicated a statically significant difference ($p<0.05$) between the mean scores of those participants that held a housing/residence life graduate assistantship and those individuals that did not, based on the following self-taught scale score variables: interpersonal ($t=2.53, p=0.013$), technical ($t=2.28, p=0.025$), and conceptual ($t=2.53, p=0.013$). Again, these findings add support to the critical role that supervised practice

experiences, and more specifically the role of a housing/residence life graduate assistantship had related to the learning of the supervisory skills and categories identified by the researcher.

Findings Across RQ 2, RQ 3, and RQ 4

The computed mean scores for the supervision skills within the three learning activities showed that most of the identified skills are being learned by master's students at or below a minimal level during their graduate preparation programs through classroom instruction, supervised practice experiences, and self-taught activities. These findings support research (i.e., Davis, 2004; Schuh & Carlisle, 1997; Stock-Ward & Javorek, 2003) which identified that few practitioners in student affairs have received adequate training as supervisors.

However, it was encouraging to note based on the computed highest mean scores for supervisory skills within the three learning activities that new professionals are adequately learning some supervision skills adequately during their graduate preparation programs. Of specific note the following skills were learned adequately through supervised practice experiences: interviewing ($M=3.44$, $SD=0.76$), controlling/rule enforcement ($M=3.41$, $SD=0.77$), performance appraisals and skill assessment ($M=3.36$, $SD=0.87$), role modeling ($M=3.36$, $SD=0.74$), crisis management ($M=3.33$, $SD=0.85$), communication ($M=3.27$, $SD=0.82$), meeting management and facilitation ($M=3.22$, $SD=0.95$), conflict resolution ($M=3.21$, $SD=0.84$), collaboration ($M=3.17$, $SD=0.74$), and team building ($M=3.16$, $SD=0.78$). Additionally, the following skills were learned adequately through self-taught learning experiences: role modeling ($M=3.58$, $SD=0.68$), meeting management and facilitation ($M=3.29$, $SD=0.82$), communication ($M=3.26$, $SD=0.78$), crisis management ($M=3.24$, $SD=0.81$), (active) listening ($M=3.19$, $SD=0.66$), mentoring ($M=3.18$, $SD=0.81$), conflict resolution ($M=3.17$, $SD=0.68$), time

management ($M=3.16$, $SD=0.75$), interviewing ($M=3.15$, $SD=0.83$), and human relations ($M=3.15$, $SD=0.78$).

Findings indicated that the majority of the skills that were learned adequately were learned through supervised practice experiences and self-taught activities, which supports the position of Hirt and Janosik (2002) that highlights the essential role supervised practice experiences play in the preparation of student affairs practitioners and specifically how the supervised practice experience aids students in understanding concepts at a deeper level than when learning was confined to only intellectual or classroom experiences. Additionally, these findings add support to the work of Winston and Hirt (2003) regarding the necessity for new professionals and graduate students to take ownership and direct their unique educational experience through self-taught learning activities when they are not achieving results through other learning methods.

Related to a specific type of supervised practice, it was encouraging to note the significant role of having a housing/residence life graduate assistantship (GA) had on the learning of categories of supervision skills across the learning activities of classroom instruction, supervised practice experiences, and self-taught methods. As detailed earlier in this section there were several statistically significant findings ($p<0.05$, $p<0.01$) related to holding a housing/residence life GA and this section will not restate those; however, the following paragraphs will review a rationale for why the significant findings possibly occurred.

Most housing/residence life graduate assistants (GA) have some type of formal supervision role during their graduate preparation programs. Typically, housing/residence life GA's have responsibility for supervising paraprofessional/student staff members most often referred to as a resident assistant or RA. Their role as supervisor of RA staff members provides

them with a unique opportunity for supervisory practice, exposing them to a variety of supervisory situations.

Graduate assistants (GA) that do not hold an assistantship in housing/residence life typically are limited in their ability to formally supervise staff members because many assistantships outside of housing/residence life lack supervision responsibilities as part of the GA. This lack of formal supervision practice by those individuals without a housing/residence life GA could result in them having fewer opportunities to learn supervisory skills and limit opportunities to practice those skills. In turn, it could limit how they process information related to supervisory skills and how they learn those skills during various knowledge acquisition activities (classroom instruction, supervised practice, and self-taught).

Research Question Five

For research question five participants (new professionals) identified what they felt were the most critical supervision skills. Findings showed that a total of 36.2% ($n=25$) of the 69 critical skills that were suggested by the participants were not specifically in the list of supervision skills identified by the researcher. A valid explanation for this could be as Schneider (1998) noted that there is no single source of knowledge that covers the area of supervision and that since “academic preparation, practical experiences, values, cultural background, and style preferences differ from person to person, supervision is a [varied] and complex process” (p. 37). Participant differences and the variance of knowledge related to supervision more than likely played a factor in what they felt are considered critical supervision skills.

The top five listed critical supervision skills by the respondents were: communication ($n=20$), use of theory ($n=18$), leading groups ($n=14$), conflict resolution ($n=10$), and listening ($n=10$). The skills of communication and use of theory were also identified by Winston and

Miller (1991) as skills that employers classified as very important for entry-level student affairs professionals to have learned/acquired. Again, as stated earlier in this chapter Winston and Miller's study involved a list of general skills important/critical to success and not a specific list of critical supervisory skills. However, a comparison between the lists showed that both studies identified communication and use of theory as important and or critical for new professionals entering the field of student affairs.

Research Question Six

Research question six (RQ 6) asked participants what supervision skills should be added to the listed skills identified by the researcher. Participants provided open-ended responses to answer this question and though no statistically significant findings came from RQ 6 it was interesting to note that 10 of 17 participant suggestions were phrases or "buzz" words as opposed to supervisory skills. For example, phrases such as creating shared vision, utilization of multiple supervisory styles, managing difficult students, and reflective practice were phrases or current "buzz" words provided by the participants.

A possible and practical explanation for this finding is that most master's students are exposed to a wide variety of literature, theories, conference presentations, and topics of current importance during their graduate preparation programs and certain phrases or terms could have resonated with the students and been easily picked up during their learning process. These phrases or terms are typically easy to remember due to saturation in literature and presentations and could be easily recalled and listed as an essential skill. Based on the fact that there are so many definitions for the term supervision and until this study there was not a formalized and categorized list of supervision skills within student affairs it is conceivable that respondents

would list “buzz” words or phrases based on their own unique understanding of the construct of supervision.

Additionally, only 39 suggestions were made by the participants and the majority of those were duplicates from the researcher’s list. The small number of suggestions (n=17) could also indicate that the supervisory skills list identified by the researcher was fairly comprehensive for this population.

Implications for Practice

Applying research to practice is critical for the development of most professions and or fields. The findings of this investigation provide several implications for practice in student affairs and for the education of future student affairs practitioners. Based on this research student affairs preparation program faculty and student affairs professionals should review the following implications and consider making applicable adjustments to curriculum, training, and services in order to enhance instruction and practice related to supervision.

General Implications for Student Affairs Graduate Student Instruction

The researcher supports the position of Schneider (1998) that reading about supervision is completely different than actually supervising in practice. Based on the findings of this study the teaching and development of supervision skills to and with new professionals must take a multi-focused approach in order to optimize the adequate level of learning of those supervision skills. Results indicated that no single stand alone learning activity (classroom instruction, supervised practice experiences, and self-taught methods) was entirely successful in aiding in the learning of supervision skills by masters students. Findings support the work of Richmond and Sherman (1991) which articulated a student affairs preparation program that incorporates a combination

comprehensive approach of theory and supervised practice experience is beneficial to most graduate students.

Implications for Student Affairs Preparation Program Faculty

The developed supervision skills list can be utilized as a resource by student affairs graduate preparation program faculty and supervised practice site supervisors to aid master's students in learning more about the task of supervision. The Student Affairs Supervisory Skill Learning Inventory (SASSLI) developed for this study has the potential to contribute greatly to the learning of supervision skills for graduate students in student affairs preparation programs. Specifically, it provides a list of identified and categorized skills based on the supervision literature that faculty can utilize to review the curricula of their programs and update administration courses that relate to supervision.

Based on the high level of supervision skills that were not learned through classroom instruction it will be necessary for faculty to connect with supervised practice site supervisors to aid in enhancing the learning of supervision skills. Specifically, student affairs graduate preparation program faculty members should meet with the supervised practice site supervisors at least annually and work in tandem to discuss and intentionally plan ways to bridge the theory-to-practice gap between learning supervisory skills in the classroom and translating them to experiential practice. These intentional conversations between faculty and supervised practice site supervisors can aid in the development of a more intentional educational plan for learning supervision skills during student affairs master's preparation programs. In turn, this will not only aid master's students with better learning supervisory skills, but will also provide them with enhanced skills that they can utilize during their supervised practice experiences.

Even with more intentional conversations and planning between faculty and supervised practice site supervisors it will be a challenging task to aid masters students in adequately learning all of the supervisory skills identified in this study. As stated earlier, the findings from this investigation indicated that no individual learning activity (i.e., classroom instruction, supervised practice experience, or self-taught) or all the combined learning activities were completely effective in aiding students adequately learn the supervisory skills identified in this study. Based on this information one could realistically imply that adequately learning all of the identified supervisory skills could be beyond the scope of a student affairs master's programs.

However, when considering employer expectations and typical job descriptions for entry-level new professionals with supervisory responsibilities in student affairs one could make the argument that master's student only need to have a minimal understanding of certain supervisory skills when they begin their first post-master's full time job. This argument could be based on the hierarchal nature of the necessary skills needed with increased job responsibilities or title. Specifically, a new professional who is an entry-level supervisor in residence life may only need to utilize a certain supervisory skill set in order to be effective at this or her job; however, to be effective a chief student affairs officer may need to have learned and utilized a more complex set of supervisory skills based on the nature of the requirement of his or her job.

Additionally, student affairs preparation program faculty should consider the developmental reality that could be associated with increased job responsibility when reviewing and teaching the identified supervisory skills detailed in this investigation. Some of the supervisory skills that were identified as having been minimally or not learned through three learning activities (i.e., forecasting) could be beyond the developmental learning level of a master's student and will need to be learned in time through continuing education and during the

individual's professional career. Each student affairs master's student will have his or her own developmental challenges when learning supervisory skills. Some of those skills will be more easily learned based on developmental needs; however, more than likely some will not be able to be learned during a student's time in his or her graduate preparation program because the supervisory skill might be developmentally beyond the capacities of the student.

Implications for Supervisors

Results will also aid supervised practice site supervisors in better shaping intentional opportunities that enhance the learning of supervisory skills for student affairs master's students. Cooper, Saunders, Winston, Hirt, Creamer, and Janosik (2002) noted that more than any other factor, the quality and nature of the relationship between the supervised practice intern/student and the supervised practice site supervisor typically is critical in determining the overall quality of the supervised practice learning experience. Based on the findings of this investigation supervised practice site supervisors should work to intentionally craft learning objectives for interns directed at the learning of supervisory skills. Specifically, supervisors could utilize the identified supervisory skills from this investigation as a framework for the development of the learning outcomes for a supervised practice contract.

Results from this investigation support the position that many new professionals will need additional formal training in the area of supervision and the skills that make up the construct of supervision after they complete their master's preparation program. New professionals are critical players in the student affairs profession, and they need special support and guidance (Harned & Murphy, 1998).

One such way to support, guide, train, and increase the learning of skills for entering and new professionals is through their first direct supervisor. In building a case for a sharing in the

development and guidance of entering and new professionals Davis (2004) articulated that, “not only do professional preparation programs have a responsibility in training new professionals on certain skill areas, but supervisors do as well” (p. 127). Additionally, Harned & Murphy highlighted the critically important role that a new professional’s first direct supervisor will play in his or her development as a professional and more specifically his or her development as a supervisor.

Based on the findings of this study and the supporting literature the first direct supervisors of new professionals will need to play a critical role in the learning of supervisory skills for new professionals, especially those that did not have a housing/residence life graduate assistantship. One way in which supervisors can aid new professionals entering the field post-masters is to have intentional conversations with these individuals regarding the construct of supervision

Davis (2004) noted that supervisors should consider and use information about new professionals’ training and skill level when working with them to develop professionally. Mid-managers within student affairs units can utilize the SASSLI and results from this study as a guide and as an assessment tool to aid them in working with entry-level supervisors to identify possible deficiencies in or lack of supervisory skills that may be in need of development or improvement. In turn, the results from the SASSLI can be utilized by supervisors of new professionals as a staff development tool to build a supervisory skill development plan for the new professionals they supervise.

Implications for the Student Affairs Field

Herdlein (2004) noted the need to develop knowledge and skills related to supervision are clearly evident in the literature of the student affairs field. However, Woodard, Love, and

Komives (2000) as well as Smith (2005) stated that master's level preparation programs in student affairs often times fall short in teaching the needed information and providing the necessary experience base related to administration and management of organizations. As addressed as recommendation earlier in this section, the responsibility for educating master's students must extend beyond the entry point of a graduate preparation program. This duty must be a task for the entire student affairs field.

The field of student affairs must work to develop a more comprehensive training process for the learning and development of supervisory skills by entering and new professionals. Davis (2004) noted that supervisory ability is a critical factor to the success of new professionals. Based on the findings from this investigation most new professionals only minimally learned the necessary skills to effectively serve as supervisors and it will be essential for faculty, supervised practice site supervisors, supervisors of new professionals, mentors, student affairs units/divisions, and professional organizations related to student affairs to work more closely together to aid those preparing to enter the field of student affairs in learning the necessary supervisory skills to be effective as supervisors. As Smith (2005) points out, practitioners that are hired for entry-level positions in student affairs should possess the skills typically acknowledged as critical for entry-level jobs.

It is encouraging that findings from this investigation can be utilized to update curriculum objectives related to supervisory skills as well as departmental, division, and professional organization training programs to enhance the learning and development of supervisory skills for master's students in student affairs preparation programs and new professionals that have recently graduated from preparation programs.

Limitations

Limitations exist in all research studies. The following limitations were present in this investigation: only new professionals who worked in residence life/housing served as the population for this investigation and this limited how the data was generalized. An additional limitation was that the collected data was self-reported by the participants. Some scholars have identified challenges associated with self-reported data. Cook and Campbell (1979) pointed out that research study participants tend to self-report what they feel the researcher expects to happen or wants to happen and/ or report what reflects positively on their own abilities, beliefs, knowledge, and opinions.

The length of time between the completion of the participant's graduate preparation program and completion of the questionnaire served as a limitation. Based on the operational definition of the population for this investigation some participants were twelve months removed from their graduate preparation program experience. During that amount of time information could have been forgotten or the experience could have become blurred. Schacter (1999) warned that the human memory is fallible and highlighted concern regarding whether research study participants are able to accurately recall their past behaviors. Finally, there was no way to determine the total population for this investigation. It is not known how many new professionals meeting the operational definition for this study work within the housing/residence life field.

Suggested Future Research

The study was exploratory in nature and served as a good start for future investigations related to supervision, graduate preparation programs, and supervisory skill development. It is the researcher's hope that the findings from this investigation will aid in a better understanding

of supervisory skill learning and development. Five primary recommendations are made for future research related to this study.

Recommendation One

First, though the Student Affairs Supervisory Skill Learning Inventory (SASSLI) Cronbach's alpha was very high, this was an exploratory investigation that utilized a locally designed instrument and the supervisory skills that were identified by the researcher could benefit from additional analysis and review. The researcher utilized 56 scholarly sources; however, additional sources from related fields to student affairs or non-student affairs related fields should be mined for data to determine if a list of supervision skills similar to the researcher's would develop. Additionally, future research should be conducted utilizing a combined list of the researcher's identified supervision skills and appropriate supervision skills that were suggested by participants from this investigation.

Recommendation Two

Next, the operational definition of new professional utilized for this investigation should be adapted to increase the potential population sample. The population for this study was limited to new professionals working within housing and residence life units and this limited the degree to which the findings could be generalized. Future research should utilize a broader definition of the term new professional in order to create the potential for a larger sample population and in turn increase the ability to generalize the results of the study.

Recommendation Three

This investigation utilized self-reported information from new professionals; however, future research should investigate the perceptions, related to supervision skill development, of student affairs preparation program faculty members and or student affairs professionals that

serve as supervisors to new professionals. Research has noted that these two populations play a significant role in the development of student affairs master's students and new professionals. By investigating supervision skill learning and development and the two populations identified above researchers would have a more comprehensive understanding of the learning process associated with supervisory skills.

Recommendation Four

Future research should be conducted on how often new professionals utilize the supervisory skills that they learned during graduate preparation programs in their first full-time post-masters job. Specifically, research could focus on comparing the skills that new professionals report as utilized more frequently to the supervision skills that supervisor's of new professionals state are critical for new professionals to know and use frequently.

Recommendation Five

Finally, the researcher recommends that additional investigation be completed on gaining a better understanding of the supervisory skills that new professionals define as critical. This investigation asked participants to list in an open-ended format the learned supervisory skills that they felt were critical; however, it is suggested that future research utilize a Likert-like scale related to the level of a skill's critical importance to gather quantitative data that can be analyzed utilizing SPSS. By scaling the questions it will allow future researchers to have greater statistical power and in turn greater confidence in their research findings.

Chapter Summary

During February 2009, with the endorsement of the Association of College and University Housing Officers-International (ACUHO-I), a sample of new professionals, as defined by this study, completed an electronic web-based questionnaire related to activities

associated with the learning of supervisory skills during their graduate preparation programs. Findings indicated that student affairs master's students are exiting graduate preparation programs with minimal preparation in regards to their knowledge of many supervisory skills. Additionally, findings support the need for a more systematic and comprehensive approach to educating master's students about the construct of supervision and supervisory skills through classroom instruction, supervised practice experiences, and self-taught activities. Several implications for practice were presented and five recommendations for future research were detailed in this chapter. In summary, it is the researcher's hope that this study, which was built on the scholarly work of others, developed a new layer of understanding surrounding the learning of supervisory skills within the student affairs field.

REFERENCES

- American Association of University Professors [AAUP]. (1983). *Agreement between Rutgers, the State University of New Jersey, and the Rutgers Council of the American Association of University Professors*. New Brunswick, NJ: Author.
- Amey, M. J. (1998). Unwritten rules: Organizational and political realities of the job. In M.J. Amey & L.M. Ressor (Eds.), *Beginning your journey: A guide for new student affairs professionals* (pp. 5-20). Washington, DC: National Association of Student Personnel Administrators.
- Armino, J. (2006). Masters-level student affairs professional preparation program: CAS standards contextual statement. In L.A. Dean (Ed.), *CAS Professional Standards for Higher Education* (6th ed.) (pp. 347-348). Washington, DC: Council for the Advancement of Standards in Higher Education.
- Arminio, J., & Creamer, D. G. (2001). What supervisors say about quality supervision. *College Student Affairs Journal*, 21(1), 35-44.
- Barr, M. (Ed.). (1993). *The handbook of student affairs administration*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Berdie, D. R., Anderson, J. F., & Neibuhr, M. A. (1986). *Questionnaire design and use* (2nd ed.) Metuchen, NJ: Scarecrow Press.
- Borders, D. L. (1994). *The good supervisor*. Greensboro, NC: ERIC Clearinghouse on Counseling and Student Services.

- Borders, L. D., & Leddick, G. R. (1988). A nationwide survey of supervision training. *Counselor Education and Supervision, 27*, 271-283.
- Brown, R. W. (1926). *Dean Briggs*. New York: Harper & Brothers.
- Brown-Wright, D. A., Dubick, R. A., & Newman, I. (1997). Graduate assistant expectation and faculty perception: Implications for mentoring and training. *Journal of College Student Development, 38*(4), 410-416.
- Brubacher, J. S., & Rudy, W. (1958). *Higher education in transition*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Bulin, J. G. (1995). *Supervision: Skills for managing work and leading people*. Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin Company.
- Bunker, D. R., & Wijnberg, M. H. (1988). *Supervision and performance: Managing professional work in human service organizations*: San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Burkard, A., Cole, D. C., Ott, M., & Stoflet, T. (2005). Entry-level competencies of new student affairs professionals: A delphi study. *NASPA Journal, 42*(3), 283-309.
- Campbell, D., & Fiske, D. W. (1959). Convergent and discriminate validation by the multitrait-multimethod matrix. *Psychological Bulletin, 54*, 297-312.
- Carelli, A. O. (2004). *The truth about supervision: Coaching, teamwork, interviewing, appraisals, 360 assessments, and recognition*. Springfield, IL: Charles C Thomas Publisher, LTD.
- Carpenter, D. S., Miller, T. K., & Winston, R. B. Jr. (1980). Toward the professionalization of student affairs. *NASPA Journal, 18*(2), 16-22.
- Carpenter, S., & Stimpson, M. T. (2007). Professionalism, scholarly practice, and professional development in student affairs. *NASPA Journal, 44*(2), 265-284.

- Carpenter, D. S., Torres, V., & Winston, R. B., Jr. (2001). Staffing the student affairs division: Theory, practice, and issues. *College Student Affairs Journal*, 21(1), 2-6.
- Carr, C. (1989). *The new manager's survival manual: All the skills you need for success*. New York, NY: John Wiley & Sons.
- Carroll, M. (1996). *Counseling supervision: Theory, skills, and practice*. New York, NY: Cassell.
- Certo, S. C. (1994). *Supervision: Quality and diversity through leadership*. Homewood, IL: Austen Press.
- Cilente, K., Henning, G., Skinner Jackson, J., Kennedy, D., & Sloan, T. (2006). *Report on the new professional needs study*. Washington, DC: American College Personnel Association. Retrieved December 11, 2006 from <http://www.myacpa.org/research/newprofessionals.php>.
- Cole, K. (2002). *The supervisor's survival guide: A practical guide to successful supervision*. French Forest, Australia: Pearson Education Australia Pty Ltd.
- Coleman, D. D., & Johnson, J. E. (Eds.) (1990). *The new professional: A resource guide for new student affairs professionals and their supervisors*. Columbus, OH: National Association of Student Personnel Administrators.
- Conneely, J. F. (Ed.). (2002). *Planning a career in college and university housing*. Columbus: Association of College and University Housing Officers-International.
- Cook, T. D., & Campbell, D. T. (1979). *Quasi-experimentation: Design and analysis issues*. Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin Company.

- Cooper, D. L., & Miller, T. K. (1998). Influence and impact: Professional development in student affairs. In J. Brooks & F. Jones (Eds), *Strategies for Staff Development: Personal and professional education in the 21st century* (pp. 55-69). New Directions for Student Services, No. 84. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Cooper, D. L., & Saunders, S. A. (2003). Supervising student affairs internships: A case study. In S.M. Janosik, D.G. Creamer, J.B. Hirt, R.B. Winston, Jr., S.A. Saunders, & D.L. Cooper (Eds.), *Supervising new professionals in student affairs* (pp. 175-205). New York: Brunner-Routledge.
- Cooper, D. L., Saunders, S. A., Winston, R. B., Jr., Hirt, J. B., Creamer, D.G., Janosik, S. K. (Eds.). (2002). *Learning through supervised practice in student affairs*. New York: Brunner-routledge.
- Council for the Advancement of Standards in Higher Education. (2006). *CAS professional standards for higher education* (6th ed.). Washington, DC: Author
- Cox, J., & Brayton Cox, K. (2007). *Your opinion please: How to build the best questionnaires in the field of education* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Creamer, D. G., & Janosik, D. G. (2003). Performance appraisal: Accountability that leads to professional development. In S.M. Janosik, D.G. Creamer, J.B. Hirt, R.B. Winston, Jr., S.A. Saunders, & D.L. Cooper (Eds.), *Supervising new professionals in student affairs: A guide for practitioners* (pp. 123-151). New York: Brunner-Routledge.
- Creamer, D. G., & Winston, R. B., Jr. (1999). The performance appraisal paradox: An essential but neglected student affairs staffing function. *NASPA Journal*, 36, 248-263.
- Creamer, D. G., & Winston, R. B., Jr. (2002). Foundations of the supervised practice experience: Definitions, context, and Philosophy. In D.L. Cooper, S.A. Saunders, R. B. Winston, Jr.,

- D.G. Creamer, & S.M. Janosik (Eds.), *Learning through supervised practice in student affairs* (pp. 1-34). New York: Brunner-Routledge.
- Creamer, D. G., Winston, R. B., Jr., & Miller, T. K. (2001). The professional student affairs administrator: Roles and functions. In R.B. Winston, Jr., D.G. Creamer, & T.K. Miller (Eds.), *The professional student affairs administrator: Educator leader, and manager*. (3-38). New York: Brunner-Routledge.
- Dalton, J. C. (1996). Managing human resources. In S.R. Komives, D.B. Woodard, Jr., & Associates (Eds.), *Student services: A handbook for the profession* (3rd ed., pp. 494-511). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Dalton, J. C. (2003). Managing human resources. In S.R. Komives, D.B. Woodard, Jr., & Associates (Eds.), *Student services: A handbook for the profession* (4th ed., pp. 397-419). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Daresh, J. C. (1989). *Supervision as a proactive process*. New York, NY: Longman.
- Davis, J. K. (2002). *Supervision needs of new professionals: Supervisor vs. new professional*. Unpublished manuscript, The University of Georgia. Athens, GA.
- Davis, J. K. (2004). *Understanding the diagnosis phenomenon of new professionals in student affairs*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Georgia, Athens.
- Davis Barham, J. K., & Winston, Jr., R. B. (2006). Supervision of new professionals in student affairs: Assessing and addressing needs. *College Student Affairs Journal*, 26(1), 45-56.
- Drew, C. J., Hardman, M. L., & Hosp, J. L. (2008). *Designing and conducting research in education*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Dunkel, N. W., & Schreiber, P. J. (1990). *Competencies of housing professionals*. Unpublished chart, National Housing Training Institute, University of Florida, Gainesville.

- Dunn, M. S. (2002). Settling into a life outside of work. In J. F. Conneely (Ed.), *Planning a career in college and university housing* (pp. 120-132). Columbus, OH: Association of College and University Housing Officers-International.
- Emanuel, H. M., Gould, P. E., & Simpson, W. F. (1985). *Supervisory skills*. Malvern, PA: Insurance Institute of America.
- Engstrom, C. M. (1999). Promoting the scholarly writing of female doctoral student in higher education and student affairs graduate programs. *NASPA Journal*, 36, 264-277.
- Evans, D. (1992). *Supervisory management: Principles and practice* (3rd edition). London, Great Britain: Cassell Educational Ltd.
- Evans, N. J., Forney, D. S., & Guido-Dibrito, F. (1998). *Student development in college: Theory, research, and practice*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Evans, N. (1983, March). The status of CSP programs. In N. Evans & Bossert, *The status of preparation employment opportunities and advancement in the field of student affairs*. Preliminary report for ACPA Commission XII.
- Fey, C. J., & Carpenter, D. S. (1996). Mid-level student affairs administrators: Management skills and professional development needs. *NASPA Journal*, 33, 218-231.
- Frost, S. H. (1991). *Academic advising for student success: A system of shared responsibility* (ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report No. 3). Washington, DC: George Washington University, School of Education and Human Development.
- Frye, B. A., & Dean, L. A. (2007). Employee evaluation and assessment skill development. *Georgia Journal of College Student Affairs*. Retrieved, April 17, 2007 from <http://www.coe.uga.edu/chds/csaa/gcpa/2007/index.html>

- Frye, B. A. (2006). *New professionals supervising graduate assistants: Identifying perceived challenges*. Unpublished manuscript, The University of Georgia. Athens, GA.
- Fuller, G. T. (1994). *The supervisor's big book of lists*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Garubo, R. C., & Rothstein, S. W. (1998). *Supportive supervision in schools*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.
- Glaser, B. G. & Strauss, A. L. (1967). *The discovery of grounded theory*. Chicago: Aldine.
- Glickman, C. D., Gordon, S. P., & Ross-Gordon, J. M. (1998). *Supervision of instruction: A developmental approach* (4th ed.). Needham Heights, MA: Allyn & Bacon A Viacom Company.
- Greer, C. R., & Plunkett, W. R. (2000). *Supervision: Diversity and teams in the workplace* (9th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice-Hall, Inc.
- Grote, D. (1996). *The complete guide to performance appraisal*. New York: American Management Association.
- Harned, P. J., & Murphy, M. C. (1998). Creating a culture of development for the new professional. In J. Brooks & F. Jones (Eds.), *Strategies for staff development: Personal and professional education in the 21st Century* (pp. 43-53). New Directions for Student Services No. 84 San Francisco: Jossey Bass.
- Haynes, M. E. (1984). *Managing performance: A comprehensive guide to effective supervision*. Belmont, CA: Lifetime Learning Publications.
- Haynes, M. E. (1991). *Stepping up to supervisor revised edition*. Los Altos, CA: Crisp Publications, Inc.
- Herdlein, R. J. (2004). Survey of chief student affairs officers regarding relevance of graduate preparation of new professionals. *NASPA Journal*, 42(1), 51-71.

- Hesburg, T., Miller, P., & Wharton, C. (1973). *Patterns for lifelong learning*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Hirt, J. B. (2006). *Where you work matters: Student affairs administrators at different types of institutions*. Lanham, MD: University Press of America.
- Hirt, J. B., & Janosik, S. M. (2003). Structure and design of the supervised practice experience. In D.L. Cooper, S.A. Saunders, R. B. Winston, Jr., J.B. Hirt, D.G. Creamer, & S.M. Janosik, (Eds.), *Learning through supervised practice in student affairs* (pp. 35-63). New York: Brunner-Routledge.
- Hirt, J. B., & Winston, R. B., Jr. (2003). Professional development: Its integration with supervision processes. In S. M. Janosik, D. G. Creamer, J. B. Hirt, R. B. Winston, Jr., S. A. Saunders, & D. L. Cooper, (Eds.), *Supervising new professionals in student affairs: A guide for practitioners* (pp. 85-121). New York: Brunner-Routledge.
- Huck, S. W. (2000). *Reading statistics and research* (3rd ed.). New York: Longman.
- Huitt, W. (2001). Why study educational psychology? *Educational Psychology Interactive*. Valdosta, GA: Valdosta State University. Retrieved, August 13, 2008 from <http://chiron.valdosta.edu/whuitt/col/intro/whyedpsy.htm>
- Huitt, W. (2003). Classroom instruction. *Educational Psychology Interactive*. Valdosta, GA: Valdosta State University. Retrieved, August 13, 2008 from <http://chiron.valdosta.edu/whuitt/col/instruct/instruct.html>
- Humphrey, B., & Stokes, J. (2000). *The 21st century supervisor: Nine essential skills for frontline leaders*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass/Pfeiffer.

- Hyman, R. E. (1985, March-April). *Do graduate preparation program address competencies important to student affairs practice?* Paper presented at the annual conference of the National Association of Student Personnel Administrators, Portland, OR.
- Hyman, R. E. (1988). Graduate preparation for professional practice: A difference of perceptions. *NASPA Journal*, 26, 143-150.
- Ignelzi, M. G., & Whitely, P. A. (2004). Supportive supervision for new professionals. In P. M. Magolda & J.E. Carnaghi (Eds.), *Job one: Experiences of new professionals in student affairs*, (pp. 115-136). Lanham, MD: United Press of America.
- Janosik, S. M., & Creamer, D. G. (2003). Introduction: A comprehensive model. In S. M. Janosik, D. G. Creamer, J. B. Hirt, R. B. Winston, Jr., S. A. Saunders, & D. L. Cooper (Eds.), *Supervising new professionals in student affairs* (pp. 1-16). New York: Brunner-Routledge.
- Janosik, S. M., Creamer, D. G., Hirt, J. B., Winston, R. B., Jr., Saunders, S. A., & Cooper, D. L. (Eds.). (2003). *Supervising new professionals in student affairs*. New York: Brunner-Routledge.
- Jennings, D. F. (1993). *Effective supervision: Frontline management for the '90's*. Minneapolis: West Publishing.
- Katz, R. L. (1955). Skills of an effective administrator. *Harvard Business Review*, 33-42.
- Kelly, K. E. (1984). Initiating a relationship with a mentor in student affairs. *NASPA Journal*, 21, 49-54.
- Kinser, K. (1993, March). *New professionals in student affairs: What they didn't teach you in graduate school*. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the National Association of Student Personnel Administrators, Boston, MA.

- Kirkpatrick, D. L. (2001). *Developing supervisors and team leaders*. Woburn, MA: Butterworth-Heinemann.
- Koehnecke, D. S. (1991). *Boundaries of graduate assistants: Bouncing off boundaries*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Conference on Composition and Communication, Boston, MA.
- Koren, H. (1996). *Management and supervision for working professionals volume 1* (3rd ed.). Boca Raton, FL: Lewis Publishers.
- Kretovics, M. (2002). Entry level competencies: What student affairs administrators consider when screening candidates. *Journal of College Student Development*, 43, 912-920.
- Kretovics, M., & McCambridge, J. (1998). Determining what employers really want: Conducting regional focus groups, *Journal of Career Planning and Employment*, 58(2), p. 25-30.
- Kuh, G. D., & Komives, S. R. (1987). The right stuff: Some thoughts on attracting good people to student affairs work. In R. B. Young & L. Moore (Eds.), *The state of the art of professional education and practice* (pp. 1-20). Washington, DC: American College Personnel Association.
- Kuk, L., & Donovan, J. (2002). Character: A missing link in student affairs preparation. *NetResults*. Retrieved February 2, 2008 from <http://www.naspa.org/membership/mem/nr.cfm?id=883>
- Ladew, D. P. (1998). *How to supervise people: Techniques for getting results through others*. Franklin Lakes, NJ: Career Press.
- Leatherman, C., & Magner, D. K. (1996, November 29). Strife over job issues flares on many campuses: Strikes, votes to unionize, fights over tenure, and court battles characterize this stormy fall. *Chronicle of Higher Education*, p. A-12.

- Leonard, E. C. Jr., & Hilgert, R. L. (2004). *Supervision: Concepts and practices of management*. Mason, Ohio: South-Western.
- Lloyd-Jones, E. (1949). The beginnings of our profession. In E. G. Williamson (ed.), *Trends in Student Personnel Work*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1949.
- Love, P. (2003). Advising and consultation. In S.R. Komives, D.B. Woodard, Jr., & Associates (Eds.), *Student services: A handbook for the profession* (4th ed., pp. 507-524). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Lovell, C. D., & Kosten, L. A. (2000). Skills, knowledge, and personal traits necessary for success as a student affairs administrator: A meta-analysis of thirty years of research. *NASPA Journal*, 37(4), 553-572.
- Marsh, S. R. (2001). Using adult development theory to inform staff supervision in student affairs. *College Student Affairs Journal*, 21(1), 45-56.
- McEwen, M. K., & Talbot, D. M. (1998). Designing the student affairs curriculum. In N.J. Evans & C.E. Phelps Tobin (Eds.), *State of the art of preparation and practice in student affairs: Another look* (pp. 125-156). Lanham, MD: University Press of America.
- Merriam, S. B. (1998). *Qualitative research and case study applications in education*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Merriam, S. B., & Associates (2002). *Qualitative research in practice: Examples for discussion and analysis*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Mills, D. B. (2000). The role of the middle manager. In M. Barr, M. Desler & Associates (Eds.) *The handbook of student affairs administration* (pp. 135-153). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Moglia, T. (1997). *Supervising for success: A guide for supervisors*. Victor, NY: Axzo Press.

- Morgan, G. A., & Griego, O. V. (1998). *Easy use and interpretation of SPSS for windows: Answering research questions with statistics*. Mahway, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Ostroth, D. D. (1981). Selecting competent residence hall staff. In G. S. Blimling & J. H. Schuh (Eds.), *Increasing the educational role of residence halls* (pp. 65-80). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Pajak, E. (1990). Dimensions of supervision. *Educational Leadership*, 48, 78-81.
- Palmer, C. J. (1995). Graduate preparation of residence hall directors: The addition and subtraction dilemma. *Journal of College and University Student Housing*, 25, 5-8.
- Plano Clark, V. L., & Creswell, J. W. (2008). *The mixed methods reader*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Peterson, R. B., & Tracy, L. (1979). *Systematic management of human resources*. Reading, MA.: Addison-Wesley.
- Pope, R. C., & Reynolds, A. L. (1997). Student affairs core competencies: Integrating multicultural awareness, knowledge, and skills. *Journal of College Student Development*, 38, 266-277.
- Porter, D. J. (2005). *Application of Sandwith's competency domain model for senior college housing officers in the United States*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Florida.
- Randall, K., & Globetti, E. (1992). Desired competencies of the chief student affairs officer as perceived by college presidents. *College Student Affairs Journal*, 11(3), 54-61.
- Renn, K. A., & Hodges, J. P. (2007). The first year on the job: experiences of new professionals in student affairs. *NASPA Journal*, 44(2), 367-391.

- Renn, K. A., Jessup Anger, E. R., & Hodges, J. P. (2007, April). *First year on the job: Themes from the National Study of New Professionals in Student Affairs*. Presented at the American College Personnel Association/National Association of Student Personnel Administrators Joint Meeting, Orlando, FL.
- Rentz, A. L. (1996). A history of student affairs. In A.L. Rentz & Associates *Student Affairs Practice in Higher Education* (2nd ed.). Charles C Thomas Publisher, LTD. Springfield, IL.
- Rhatigan, J. J. (2000). The history and philosophy of student affairs. In M.J. Barr, M.K. Desler, & Associates (Eds.), *The handbook of student affairs administration* 2nd ed., (pp. 3-24) San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Ricci, J. P., Porterfield, W. D., & Piper, T. D. (1987). Using developmental theory in supervising residential staff members. *NASPA Journal*, 24, 32-41.
- Richmond, J., & Sherman, K. J. (1991). Student-development preparation and placement: A longitudinal study of graduate students' and new professionals' experiences. *Journal of College Student Development*, 32, 8-32.
- Ricks, B. R., Ginn, M. L., & Daughtrey, A. S. (1995). *Contemporary supervision: Managing people and technology*. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill, Inc.
- Rodgers, J. L. (1992). Graduate student views of leadership education in college Student personnel preparation programs. *NASPA Journal*, 29(1), 169-179.
- Rudestam, E. R., & R. R. Newton. *Surviving your dissertation: A comprehensive guide to content and process*. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Sandeen, A. (1991). *The chief student affairs officer: Leader, manager, mediator, educator*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

- Sandwith, P. (1993). A hierarchy of management training requirements: The competency domain model. *Public Personnel Management*, 22(1), 43-62.
- Saunders, S. A., & Cooper, D. L. (1999). The doctorate in student affairs: Essential skills and competencies for mid-management. *Journal of College Student Development*, 40, 185-191.
- Saunders, S. A., & Cooper, D. L. (2003). In S. M. Janosik, D. G. Creamer, J. B. Hirt, R. B. Winston, Jr., S. A. Saunders, & D. L. Cooper (Eds.), *Supervising new professionals in student affairs* (pp.1-16). New York: Brunner-Routledge.
- Saunders, S. A., Cooper, D. L., Winston, R. B., Jr., & Chernow, E. (2000). Supervising staff in student affairs: Exploration of the synergistic approach. *Journal of college student development*, 41, 181-192.
- Schacter, D. L. (1999). The seven sins of memory: Insights from psychology and cognitive neuroscience. *American Psychology*, 54, 182-203.
- Schneider, R. S. (1998). Supervisor as architect, catalyst, advocate and interpreter. In M.J. Amey & L.M. Ressor (Eds.), *Beginning your journey: A guide for new student affairs professionals* (pp. 5-20). Washington, DC: National Association of Student Personnel Administrators.
- Schuh, J. H., & Carlisle, W. (1991). Supervision and evaluation: Selected topics for emerging professionals. In T. K. Miller & R. B. Winston, Jr. (Eds.), *Administration and leadership in student affairs* (pp. 495-532). Muncie, IN: Accelerated Development.
- Schuh, J. H., & Carlisle, W. (1997). Supervision and evaluation: Selected topics for emerging professionals. In E. J. Whitt (Ed.), *College student affairs administration*. Needham Heights, MA: Simon & Schuster.

- Smith, R. L. (2005). *Supervisor's expectations of entry-level professionals in house and residence life*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. University of Georgia.
- Stamatakos, L. C. (1981). Student affairs progress toward professionalism: Recommendations for action. Parts I and II. *Journal of College Student Personnel*, 22, 105-113, 1997-207.
- Stock-Ward, S. R., & Javorek, M. E. (2003). Applying theory to practice: Supervision in student affairs. *NASPA Journal*, 40(3), 77-92.
- Stuit, D. B., Dickson, G. S., Jordan, T. F., & Schloerb, L. (1949). *Predicting success in professional schools*. Menasha, WI: George Banta.
- Sutton, E. M., & Bailey, E. A. (2002). Settling into the institution. In J. F. Conneely (Ed.), *Planning a career in college and university housing* (pp. 110-118). Columbus, OH: Association of College and University Housing Officers-International.
- Taub, D. J., & McEwen, M. K. (2006). Decision to enter the profession of student affairs. *Journal of College Student Development*, 47, 206-216.
- Tull, A. (2003). Organizational socialization of new professionals in student affairs: Part three- student affairs organizations, with an emphasis on supervisory relationships. *NetResults*. Retrieved, February 2, 2006 from <http://www.naspa.org/membership/mem/nr.cfm?id=1501>
- Tull, A. (2006). Synergistic supervision, job satisfaction, and intention to turnover of new professionals in student affairs. *Journal of College Student Development*, 47, 465-477.
- Upcraft, M. L. (1998). Do graduate preparation programs really prepare practitioners? In Evan & Tobin (Eds.), *The state of the art of preparation and practice in student affairs* (pp. 225-237). Latham, MD: University Press of America.

- Von Der Embse, T. J. (1987). *Supervision: Managerial skills for a new era*. New York, NY: Macmillan.
- Von Destion, M. (1986). *Educating student personnel administrators: Recommended standards and the University of Arizona master's program* (Report No. HE-021-720). East Lansing, MI: National Center for Research on Teacher Learning. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED. 298824).
- Wapel, J. N. (2006). An assessment of skills and competencies necessary for entry-level student affairs work. *NASPA Journal*, 43(1), 1-18.
- White, J. D. (2007). *Supervising new professionals: Considerations for selecting supervisory approaches*. Unpublished manuscript, The University of Georgia. Athens, GA.
- White, J. D. (2008). *New student affairs professionals' perceptions of the synergistic supervision efforts of their supervisors*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Georgia, Athens.
- Winston, R. B., Jr., (2001) *Supervisors of new professionals: Observations about supervision*. Unpublished document, University of Georgia.
- Winston, R. B., Jr., & Creamer, D. G. (1997). *Improving staffing practices in student affairs*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Winston, R. B., Jr., & Creamer, D. G. (1998). Staff supervision and professional development: An integrated approach. In W. A. Bryan & R. A. Schwartz (Eds.), *Strategies for staff development: Personal and professional education in the 21st Century* (pp. 29-42). New Directions for Student Services No. 84. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Winston, R. B., Jr., Creamer, D. G., & Miller, T. K. (2001). *The professional student affairs administrator: Educator, leader, and manager*. New York: Brunner-Routledge.

- Winston, R. B., Jr., & Hirt, J. B. (2003). Activating synergistic supervision approaches: Practical suggestions. In S.M. Janosik, D.G. Creamer, J.B. Hirt, R.B. Winston, Jr., S.A. Saunders, & D.L. Cooper (Eds.), *Supervising new professionals in student affairs: A guide for practitioners* (pp. 43-83). New York: Brunner-Routledge.
- Winston, R. B., Jr., & Fitch, R. T. (1993). Paraprofessional staffing. In R. B. Winston, Jr., & S. Anchors (Eds.), *Student housing and residential life*. (pp. 315-343) San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Winston, R. B., Jr., Lathrop, B. J., Lease, J., Davis, J. S., Newsome, K., & Beeny, C. (2001). *Supervised practice in student preparation: State of the art*. University of Georgia. Unpublished manuscript.
- Winston, R. B., Jr., & Miller, T. K. (1991). Human resource management: Professional preparation and staff selection. In T.K. Miller, R.B. Winston Jr., & Associates (Eds.), *Administration and leadership in student affairs: Actualizing student development in higher education* (pp. 449-494). Muncie, IN: Accelerated Development.
- Woodard, D. B., Jr., Love, P., & Komives, S. R. (2000). *Leadership and management issues for a new century*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Young, R. B. (1994). Student affairs professionals' perceptions of barriers to participation in development activities. *NASPA Journal*, 31, 243-251.
- Young, R. B., & Elfrink, V. L. (1991). Values education in student affairs graduate programs. *Journal of College Student Development*, 32, 109-115.
- Young, D. G., & Janosik, S. M. (2007). Using CAS standards to measure learning outcomes of student affairs preparation programs. *NASPA Journal*, 44(2), 341-366.

APPENDIX A

PAPER VERSION OF QUESTIONNAIRE

Student Affairs Supervisory Skill Learning Inventory

© 2009 Brandon Arris Frye All Rights Reserved

The survey will take approximately 20 minutes to complete. Please **review the list of instructional activities** prior to completing the questionnaire.

Instructional Activities

- **Classroom Instruction** - a formal class activity that occurs in an educational environment and is focused on the intentional direction of the student's learning process. It can formally occur through professors, peers, or guest lecturers as well as through assigned classroom projects and examinations.
- **Supervised Practice** - is an educational experience (graduate assistantship, internship, or practicum experiences) that is part of an academic graduate preparation program. The experience is experiential in nature and involves the student going into the field to learn from a more experienced professional.
- **Self-taught** - a learning process that is initiated by the enrolled graduate student that **was not an assigned class project, class reading, or lecture**. The student must have taken initiative to go **beyond the requirements of classroom instruction and supervised practice experience (i.e., graduate assistantship, internship, or practicum)** to investigate and learn about a topic of interest.

Section A: Supervisory Skill Identification**Directions-** Section (A)

For each supervisory skill (phrase) note the degree to which you learned that skill (not at all, minimally, adequately, very well), through **each** instructional activity (classroom instruction, supervised practice, and self-taught) during your graduate preparation program experience.

Note: *DO NOT* utilize your current position as the framework to complete the questionnaire.

Note: As you complete section (A) please reflect on the listed supervision skills because you will be asked in section (B) if you would add any additional supervision skills to those identified by the researcher in this questionnaire.

*Supervisory skill**Degree of learning during graduate preparation program*

Serve as an advisor to supervisees	Not at All	Minimally	Adequately	Very Well
Classroom Instruction	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Supervised Practice	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Self-taught	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Position staff members related to their strengths in order to accomplish unit goals	Not at All	Minimally	Adequately	Very Well
Classroom Instruction	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Supervised Practice	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Self-taught	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Promote collaboration between the staff members that you supervise	Not at All	Minimally	Adequately	Very Well
Classroom Instruction	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Supervised Practice	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Self-taught	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Effectively use communication skills to supervise staff	Not at All	Minimally	Adequately	Very Well
Classroom Instruction	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Supervised Practice	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Self-taught	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Resolve staff conflicts	Not at All	Minimally	Adequately	Very Well
Classroom Instruction	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Supervised Practice	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Self-taught	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Promote diversity within one's staff by facilitating the interaction of people who are different	Not at All	Minimally	Adequately	Very Well
Classroom Instruction	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Supervised Practice	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Self-taught	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Empower supervisees to reach goals	Not at All	Minimally	Adequately	Very Well
Classroom Instruction	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Supervised Practice	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Self-taught	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Provide clear feedback to supervisees	Not at All	Minimally	Adequately	Very Well
Classroom Instruction	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Supervised Practice	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Self-taught	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Utilize active listening skills to determine supervisee concerns	Not at All	Minimally	Adequately	Very Well
Classroom Instruction	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Supervised Practice	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Self-taught	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Serve as mentor (guide) to supervisees	Not at All	Minimally	Adequately	Very Well
Classroom Instruction	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Supervised Practice	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Self-taught	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Utilize effective techniques to motivate supervisees	Not at All	Minimally	Adequately	Very Well
Classroom Instruction	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Supervised Practice	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Self-taught	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Utilize human relations (people) skills to supervise staff to meet unit goals	Not at All	Minimally	Adequately	Very Well
Classroom Instruction	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Supervised Practice	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Self-taught	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Use appropriate approaches to aid supervisees in building relationships (networking)	Not at All	Minimally	Adequately	Very Well
Classroom Instruction	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Supervised Practice	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Self-taught	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Serve as a positive example to staff by modeling appropriate professional behavior	Not at All	Minimally	Adequately	Very Well
Classroom Instruction	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Supervised Practice	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Self-taught	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Implement strategies to minimize the level of stress for your staff	Not at All	Minimally	Adequately	Very Well
Classroom Instruction	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Supervised Practice	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Self-taught	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Support (nurture) supervisees	Not at All	Minimally	Adequately	Very Well
Classroom Instruction	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Supervised Practice	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Self-taught	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Build effective work teams	Not at All	Minimally	Adequately	Very Well
Classroom Instruction	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Supervised Practice	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Self-taught	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Use analytical (logical) reasoning methods to make work related decisions	Not at All	Minimally	Adequately	Very Well
Classroom Instruction	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Supervised Practice	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Self-taught	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Clarify unit objectives and goals for supervisees	Not at All	Minimally	Adequately	Very Well
Classroom Instruction	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Supervised Practice	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Self-taught	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Diagnose work related challenges in an expedient manner	Not at All	Minimally	Adequately	Very Well
Classroom Instruction	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Supervised Practice	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Self-taught	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Utilize appropriate strategies to identify staff needs	Not at All	Minimally	Adequately	Very Well
Classroom Instruction	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Supervised Practice	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Self-taught	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Conduct periodic staff performance appraisals to evaluate staff skill levels	Not at All	Minimally	Adequately	Very Well
Classroom Instruction	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Supervised Practice	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Self-taught	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Utilize assessment techniques to determine program effectiveness	Not at All	Minimally	Adequately	Very Well
Classroom Instruction	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Supervised Practice	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Self-taught	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Make use of appropriate self-assessment techniques to maximize work related performance	Not at All	Minimally	Adequately	Very Well
Classroom Instruction	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Supervised Practice	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Self-taught	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Instruct (teach) employees	Not at All	Minimally	Adequately	Very Well
Classroom Instruction	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Supervised Practice	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Self-taught	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Utilize appropriate technology to better meet unit goals	Not at All	Minimally	Adequately	Very Well
Classroom Instruction	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Supervised Practice	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Self-taught	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Author appropriate correspondence related to supervisory duties	Not at All	Minimally	Adequately	Very Well
Classroom Instruction	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Supervised Practice	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Self-taught	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Utilize appropriate budget management techniques	Not at All	Minimally	Adequately	Very Well
Classroom Instruction	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Supervised Practice	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Self-taught	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Enforce departmental rules (procedures)	Not at All	Minimally	Adequately	Very Well
Classroom Instruction	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Supervised Practice	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Self-taught	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Aid supervisees with crisis management through the use of appropriate leadership techniques	Not at All	Minimally	Adequately	Very Well
Classroom Instruction	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Supervised Practice	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Self-taught	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Delegate appropriate tasks to supervisees	Not at All	Minimally	Adequately	Very Well
Classroom Instruction	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Supervised Practice	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Self-taught	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Direct staff in order to complete work related tasks	Not at All	Minimally	Adequately	Very Well
Classroom Instruction	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Supervised Practice	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Self-taught	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Administer employee disciplinary procedures	Not at All	Minimally	Adequately	Very Well
Classroom Instruction	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Supervised Practice	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Self-taught	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Coordinate supervisee work activities	Not at All	Minimally	Adequately	Very Well
Classroom Instruction	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Supervised Practice	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Self-taught	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Interview candidates for jobs	Not at All	Minimally	Adequately	Very Well
Classroom Instruction	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Supervised Practice	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Self-taught	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Develop job descriptions	Not at All	Minimally	Adequately	Very Well
Classroom Instruction	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Supervised Practice	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Self-taught	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Manage staff meetings	Not at All	Minimally	Adequately	Very Well
Classroom Instruction	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Supervised Practice	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Self-taught	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Monitor staff work assignments	Not at All	Minimally	Adequately	Very Well
Classroom Instruction	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Supervised Practice	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Self-taught	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Organize staff to maximize accomplishment of unit goals	Not at All	Minimally	Adequately	Very Well
Classroom Instruction	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Supervised Practice	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Self-taught	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Effectively manage projects to accomplish work related goals	Not at All	Minimally	Adequately	Very Well
Classroom Instruction	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Supervised Practice	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Self-taught	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Recruit candidates to fill open positions	Not at All	Minimally	Adequately	Very Well
Classroom Instruction	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Supervised Practice	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Self-taught	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Manage the acquisition of resources (i.e., human, financial, time, facilities) to meet unit goals	Not at All	Minimally	Adequately	Very Well
Classroom Instruction	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Supervised Practice	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Self-taught	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Implement staff selection methods	Not at All	Minimally	Adequately	Very Well
Classroom Instruction	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Supervised Practice	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Self-taught	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Effectively manage time to complete supervisory responsibilities	Not at All	Minimally	Adequately	Very Well
Classroom Instruction	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Supervised Practice	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Self-taught	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Direct staff training programs	Not at All	Minimally	Adequately	Very Well
Classroom Instruction	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Supervised Practice	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Self-taught	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Aid staff to effectively manage change	Not at All	Minimally	Adequately	Very Well
Classroom Instruction	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Supervised Practice	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Self-taught	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Ability to implement decisions you make in a supervisory capacity	Not at All	Minimally	Adequately	Very Well
Classroom Instruction	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Supervised Practice	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Self-taught	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Utilize appropriate techniques to aid in the development of supervisees	Not at All	Minimally	Adequately	Very Well
Classroom Instruction	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Supervised Practice	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Self-taught	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Assist staff with the management of various environmental (intrinsic and extrinsic) factors	Not at All	Minimally	Adequately	Very Well
Classroom Instruction	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Supervised Practice	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Self-taught	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Utilize forecasting (prediction) techniques to anticipate unit staffing needs	Not at All	Minimally	Adequately	Very Well
Classroom Instruction	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Supervised Practice	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Self-taught	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Implement developed unit goals	Not at All	Minimally	Adequately	Very Well
Classroom Instruction	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Supervised Practice	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Self-taught	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Use appropriate techniques to promote supervisee creativity (innovation)	Not at All	Minimally	Adequately	Very Well
Classroom Instruction	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Supervised Practice	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Self-taught	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Interpret institutional policies (procedures) to address staff concerns	Not at All	Minimally	Adequately	Very Well
Classroom Instruction	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Supervised Practice	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Self-taught	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Practice applicable strategies to serve as a leader to supervisees	Not at All	Minimally	Adequately	Very Well
Classroom Instruction	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Supervised Practice	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Self-taught	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Make use of appropriate strategic planning techniques	Not at All	Minimally	Adequately	Very Well
Classroom Instruction	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Supervised Practice	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Self-taught	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Use appropriate techniques to solve work related problems	Not at All	Minimally	Adequately	Very Well
Classroom Instruction	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Supervised Practice	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Self-taught	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Reorganize staff responsibilities to achieve unit goals	Not at All	Minimally	Adequately	Very Well
Classroom Instruction	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Supervised Practice	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Self-taught	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Develop a vision for your area of responsibility	Not at All	Minimally	Adequately	Very Well
Classroom Instruction	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Supervised Practice	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Self-taught	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Section B: Open-ended Questions

Please reflect on your graduate preparation program experience (**classroom instruction, supervised practice, and self-taught experiences**) and list the most critical supervision skills that you feel you learned during graduate school.

Please reflect on your graduate preparation program experience (**classroom instruction, supervised practice, and self-taught experiences**) and list what supervision skills, if any, should be added to the supervision skills identified by the researcher.

Section C: Demographic Questions

With which sex do you identify (select one)?

- Male
- Female
- Transgender

Ethnicity (select one)

- African American
- Native American
- Asian/Pacific Islander
- Multiracial
- Caucasian
-
- Other: _____
- Hispanic/Latino/Latina

Your graduate preparation program was focused on (select one)?

- Student affairs was a minor emphasis within a broader program
- Student affairs was a concentration or major within a broader program
- Student affairs was a stand-alone program
- Other: _____

Did you hold a graduate assistantship (GA) during graduate school (select one)?

- Yes
- No

If yes, did you serve as a GA within a housing or residence life unit during your preparation program (select one)?

- Yes
- No

Did you have supervisory responsibilities during graduate school (select one)?

- Yes
- No

How many months have you been in your current position (select one)?

- 0-2
- 3-6
- 6-9
- 10-12
- More than 12 months

What level(s) of staff do you currently supervise (please check all that apply)?

- None
- Undergraduate staff
- Receptionist/secretarial staff
- Graduate level staff
- Maintenance/custodial staff
- Other: _____

Did you work full-time post-bachelors degree before attending graduate school (select one)?

- Yes
- No

If yes to question 69, did you have supervisory responsibilities during your post-bachelor's pre-Master's job (select one)?

- Yes
- No

Thank you for your participation in this study

APPENDIX B

EMAIL TO CHIEF HOUSING OFFICERS REQUESTING ASSISTANCE

Dear Chief Housing Officer:

I am writing to request your assistance and support in conducting my dissertation research. I would like to invite the new professionals, individuals with twelve months or less post-master's work experience, within your unit to participate in my Association of College and University Housing Officers-International (ACUHO-I) supported study.

The topic of my study is "An Investigation of How Master's Students Learn Supervisory Skills During Student Affairs Graduate Preparation Programs." The study will focus on identifying the supervision skills new professionals **learned during their graduate preparation programs**. Additionally, the study will detail the supervision skills that new professionals list as critical to their success as supervisors.

To aid me in conducting my study, please follow these simple procedures:

PROCEDURES TO SUPPORT THIS STUDY

1. Respond via email to me at bfrye@uga.edu by (DATE) and provide me with the names and email addresses of your residence life professionals fitting the following criteria. In order to have the most statistical power for my study, it is necessary to have the names and email addresses for potential participants. Having this information will allow me to better calculate a response rate for my questionnaire.
 - Participants have **attained** a master's degree in student affairs or related field of study (i.e., counseling, student development, higher education, etc.).
 - Participants are currently **within the first twelve months** of their **first full-time post-master's job**.
 - Participants work in a residence life or housing unit at a college or university.
 - Participants are not currently enrolled in classes (Ph.D. program, professional program [i.e., MBA], etc...).
 - Participants **with and without** current supervisory responsibilities can participate.
2. Those new professionals will then receive a subsequent email message from me inviting them to participate in my study and detailing consent procedures.

Thank you in advance for your time and consideration with supporting my research. It is my hope that this study will contribute to the field of student affairs and aid residence life/housing professionals by improving supervisory practices. I will make the research results available to ACUHO-I.

This study is being conducted under the direction of Dr. Merrily Dunn, Associate Professor, Department of Counseling and Human Development. She can be reached at 706-542-3927 or via email at merrily@uga.edu.

Sincerely,

Brandon A. Frye
 Doctoral Candidate, Student Affairs Administration Program
 University of Georgia
bfrye@uga.edu
 706-542-1131

APPENDIX C

REMINDER EMAIL TO CHIEF HOUSING OFFICERS REQUESTING ASSISTANCE

Dear Chief Housing Officer:

This is a follow-up email to the one you received from me recently. This is a reminder of the opportunity to aid me in conducting my dissertation research study being supported by the Association of College and University Housing Officers-International (ACUHO-I).

I am writing to request your assistance and support in conducting my dissertation research. I would like to invite the new professionals, individuals with twelve months or less post-master's work experience, within your unit to participate in my Association of College and University Housing Officers-International (ACUHO-I) supported study.

The topic of my study is "An Investigation of How Master's Students Learn Supervisory Skills During Student Affairs Graduate Preparation Programs." The study will focus on identifying the supervision skills new professionals **learned during their graduate preparation programs**. Additionally, the study will detail the supervision skills that new professionals list as critical to their success as supervisors.

To aid me in conducting my study, please follow these simple procedures:

PROCEDURES TO SUPPORT THIS STUDY

1. Respond via email to me at bfrye@uga.edu by (DATE) and provide me with the names and email addresses of your residence life professionals fitting the following criteria. In order to have the most statistical power for my study, it is necessary to have the names and email addresses for potential participants. Having this information will allow me to better calculate a response rate for my questionnaire.
 - Participants have **attained** a master's degree in student affairs or related field of study (i.e., counseling, student development, higher education, etc.).
 - Participants are currently **within the first twelve** months of their **first full-time post-master's job**.
 - Participants work in a residence life or housing unit at a college or university.
 - Participants are **not** currently enrolled in classes (Ph.D. program, professional program [i.e., MBA], second master's program, etc...).
 - Participants **with and without** current supervisory responsibilities can participate.
2. Those new professionals will then receive a subsequent email message from me inviting them to participate in my study and detailing consent procedures

Thank you in advance for your time and consideration with supporting my research. It is my hope that this study will contribute to the field of student affairs and aid residence life/housing professionals by improving supervisory practices. I will make the research results available to ACUHO-I.

This study is being conducted under the direction of Dr. Merrily Dunn, Associate Professor, Department of Counseling and Human Development. She can be reached at 706-542-3927 or via email at merrily@uga.edu.

Sincerely,
 Brandon A. Frye
 Doctoral Candidate, Student Affairs Administration Program
 University of Georgia
bfrye@uga.edu, 706-542-1131

APPENDIX D

EMAIL REQUEST TO PARTICIPATE

Dear (Insert Name):

Your contact information was provided to me by your institution's Chief Housing Officer (CHO) as a residence life professional possibly fitting the criteria for participating in my study.

I would like to invite you to participate in my dissertation research being supported by the Association of College and University Housing Officers-International (ACUHO-I).

The purpose of the study is to identify the supervision skills new professionals (as defined by this study) learned during their graduate preparation programs through the following instructional activities or methods: 1) classroom instruction, 2) supervised practice (graduate assistantship, practicum, or internship), and 3) self-taught experiences. Additionally, it will identify the supervision skills new professionals list as critical when supervising their direct reports.

If you meet all elements of the criteria listed below I would greatly appreciate your participation in this study:

Criteria to Participate:

You have attained a master's degree in student affairs or related field of study (i.e., counseling, student development, higher education, etc.).

You are currently within the first twelve months of your first full-time post-master's job.

You work in a residence life or housing unit at a college or university.

You are not currently enrolled in classes (Ph.D. program, professional program [i.e., MBA], second master's program, etc...).

You do not need to currently have supervisory responsibilities.

The web-based questionnaire should take no longer than approximately 20 minutes to complete. Please review the consent information listed below.

Consent Information

By completing the web-based questionnaire and entering the password (supervision), you are agreeing to participate in the study titled "An Investigation of How Masters Students Learn Supervisory Skills During Student Affairs Graduate Preparation Programs" conducted by Brandon A. Frye from the Department of Counseling and Human Development/College Student Affairs Administration Program at the University of Georgia under the direction of Dr. Merrily Dunn, Associate Professor, Department of Counseling and Human Development (706-542-3927 or merrily@uga.edu).

If you choose to participate in this study, your participation will involve completing an online survey that asks about your perceptions. The results of the survey will be analyzed and be utilized to complete Brandon A. Frye's dissertation. Data may also be synthesized and published

so that other practitioners may learn from the information. Ultimately the information will be used to improve the field of student affairs.

Participation in this survey is voluntary and confidential. You can refuse to participate or stop participating at any time without penalty or loss of benefits to which you are otherwise entitled. The web-site and its associated server have been secured for privacy. However, internet communications are insecure and there is a limit to the confidentiality that can be guaranteed due to the internet technology itself. Once the researcher receives electronic data from completed surveys, standard confidentiality procedures will be employed.

No risk or discomfort is expected by participating in this study. The researcher will analyze the data collected from this survey. All completed survey data will be retained in a locked cabinet.

You may choose to skip any item of the survey; you may stop taking the survey at any time; or you may withdraw your participation in this study at any time without giving any reason and without penalty. To do this, you may close the survey window at any time. You may ask to have all of the information about you (to the extent that it can be identified as your information) returned to you, removed from the research records, or destroyed. All contact information and any identifiers will be destroyed after three years.

Your participation in this investigation will benefit you by providing an opportunity to reflect upon your graduate preparation program experience and the supervision skills that were or were not attained during that experience, potentially aiding in your understanding of your supervisory skills and practices.

Please print a copy of this consent form/email for your records. If you are not able to print this document one can be requested by emailing the researcher at bfrye@uga.edu.

If you have questions regarding this study, please feel free to contact the researcher at (706) 542-1131 or via email at bfrye@uga.edu. Additional questions or problems regarding your rights as a research participant should be addressed to The Chairperson, Institutional Review Board, University of Georgia, 612 Boyd Graduate Studies Research Center, Athens, Georgia 30602-7411; Telephone (706) 542-3199; E-Mail Address IRB@uga.edu.

Please click on the link below and remember to enter the password (supervision) to take the survey.

<http://vpsa4.vpsa.uga.edu/surveys/supervisionskillsbf/consent.asp>

APPENDIX E

REMINDER EMAIL REQUEST TO PARTICIPATE

Dear (Insert Name):

This is a follow-up email to the one you received from me recently. If you have already completed my questionnaire, please delete this message with my thanks for your participation.

If you have not completed the questionnaire, please read on for more information.

Your contact information was provided to me by your institution's Chief Housing Officer (CHO) as a residence life professional possibly fitting the criteria for participating in my study.

I would like to invite you to participate in my dissertation research being supported by the Association of College and University Housing Officers-International (ACUHO-I).

The purpose of the study is to identify the supervision skills new professionals (as defined by this study) learned during their graduate preparation programs through the following instructional activities or methods: 1) classroom instruction, 2) supervised practice (graduate assistantship, practicum, or internship), and 3) self-taught experiences. Additionally, it will identify the supervision skills new professionals list as critical when supervising their direct reports.

If you meet all elements of the criteria listed below I would greatly appreciate your participation in this study:

Criteria to Participate:

You have attained a master's degree in student affairs or related field of study (i.e., counseling, student development, higher education, etc.).

You are currently within the first twelve months of your first full-time post-master's job.

You work in a residence life or housing unit at a college or university.

You are not currently enrolled in classes (Ph.D. program, professional program [i.e., MBA], second master's program, etc...).

You do not need to currently have supervisory responsibilities.

The web-based questionnaire should take no longer than approximately 20 minutes to complete. Please review the consent information listed below.

Consent Information

By completing the web-based questionnaire and entering the password (supervision), you are agreeing to participate in the study titled "An Investigation of How Masters Students Learn Supervisory Skills During Student Affairs Graduate Preparation Programs" conducted by Brandon A. Frye from the Department of Counseling and Human Development/College Student Affairs Administration Program at the University of Georgia under the direction of Dr. Merrily Dunn, Associate Professor, Department of Counseling and Human Development (706-542-3927 or merrily@uga.edu).

If you choose to participate in this study, your participation will involve completing an online survey that asks about your perceptions. The results of the survey will be analyzed and be utilized to complete Brandon A. Frye's dissertation. Data may also be synthesized and published so that other practitioners may learn from the information. Ultimately the information will be used to improve the field of student affairs.

Participation in this survey is voluntary and confidential. You can refuse to participate or stop participating at any time without penalty or loss of benefits to which you are otherwise entitled. The web-site and its associated server have been secured for privacy. However, internet communications are insecure and there is a limit to the confidentiality that can be guaranteed due to the internet technology itself. Once the researcher receives electronic data from completed surveys, standard confidentiality procedures will be employed.

No risk or discomfort is expected by participating in this study. The researcher will analyze the data collected from this survey. All completed survey data will be retained in a locked cabinet.

You may choose to skip any item of the survey; you may stop taking the survey at any time; or you may withdraw your participation in this study at any time without giving any reason and without penalty. To do this, you may close the survey window at any time. You may ask to have all of the information about you (to the extent that it can be identified as your information) returned to you, removed from the research records, or destroyed. All contact information and any identifiers will be destroyed after three years.

Your participation in this investigation will benefit you by providing an opportunity to reflect upon your graduate preparation program experience and the supervision skills that were or were not attained during that experience, potentially aiding in your understanding of your supervisory skills and practices.

Please print a copy of this consent form/email for your records. If you are not able to print this document one can be requested by emailing the researcher at bfrye@uga.edu.

If you have questions regarding this study, please feel free to contact the researcher at (706) 542-1131 or via email at bfrye@uga.edu. Additional questions or problems regarding your rights as a research participant should be addressed to The Chairperson, Institutional Review Board, University of Georgia, 612 Boyd Graduate Studies Research Center, Athens, Georgia 30602-7411; Telephone (706) 542-3199; E-Mail Address IRB@uga.edu.

Please click on the link below and remember to enter the password (supervision) to take the survey.

<http://vpsa4.vpsa.uga.edu/surveys/supervisionskillsbf/consent.asp>

APPENDIX F

FINAL REMINDER EMAIL REQUEST TO PARTICIPATE

Dear (Insert Name):

This is a **final** follow-up email to the one you received from me recently. If you have already completed my questionnaire, please delete this message with my thanks for your participation.

If you have not completed the questionnaire, please read on for more information.

Your contact information was provided to me by your institution's Chief Housing Officer (CHO) as a residence life professional possibly fitting the criteria for participating in my study.

I would like to invite you to participate in my dissertation research being supported by the Association of College and University Housing Officers-International (ACUHO-I).

The purpose of the study is to identify the supervision skills new professionals (as defined by this study) learned during their graduate preparation programs through the following instructional activities or methods: 1) classroom instruction, 2) supervised practice (graduate assistantship, practicum, or internship), and 3) self-taught experiences. Additionally, it will identify the supervision skills new professionals list as critical when supervising their direct reports.

If you meet all elements of the criteria listed below I would greatly appreciate your participation in this study:

Criteria to Participate:

You have attained a master's degree in student affairs or related field of study (i.e., counseling, student development, higher education, etc.).

You are currently within the first twelve months of your first full-time post-master's job.

You work in a residence life or housing unit at a college or university.

You are not currently enrolled in classes (Ph.D. program, professional program [i.e., MBA], second master's program, etc...).

You do not need to currently have supervisory responsibilities.

The web-based questionnaire should take no longer than approximately 20 minutes to complete. Please review the consent information listed below.

Consent Information

By completing the web-based questionnaire and entering the password (supervision), you are agreeing to participate in the study titled "An Investigation of How Masters Students Learn Supervisory Skills During Student Affairs Graduate Preparation Programs" conducted by Brandon A. Frye from the Department of Counseling and Human Development/College Student Affairs Administration Program at the University of Georgia under the direction of Dr. Merrily

Dunn, Associate Professor, Department of Counseling and Human Development (706-542-3927 or merrily@uga.edu).

If you choose to participate in this study, your participation will involve completing an online survey that asks about your perceptions. The results of the survey will be analyzed and be utilized to complete Brandon A. Frye's dissertation. Data may also be synthesized and published so that other practitioners may learn from the information. Ultimately the information will be used to improve the field of student affairs.

Participation in this survey is voluntary and confidential. You can refuse to participate or stop participating at any time without penalty or loss of benefits to which you are otherwise entitled. The web-site and its associated server have been secured for privacy. However, internet communications are insecure and there is a limit to the confidentiality that can be guaranteed due to the internet technology itself. Once the researcher receives electronic data from completed surveys, standard confidentiality procedures will be employed.

No risk or discomfort is expected by participating in this study. The researcher will analyze the data collected from this survey. All completed survey data will be retained in a locked cabinet.

You may choose to skip any item of the survey; you may stop taking the survey at any time; or you may withdraw your participation in this study at any time without giving any reason and without penalty. To do this, you may close the survey window at any time. You may ask to have all of the information about you (to the extent that it can be identified as your information) returned to you, removed from the research records, or destroyed. All contact information and any identifiers will be destroyed after three years.

Your participation in this investigation will benefit you by providing an opportunity to reflect upon your graduate preparation program experience and the supervision skills that were or were not attained during that experience, potentially aiding in your understanding of your supervisory skills and practices.

Please print a copy of this consent form/email for your records. If you are not able to print this document one can be requested by emailing the researcher at bfrye@uga.edu.

If you have questions regarding this study, please feel free to contact the researcher at (706) 542-1131 or via email at bfrye@uga.edu. Additional questions or problems regarding your rights as a research participant should be addressed to The Chairperson, Institutional Review Board, University of Georgia, 612 Boyd Graduate Studies Research Center, Athens, Georgia 30602-7411; Telephone (706) 542-3199; E-Mail Address IRB@uga.edu.

Please click on the link below and remember to enter the password (supervision) to take the survey.

<http://vpsa4.vpsa.uga.edu/surveys/supervisionskillsbf/consent.asp>

APPENDIX G

LETTER OF SUPPORT FROM DR.GERRY KOWALSKI, UNIVERSITY OF GEORGIA

Dear Fellow Chief Housing Officers:

Please join me in encouraging new professionals, those with twelve months or less post-master's work experience, within your units to consider participation in a study being conducted by Brandon Frye, Doctoral Candidate in the Student Affairs Administration program at the University of Georgia (UGA), on supervisory skill development during graduate preparation programs.

This is an important area of professional practice and his study will offer a better understanding of supervisory skill development of graduate students who will be entering the field of student affairs and potentially working in university/college residence life and housing. Many of our new employees are required to supervise a variety of staff members and must regularly utilize supervision skills. Brandon's research has the potential to provide useful information to practitioners working within housing and residence life as well as preparation program faculty as we strive to improve: 1) the quality of graduate education, 2) supervisory skill development, 3) in-service training, and 4) the quality of professional practice of new professionals entering the field of student affairs.

On behalf of the Department of University Housing at UGA, I offer my support to Brandon's study and it is my hope that you will aid him in identifying new professionals within your unit who can be invited to participate in his study.

Thanks for your time, consideration, and assistance.

Sincerely,

Gerry Kowalski, Ph.D.
Executive Director of University Housing
Adjunct Assistant Professor, Counseling and Human Development
University of Georgia

APPENDIX H

PEER REVIEW SURVEY CRITIQUE

Directions: A critique form will be utilized to gather feedback for my questionnaire. Please use the critique, adapted from Cox and Brayton Cox's (2008) questionnaire self assessment, listed below. Please check "yes" or "no" per each question. If you select "no" for an answer please provide feedback on how I can improve the instrument in that specific area.

General Feedback**1. Is the form pleasant to look at?** Yes No

Suggestions for

improvement: _____

2. Is spacing appropriate? Yes No

Suggestions for

improvement: _____

3. Are similar items grouped? Yes No

Suggestions for

improvement: _____

3. Is the title appropriate for the questionnaire? Yes No

Suggestions for

improvement: _____

4. Can the questionnaire be completed in 10-15 minutes? Yes No

Suggestions for

improvement: _____

5. Is the font appropriate? Yes No

Suggestions for

improvement: _____

6. Has bolding and underlining been utilized in an appropriate way? Yes No

Suggestions for

improvement: _____

7. Does the survey have an engaging first question?

- Yes
 No

Suggestions for improvement: _____

Content**8. Are there unclear terms in the survey?**

- Yes
 No

Suggestions for improvement: _____

9. Were there unnecessary items?

- Yes
 No

Suggestions for improvement: _____

10. Is the questionnaire introduced in an appropriate manner?

- Yes
 No

Suggestions for improvement: _____

11. Are the directions written simply and clearly?

- Yes
 No

Suggestions for improvement: _____

12. Has jargon been explained and or minimized?

- Yes
 No

Suggestions for improvement: _____

13. Would you complete the instrument if it were sent to you?

- Yes
 No

Suggestions for improvement: _____

14. Please add any additional comments to aid in the improvement of the questionnaire.

THANK YOU FOR YOUR FEEDBACK AND HELP!

APPENDIX I

PHASE ONE OF QUESTIONNAIRE DESIGN PROCESS

Supervision Skills, Citations, and Disciplines

#	Source	Discipline	Skills
1	Arminio & Creamer (2001)	Student Affairs	listening, role modeling, motivating, teaching, directing, interpreting institutional culture, vision development, assessment, planning, communication
2	Bulin (1995)	Business	communication, motivation, leadership, team management, planning, organizing, staffing, delegation, controlling, counseling, discipline, performance appraisal, conflict resolution, time management, meeting management, environmental management, diversity management, problem solving, decision making, listening, self-assessment, resource management, forecasting, recruiting, interviewing, staff development, counseling, standard setting
3	Bunker & Wijnberg (1998)	Human Services	relationship building, performance development, team building, planning, problem solving, goal clarification, communication
4	Carelli (2004)	Business	coaching, team building, interviewing, performance appraisal, assessment, recognition, counseling, goal setting, communication, budget management, training, relationship building, organization, problem solving, delegation
5	Carr (1989)	Business	communication, delegation, group management, motivation, guiding, staff selection, structuring, planning, interpersonal, technical, synthesizing
6	Carroll (1996)	Counseling, International	teaching, employee evaluation, relationship building, monitoring, consultation, modeling, objective writing, self-assessment, group management, clarification
7	Certo (1994)	Business	diversity management, motivation, training, team management, listening, meeting management, interviewing, delegation, leadership, controlling, quality management, communication, problem solving, decision making, time management, stress

			management, managing conflict, discipline, role modeling
8	Cole (2002)	Business, International	motivational, mentoring, performance measurement, staff evaluation, self assessment, goal setting, non-verbal communication, communication, meeting management, people, political management, diversity management, time management, conflict management, recruitment, interviewing, budgeting, resource management, need identification, training, evaluation, teambuilding, coaching, problem solving, feedback, delegation, big picture though, task assignment, analytical, active listening, program assessment/evaluation, empowerment, job design, network building
9	Creamer & Janosik (2003)	Student Affairs	goal setting, performance assessment, skill assessment, motivational
10	Creamer & Winston (1999)	Student Affairs	performance appraisal, goal setting, skill assessment, employee evaluation
11	Dalton (1996)	Student Affairs	skills assessment, goal design, outcome measurement, staff training
12	Dalton (2003)	Student Affairs	motivation, synergistic leadership, interpretation, communication, stress management, feedback, team management, diversity management, human relation, directing, restructuring, vision development, articulation of goals, modeling
13	Daresh (1989)	Educational Leadership	human relation, organizational analysis, leadership, motivation, communication, change management, conflict management, evaluation, staff development, group management
14	Davis (2002)	Student Affairs	Diagnostic
15	Davis (2004)	Student Affairs	relationship building, diagnostic, staff development, support
16	Davis Barham & Winston (2006)	Student Affairs	diagnostic, staff professional development
17	Emanuel, Gould, & Simpson (1985)	Business, Insurance	problem solving, time management, directing, planning, staffing, organizing
18	Evans (1992)	Business, International	creating, planning, forecasting, organizing, communication, motivation, controlling, people, goal setting, performance appraisal, staff development, budgeting, relationship building, team building, problem solving,

			decision making, interviewing, conflict management, leadership, change management, recruitment, training, counseling, political management, report writing, time management
19	Fey & Carpenter (1996)	Student Affairs	personnel management
20	Frye & Dean (2007)	Student Affairs	assessment, employee evaluation, goal setting, motivation, relationship building, collaboration, planning
21	Fuller (1994)	Business	time management, delegation, goal development, technology, organization, prioritizing, staff development, communication, listening, decision making, teambuilding, motivation, meeting management, conflict management, crisis management, training
22	Garubo & Rothstein (1998)	Educational Leadership	teaching, assessment, communication, problem solving, staff development, feeling expression, conflict management, inquiry, relationship building, employee evaluation, listening, trust building, conflict management, staff selection
23	Glickman, Gordon, & Ross-Gordon (1998)	Educational Leadership	listening, clarifying, encouraging, reflective, presentation, problem solving, negotiation, directing, standardizing, reinforcing, self-assessment, collaboration, assessment, planning, observation, research, performance evaluation, group management, analytical, coaching, conflict resolution, meeting management, interpersonal, technical
24	Greer & Plunkett (2000)	Business	interpretation, communication, performance review, assessment, evaluation, administrative
25	Grote (1996)	Business	motivational, performance appraisal, mentoring
26	Harned & Murphy (1998)	Student Affairs	employee need identification, relationship building, employee growth development, strategic planning, resource orchestration, mentoring, providing advice, character development
27	Haynes (1984)	Business	conflict management, project planning, feedback, performance review, discipline, workgroup organization, delegation, intrapersonal, interpersonal, technical, administrative

28	Haynes (1991)	Business	intrapersonal, technical, interpersonal, administrative, communication, conflict management, stress management, planning, project management, time management, rule enforcement, team management, performance appraisal, training, performance improvement, disciplinary, staffing, organization, decision making, skill development, career planning, work distribution, leadership, bargaining, instruction, motivational, meeting management
29	Hirt & Winston (2003)	Student Affairs	skill assessment, team building, implementation, program evaluation
30	Humphrey & Stokes (2000)	Educational Leadership	communication, coaching, team, project management, computer, continuous improvement, writing, business analysis, resource management, people, technical, administrative
31	Ignelzi & Whitely (2004)	Student Affairs	relationship building
32	Janosik & Creamer (2003)	Student Affairs	clarify objectives, building relationships, goal development, performance appraisal
33	Jennings (1993)	Business	planning, decision making, organizing, leadership, motivating, controlling, performance evaluation, communication, job analysis
34	Kelly (1984)	Student Affairs	Coaching
35	Kirkpatrick (2001)	Business	planning, implementation, evaluation, training, need identification, performance appraisal, coaching, staff selection, writing, leadership, human relations, quality management, team building, empowerment, communication, motivational, performance improvement, technical, resource management, diagnostic, group management, administrative, teaching, job analysis, writing, listening, oral communication, meeting management, discipline, decision making, conflict resolution, change management, self-development, counseling
36	Koren (1996)	Adult Education	planning, leadership, organizing, budgeting, people management, motivation, counseling, communication, teaching, performance appraisal, delegation, public relations
37	Ladew (1998)	Business	leadership, coaching, nurturing,

			empowerment, directing, supporting, challenging, advocating, environmental management, change management, performance assessment, meeting management, goal setting (personal and group), communication, budgeting, resource management, role modeling, rule enforcement, planning, delegation, prioritizing, time management, stress management, crisis management, technology, people, training, mentoring, staff development, conflict management, diversity management, team building
38	Leonard & Hilgert (2004)	Business	communication, motivation, decision making, planning, time management, meeting facilitation/management, coaching, delegation, employee selection
39	Marsh (2001)	Student Affairs	staff professional development, mission articulation, monitoring institutional climate, teamwork, coordinating, problem solving, goal setting, developmental understanding, reorganization, assessment
40	Mills (2000)	Student Affairs	ability to communicate tasks, motivational
41	Moglia (1997)	Business	human, team building, delegation, decision making, communication, crisis management, interviewing, budgeting, writing, risk management, training, performance evaluation, administrative, role modeling, teaching, motivational, organizational leadership, listening, goal setting, relationship building, discipline, problem solving, collaboration, technical, interpersonal, conceptual
42	Pajak (1990)	Educational Leadership, K-12	communication, staff development, collaboration, vision development, problem solving, resources acquisition, relationship building
43	Ricks, Ginn, & Daughtrey (1995)	Business	relationship building, communication, objective clarification, planning, organization, staffing, leading, motivating, controlling, delegation, problem solving, decision making, training, coaching, developing employees, time management, strategic planning, forecasting, environmental management, objective writing, job analysis, resource management, recruiting,

			interviewing, diversity management, mentoring, change management, budget management, report writing, technical, conceptual, human
44	Saunders & Cooper (1999)	Student Affairs	personnel management
45	Saunders, Cooper, Winston, & Chernow (2000)	Student Affairs	personnel management, environmental management, goal setting, coaching, problem solving
46	Schneider (1998)	Student Affairs	documentation, staff selection, staff development, delegation, training, communication, performance review, advocating, interpretation
47	Schuh & Carlisle (1991)	Student Affairs	leadership, directing, motivational, evaluation, support, relationship building
48	Smith (2005)	Student Affairs	training, planning, relationship building, communication, goal development, transmitting expectations, performance evaluation, nurturing
49	Stock-Ward & Javorek (2003)	Student Affairs	helping, goal development, training, motivation, modeling, collaboration, confrontation, planning, organization, administrative, communication
50	Tull (2006)	Student Affairs	staff development
51	Upcraft (1988)	Student Affairs	training, performance appraisal, motivational, outcome assessment
52	Von Der Embse (1987)	Business	facilitating, directing, monitoring, planning, organizing, human, conceptual, communication
53	Winston & Creamer (1997)	Student Affairs	mission articulation, monitoring institutional climate, teamwork, coordinating work activities, problem solving, enhance institutional mission, goal development, modeling, relationship building
54	Winston & Creamer (1998)	Student Affairs	communication, relationship building, teaching, leadership, conflict management, writing, time management, goal setting, innovation, skill assessment, providing advice, analytical, interpersonal, organizational
55	Winston & Creamer (2002)	Student Affairs	relationship building, communication, structuring, teaching, role modeling, evaluation, planning, problem solving
56	Winston & Hirt (2003)	Student Affairs	skill assessment, directing, enhance diversity, goal development (personal and

			professional), delegation, performance appraisal, planning, mentoring, coaching, counseling, role modeling
--	--	--	--

APPENDIX J

PHAS SIX OF QUESTIONNAIRE DESIGN PROCESS

Revised List of Identified Skills and Supporting Literature

#	Skill	Supporting Literature
1	Administrative	Greer & Plunkett (2000); Haynes (1984); Haynes (1991); Humphrey & Stokes, (2000); Kirkpatrick (2001); Moglia (1997); Stock-Ward & Javorek (2003)
2	Advisement/consultation/counseling	Bulin (1995); Carelli (2004) Evans (1992); Harned & Murphy (1998); Kirkpatrick (2001); Koren (1996); Winston & Creamer (1998); Winston & Hirt (2003)
3	Analytical	Cole (2002); Glickman, Gordon, & Ross-Gordon (1998); Winston & Creamer (1998)
4	Budgeting	Carelli (2004); Cole (2002); Evans (1992); Koren (1996); Ladew (1998); Moglia (1997); Ricks, Ginn, & Daughtrey (1995)
5	Change management	Daresh (1989); Evans (1992); Kirkpatrick (2001); Ricks, Ginn, & Daughtrey (1995); Ladew (1998)
6	Clarification/ clarifying objectives and goals	Bunker & Wijnberg (1998); Carroll (1996); Glickman, Gordon, & Ross-Gordon (1998); Janosik & Creamer (2003); Ricks, Ginn, & Daughtrey (1995)
7	Coaching	Carelli (2004); Cole (2002); Glickman, Gordon, & Ross-Gordon (1998); Humphrey & Stokes (2000); Kelly (1984); Kirkpatrick (2001); Ladew (1998); Leonard & Hilgert (2004); Ricks, Ginn, & Daughtrey (1995); Saunders, Cooper, Winston, & Chernow (2000); Winston & Hirt (2003)
8	Collaboration	Frye & Dean (2007); Glickman, Gordon, & Ross-Gordon (1998); Moglia (1997); Pajak (1990); Stock-Ward & Javorek (2003)
9	Communication (i.e., feeling expression, transmitting expectations, presentations, mission articulation, etc...)	Armino & Creamer (2001); Bulin (1995); Bunker & Wijnberg (1998); Carelli (2004); Carr (1989); Certo (1994); Cole (2002); Dalton (2003); Daresh (1989); Evans (1992); Fuller (1994); Garubo & Rothstein (1998); Glickman, Gordon, & Ross-Gordon (1998); Greer & Plunkett (2000); Haynes (1991); Humphrey & Stokes (2000); Jennings (1993); Kirkpatrick (2001); Koren (1996); Ladew

		(1998); Leonard & Hilgert (2004); Marsh (2001); Mills (2000); Moglia (1997); Pajak (1990); Ricks, Ginn, & Daughtrey (1995); Schneider (1998); Smith (2005); Stock-Ward & Javorek (2003); Von Der Embse (1987); Winston & Creamer (1997); Winston & Creamer (1998); Winston & Creamer (2002)
10	Conceptualization	Moglia (1997); Ricks, Ginn, & Daughtrey (1995); Von Der Embse (1987)
11	Conflict management/resolution	Bulin (1995); Certo (1994); Cole (2002); Creamer & Winston (1999); Daresh (1989); Evans (1992); Fuller (1994); Garubo & Rothstein (1998); Glickman, Gordan, & Ross-Gordan (1998); Haynes (1984); Haynes (1991); Kirkpatrick (2001); Winston & Creamer (1998)
12	Controlling/rule enforcement	Bulin (1995); Certo (1994); Haynes (1991); Jennings (1993); Ladew (1998); Ricks, Ginn, & Daughtrey (1995)
13	Crisis management	Fuller (1994); Ladew (1998) Moglia (1997)
14	Decision making	Bulin (1995); Certo (1994); Evans (1992); Fuller (1994); Jennings (1993); Kirkpatrick (2001); Leonard & Hilgert (2004); Moglia (1997); Ricks, Ginn, & Daughtrey (1995)
15	Delegation	Bulin (1995); Carelli (2004); Carr (1989); Certo (1994); Cole (2002); Fuller (1994); Haynes (1984); Koren (1996); Ladew (1998); Leonard & Hilgert (2004); Moglia (1997); Ricks, Ginn, & Daughtrey (1995); Schneider (1998); Winston & Hirt (2003)
16	Diagnostic	Davis (2002); Davis (2004); Davis Barham & Winston (2006); Kirkpatrick (2001)
17	Directing	Armino & Creamer (2001); Dalton (2003); Emanuel, Gould, & Simpson (1985); Glickman, Gordon, & Ross-Gordon (1998); Ladew (1998); Schuh & Carlisle (1991); Winston & Hirt (2003)
18	Discipline	Bulin (1995); Certo (1994); Haynes (1984); Haynes (1991); Kirkpatrick (2001); Moglia (1997)
19	Distribution/coordination of work activities	Cole (2002); Haynes (1991); Marsh (2001); Winston & Creamer (1997)
20	Diversity enhancement/promotion	Bulin (1995); Certo (1994); Cole (2002); Creamer & Winston (1999); Dalton (2000); Ricks, Ginn, & Daughtrey (1995); Winston & Hirt (2003)

21	Employee/staff selection	Carr (1989); Garubo & Rothstein (1998); Kirkpatrick (2001) Leonard & Hilgert (2004); Schneider (1998)
22	Employee/staff professional development	Bulin (1995); Daresh (1989); Davis (2004); Davis Barham & Winston (2006); Evans (1992); Fuller (1994); Garubo & Rothstein (1998); Harned & Haynes (1991); Kirkpatrick (2001); Ladew (1998); Marsh (2001); Murphy (1998); Pajak (1990); Ricks, Ginn, & Daughtrey (1995); Schneider (1998); Tull (2006)
23	Empowerment	Cole (2002); Ladew (1998); Kirkpatrick (2001)
24	Environmental management	Bulin (1995); Ladew (1998); Ricks, Ginn, & Daughtrey (1995) Saunders, Cooper, Winston, & Chernow (2000)
25	Feedback	Cole (2002) Dalton (2003); Haynes (1984)
26	Forecasting	Bulin (1995); Evans (1992); Ricks, Ginn, & Daughtrey (1995)
27	Goal setting/development/design	Carelli (2004); Cole (2002); Creamer & Janosik (2003); Creamer & Winston (1999); Dalton (1996); Dalton (2003); Evans (1992); Frye & Dean (2007); Fuller (1994); Janosik & Creamer (2003); Ladew (1998); Marsh (2001); Moglia (1997); Saunders, Cooper, Winston, & Chernow (2000); Smith (2005); Stock-Ward & Javorek (2003); Winston & Creamer (1997); Winston & Creamer (1997b) Winston & Creamer (1998); Winston & Hirt (2003)
28	Innovation/creativity	Evans (1992); Hirt & Winston (2003); Winston & Creamer (1998); Winston & Hirt (2003)
29	Interpersonal	Carr (1989); Glickman, Gordon, & Ross-Gordon (1998); Haynes (1984); Haynes (1991); Moglia (1997); Winston & Creamer (1998)
30	Interpretation	Dalton (2003); Greer & Plunkett (2000); Schneider (1998)
31	Interviewing	Evans (1992); Bulin (1995); Carelli (2004); Certo (1994); Cole (2002); Moglia (1997); Ricks, Ginn, & Daughtrey (1995)
32	Job analysis	Evans (1992); Jennings (1993); Kirkpatrick (2001); Ricks, Ginn, & Daughtrey (1995)
33	Leadership	Bulin (1995); Certo (1994); Dalton (2003); Daresh (1989); Evans (1992); Haynes (1991);

		Jennings (1993); Kirkpatrick (2001); Koren (1996); Ladew (1998); Moglia (1997); Ricks, Ginn, & Daughtrey (1995); Schuh & Carlisle (1991); Winston & Creamer (1998)
34	Listening	Armino & Creamer (2001); Bulin (1995); Certo (1994); Cole (2002) Fuller (1994); Garubo & Rothstein (1998); Glickman, Gordon, & Ross-Gordon (1998); Kirkpatrick (2001); Moglia (1997)
35	Meeting management/facilitation	Bulin (1995); Certo (1994); Cole (2002); Fuller (1994); Glickman, Gordon, & Ross-Gordon (1998); Haynes (1991); Kirkpatrick (2001); Ladew (1998); Leonard & Hilgert (2004)
36	Mentoring/guiding	Carr (1989); Cole (2002); Grote (1996); Harned & Murphy (1998); Ladew (1998); Ricks, Ginn, & Daughtrey (1995); Winston & Hirt (2003)
37	Monitoring work	Carroll (1996); Marsh (2001); Von Der Embse (1987); Winston & Creamer (1997)
38	Motivational	Arminio & Creamer (2001); Bulin (1995); Carr (1989); Cole (2002); Creamer & Janosik (2003); Dalton (2003); Daresh (1989); Evans (1992) Frye & Dean (2007); Fuller (1994); Grote (1996); Haynes (1991); Javorek (2003); Jennings (1993); Kirkpatrick (2001); Koren (1996); Leonard & Hilgert (2004); Mills (2000); Moglia (1997); Ricks, Ginn, & Daughtrey (1995); Stock-Ward & Javorek (2003); Upcraft (1988)
39	Need identification	Cole (2002); Harned & Murphy (1998); Kirkpatrick (2001)
40	Organizing	Bulin (1995); Carelli (2004); Emanuel, Gould, & Simpson (1985); Evans (1992); Fuller (1994); Haynes (1991); Jennings (1993); Koren (1996); Moglia (1997); Ricks, Ginn, & Daughtrey (1995); Stock-Ward & Javorek (2003); Winston & Creamer (1998)
41	Outcome measurement/assessment	Dalton (1996); Frye & Dean (2007); Upcraft (1988)
42	People/human relation	Cole (2002); Dalton (2003); Daresh (1989); Evans (1992); Humphrey & Stokes (2000); Kirkpatrick (2001); Koren (1996); Ladew (1998); Moglia (1997); Ricks, Ginn, & Daughtrey (1995); Von Der Embse (1987)
43	Performance	Bunker & Wijnberg (1998); Haynes (1991);

	development/improvement	Humphrey & Stokes, (2000); Kirkpatrick (2001)
44	Performance review/appraisal/evaluation/skill assessment	Bulin (1995); Carelli (2004); Carroll (1996); Cole (2002); Creamer & Janosik (2003); Creamer & Winston (1999); Dalton (1996); Daresh (1989); Evans (1992); Frye & Dean (2007); Garubo & Rothstein (1998); Glickman, Gordon, & Ross-Gordon (1998); Greer & Plunkett (2000); Grote (1996); Haynes (1984); Haynes (1991); Janosik & Creamer (2003); Jennings (1993); Kirkpatrick (2001); Koren (1996); Ladew (1998); Marsh (2001); Moglia (1997); Schneider (1998); Schuh & Carlisle (1991); Smith (2005); Upcraft (1998); Winston & Creamer (1998); Winston & Creamer (2002); Winston & Hirt (2003)
45	Personnel management	Fey & Carpenter (1996); Saunders & Cooper (1999); Saunders, Cooper, Winston, Chernow (2000)
46	Planning (general and strategic)/structuring	Arminio & Creamer (2001); Bulin (1995); Bunker & Wijnberg (1998); Carr (1989); Emanuel, Gould, & Simpson (1985); Evans (1992); Frye & Dean (2007); Glickman, Gordon, & Ross-Gordon (1998); Harned & Murphy (1998); Haynes (1991); Jennings (1993); Kirkpatrick (2001); Koren (1996); Ladew (1998); Leonard & Hilgert (2004); Ricks, Ginn, & Daughtrey (1995); Smith (2005); Stock-Ward & Javorek (2003); Von Der Embse (1987); Winston & Creamer (2002); Winston & Hirt (2003)
47	Problem solving	Bulin (1995); Bunker & Wijnberg (1998); Carelli (2004); Certo (1994); Cole (2002); Emanuel, Gould, & Simpson (1985); Evans (1992); Garubo & Rothstein (1998); Glickman, Gordon, & Ross-Gordon (1998); Marsh (2001); Moglia (1997); Pajak (1990); Ricks, Ginn, & Daughtrey (1995); Saunders, Cooper, Winston, & Chernow (2000); Von Der Embse (1987); Winston & Creamer (1997); Winston & Creamer (2002)
48	Program evaluation	Armino & Creamer (2001); Cole (2002) Hirt & Winston (2001)
49	Project management/planning	Hayes (1990); Haynes (1991); Humphrey & Stokes (2000)

50	Recruitment	Bulin (1995); Cole (2002); Evans (1992); Ricks, Ginn, & Daughtrey (1995)
51	Relationship/network/trust building	Bunker & Wijnberg (1998); Carelli (2004); Carroll (1996); Cole (2002); Davis (2004); Evans (1992); Frye & Dean (2007); Garubo & Rothstein (1998); Harned & Murphy (1998); Ignelzi & Whitley (2004); Janosik & Creamer (2003); Moglia (1997); Pajak (1990); Ricks, Ginn, & Daughtrey (1995); Schuh & Carlisle (1991); Smith (2005); Winston & Creamer (1997); Winston & Creamer (1998); Winston & Creamer (2002)
52	Resource management/acquisition	Bulin (1995); Cole (2002); Harned & Murphy (1998); Humphrey & Stokes (2000) Kirkpatrick (2001); Ladew (1998); Pajak (1990); Ricks, Ginn, & Daughtrey (1995)
53	Restructuring/reorganization	Dalton (2003); Marsh (2001); Winston & Creamer (2002)
54	Role modeling	Arminio & Creamer (2001); Carroll (1996); Certo (1994); Dalton (2003); Ladew (1998); Molia (1997); Stock-Ward & Javorek (2003); Winston & Creamer (1997); Winston & Creamer (2002); Winston & Hirt (2003)
55	Self-assessment	Bulin (1995); Carroll (1996); Glickman, Gordon & Ross-Gordon (1998); Cole (2002)
56	Staffing/job design	Bulin (1995); Cole (2002); Emanuel, Gould, & Simpson (1985); Haynes (1991); Ricks, Ginn, & Daughtrey (1995); Von Der Embse (1987)
57	Stress management	Certo (1994); Dalton (2003); Haynes (1991); Ladew (1998)
58	Supporting/encouraging/nurturing/advocating/helping	Davis (2004); Glickman, Gordon, & Ross-Gordon (1998); Ladew (1998); Schneider (1998); Schuh & Carlisle (1991); Smith (2005) Stock-Ward & Javorek (2003)
59	Teaching/instruction	Arminio & Creamer (2001); Carroll (1996); Garubo & Rothstein (1998); Haynes (1991); Kirkpatrick (2001); Koren (1996); Moglia (1997); Winston & Creamer (1998); Winston & Creamer (2002)
60	Team/group building/management/organization	Bulin (1995); Bunker & Wijnberg (1998); Carelli (2004); Carr (1989); Carroll (1996); Certo (1994); Cole (2002); Dalton (2000); Daresh (1989); Evans (1992); Fuller (1994); Glickman, Gordon, & Ross-Gordon (1998); Haynes (1984); Haynes (1991); Hirt &

		Winston (2003); Kirkpartick (2001); Ladew (1998); Marsh (2001); Moglia (1997); Winston & Creamer (1997)
61	Technical	Carr (1989); Glickman, Gordon, & Ross-Gordon (1998); Haynes (1984); Haynes (1991); Humphrey & Stokes (2000); Kirkpatrick (2001); Moglia (1997); Ricks, Ginn, & Daughtrey (1995)
62	Technology/computer	Fuller (1994); Humphrey & Stokes (2000); Ladew (1998);
63	Time management	Bulin (1995); Certo (1994); Cole (2002); Emanuel, Gould, & Simpson (1985); Evans (1992); Fuller (1994); Haynes (1991); Ladew (1998); Leonard & Hilgert (2004); Ricks, Ginn, & Daughtrey (1995); Winston & Creamer (1998)
64	Training	Certo (1994); Carelli (2004); Cole (2002); Dalton (1996); Evans (1992); Fuller (1994); Haynes (1991); Kirkpatrick (2001); Ladew (1998); Moglia (1997); Ricks, Ginn, & Daughtrey (1995); Schneider (1998); Smith (2005); Stock-Ward & Javorek (2003); Upcraft (1988)
65	Vision development	Armino & Creamer (2001); Dalton (2003); Pajak (1990)
66	Writing	Carroll (1996); Evans (1992); Humphrey & Stokes (2000); Kirkpatrick (2001); Moglia (1997); Ricks, Ginn, & Daughtrey (1995); Winston & Creamer (1998)

APPENDIX K

PHASE SEVEN OF QUESTIONNAIRE DESIGN PROCESS

Thirty-three citations (n=1)

The skill listed below is in 58% of the total reviewed sources (n=56)

communication (i.e., feeling expression, transmitting expectations, presentations, mission articulation, etc...)

Thirty citations (n=1)

The skill listed below is in 53% of the total reviewed sources (n=56)

1. performance review/appraisal/evaluation/ skill assessment

Twenty-two citations (n=1)

The skill listed below is in 39% of the total reviewed sources (n=56)

1. motivational

Twenty-one citations (n=1)

The skill listed below is 37% of the total reviewed sources (n=56)

1. planning (general and strategic)/structuring

Twenty citations (n=2)

The skills listed below are in 35% of the total reviewed sources (n=56)

1. goal setting/development/design
2. team/group building/management/organization

Nineteen citations (n=1)

The skill listed below is in 33% of the total reviewed sources (n=56)

1. relationship/network/trust building

Seventeen citations (n=1)

The skill listed below is in 30 % of the total reviewed sources (n=56)

1. problem solving

Sixteen citations (n=1)

The skill listed below is in 28% of the total reviewed sources (n=56)

1. employee/staff professional development

Fifteen citations (n=1)

The skill listed below is in 26% of the total reviewed sources (n=56)

1. training

Fourteen citations (n=2)

The skills listed below are in 25% of the total reviewed sources (n=56)

1. delegation
2. leadership

Thirteen citations (n=1)

The skill listed below is in 23% of the total reviewed sources (n=56)

1. conflict management/resolution

Twelve citations (n=1)

The skill listed below is in 21% of total reviewed sources (n=56)

1. organizing

Eleven citations (n=3)

The skills listed below are in 19% of the total reviewed sources (n=56)

1. coaching
2. people/human relations
3. time management

Ten citations (n=1)

The skill listed below is in 18% of the total reviewed sources (n=56)

1. role modeling

Nine citations (n=4)

The skills listed below are in 16% of the total reviewed sources (n=56)

1. decision making
2. listening
3. meeting management/facilitation
4. teaching/instruction

Eight citations (n=3)

The skills listed below are in 14% of the total reviewed sources (n=56)

1. advisement/consultation/counseling
2. resource management/acquisition
3. technical

Seven citations (n=8)

The skills listed below are in 12% of the total reviewed sources (n=56)

1. administrative
2. budgeting
3. directing
4. diversity enhancement/promotion
5. interviewing
6. mentoring/guiding
7. supporting/encouraging/nurturing/advocating/helping

8. writing

Six citations (n=4)

The skills listed below are in 11% of the total reviewed sources (n=56)

1. controlling/rule enforcement
2. discipline
3. interpersonal
4. staffing/job design

Five citations (n=4)

The skills listed below are in 9% of the total reviewed sources (n=56)

1. change management
2. clarification/clarifying objectives and goals
3. collaboration
4. employee/staff selection

Four citations (n=10)

The skills listed below are in 7% of the total reviewed sources (n=56)

1. diagnostic
2. distribution/coordination of work activities
3. environmental management
4. innovation/creativity
5. job analysis
6. monitoring work
7. performance development/improvement
8. recruitment

9. self-assessment
10. stress management

Three citations (n=15)

The skills listed below are in 5% of the total reviewed sources (n=56)

1. analytical
2. conceptualization
3. crisis management
4. empowerment
5. feedback
6. forecasting
7. interpretation
8. need identification
9. outcome measurement/assessment
10. personnel management
11. program evaluation
12. project management/planning
13. restructuring/reorganization
14. technology/computer
15. vision development

APPENDIX L

PHASE EIGHT OF QUESTIONNAIRE DESIGN PROCESS

Category 1: Technical (n=11)

1. Analytical
2. Clarification/clarifying objectives and goals
3. Diagnostic
4. Need identification
5. Outcome measurement/assessment
6. Performance review/appraisal/evaluation/skill assessment
7. Program evaluation
8. Self-assessment
9. Teaching/instruction
10. Technology/computer
11. Writing

Category 2: Interpersonal (n=18)

1. Advisement/consultation/counseling
2. Coaching
3. Collaboration
4. Communication
5. Conflict management/resolution
6. Diversity enhancement/promotion
7. Empowerment
8. Feedback

9. Leadership
10. Listening
11. Mentoring/guiding
12. Motivational
13. People/human relation
14. Relationship/network/trust building
15. Role modeling
16. Stress management
17. Supporting/encouraging/nurturing/advocating/helping
18. Team/group building/management/organization

Category 3: Administrative (n=20)

1. Budgeting
2. Controlling/rule enforcement
3. Crisis management
4. Delegation
5. Directing
6. Discipline
7. Distribution/coordination of work activities
8. Employee/staff selection
9. Interviewing
10. Job analysis
11. Meeting management/facilitation
12. Monitoring work

13. Organizing
14. Personnel management
15. Project management/planning
16. Recruitment
17. Resource management/acquisition
18. Staffing/job design
19. Time management
20. Training

Category 4: Conceptual (n=13)

1. Change management
2. Decision making
3. Employee/staff professional development
4. Environmental management
5. Forecasting
6. Goal setting/development/design
7. Innovation/creativity
8. Interpretation
9. Performance development/improvement
10. Planning (general and strategic)/structuring
11. Problem solving
12. Restructuring/reorganization
13. Vision development

APPENDIX M

PHASE NINE OF QUESTIONNAIRE DESIGN PROCESS

Category 1: Technical (n=11)

1. Analytical
2. Clarification/clarifying objectives and goals
3. Diagnostic
4. Need identification
5. Outcome measurement/assessment
6. Performance review/appraisal/evaluation/skill assessment
7. Program evaluation
8. Self-assessment
9. Teaching/instruction
10. Technology/computer
11. Writing

Category 2: Interpersonal (n=18)

1. Advisement/consultation/counseling
2. Coaching
3. Collaboration
4. Communication
5. Conflict management/resolution
6. Diversity enhancement/promotion
7. Performance development/improvement

8. Empowerment
9. Feedback
10. Listening
11. Mentoring/guiding
12. Motivational
13. People/human relation
14. Relationship/network/trust building
15. Role modeling
16. Stress management
17. Supporting/encouraging/nurturing/advocating/helping
18. Team/group building/management/organization

Category 3: Administrative (n=20)

1. Budgeting
2. Controlling/rule enforcement
3. Crisis management
4. Delegation
5. Directing
6. Discipline
7. Distribution/coordination of work activities
8. Employee/staff selection
9. Interviewing
10. Job analysis
11. Meeting management/facilitation

12. Monitoring work
13. Organizing
14. Personnel management
15. Project management/planning
16. Recruitment
17. Resource management/acquisition
18. Staffing/job design
19. Time management
20. Training

Category 4: Conceptual (n=13)

1. Change management
2. Decision making
3. Employee/staff professional development
4. Environmental management
5. Forecasting
6. Goal setting/development/design
7. Innovation/creativity
8. Interpretation
9. Leadership
10. Planning (general and strategic)/structuring
11. Problem solving
12. Restructuring/reorganization
13. Vision development

APPENDIX N

PHASE TWELVE OF QUESTIONNAIRE DESIGN PROCESS

Skills, Supporting Literature Citations, Stems, and Definitions

Category 1: Interpersonal

Skill	Citations	# of Citations	Stem	Definition
Active Listening	Armino & Creamer (2001); Bulin (1995); Certo (1994); Cole (2002) Fuller (1994); Garubo & Rothstein (1998); Glickman, Gordon, & Ross-Gordon (1998); Kirkpatrick (2001); Moglia (1997)	9	Utilize active listening skills to determine supervisee concerns	Hearing what the speaker is saying, understanding the facts and feelings the speaker is attempting to convey, and articulating what you understand that message to be (Certo, 1994).
Advisement	Bulin (1995); Carelli (2004) Evans (1992); Harned & Murphy (1998); Kirkpatrick (2001); Koren (1996); Winston & Creamer (1998); Winston & Hirt (2003)	7	Serve as an advisor to supervisees	Act as a consultant for one or more employees (Dunkel & Schreiber, 1990).
Coaching	Carelli (2004); Cole (2002); Glickman, Gordon, & Ross-Gordon (1998); Humphrey & Stokes (2000); Kelly (1984); Kirkpatrick (2001); Ladew (1998); Leonard & Hilgert (2004); Ricks, Ginn, & Daughtrey (1995); Saunders, Cooper, Winston, & Chernow (2000); Winston & Hirt (2003)	11	Position staff members related to their strengths in order to accomplish unit goals	A short educational interaction by a supervisor that provides information that is intended to guide the supervisee in the appropriate direction for success (Cole, 2002).
Collaboration	Frye & Dean (2007); Glickman, Gordon, & Ross-Gordon (1998); Moglia (1997); Pajak (1990); Stock-Ward & Javorek (2003)	5	Promote collaboration between the staff members that you supervise	The process of participating in and acknowledging consensual processes (Moglia, 1997).
Communication	Armino & Creamer (2001); Bulin (1995); Bunker & Wijnberg (1998); Carelli (2004); Carr (1989); Certo (1994); Cole (2002); Dalton (2003); Daresh (1989); Evans (1992); Fuller (1994); Garubo	33	Effectively use communication skills to supervise staff	Skills that pertain to the exchange of insights, information, and feelings from a source to a receiver of the information (Bulin, 1995; Dunkel & Schreiber, 1990).

	& Rothstein (1998); Glickman, Gordon, & Ross-Gordon (1998) Greer & Plunkett (2000); Haynes (1991); Humphrey & Stokes (2000); Jennings (1993); Kirkpatrick (2001); Koren (1996); Ladew (1998); Leonard & Hilgert (2004); Marsh (2001); Mills (2000); Moglia (1997); Pajak (1990); Ricks, Ginn, & Daughtrey (1995); Schneider (1998); Smith (2005); Stock-Ward & Javorek (2003); Von Der Embse (1987); Winston & Creamer (1997); Winston & Creamer (1998); Winston & Creamer (2002)			
Conflict resolution	Bulin (1995); Certo (1994); Cole (2002); Creamer & Winston (1999); Daresh (1989); Evans (1992); Fuller (1994); Garubo & Rothstein (1998); Glickman, Gordon, & Ross-Gordon (1998); Hayes (1990); Haynes (1991); Kirkpatrick (2001); Winston & Creamer (1998)	13	Resolve staff conflicts	The process of responding to problems that stem from some form of conflict in order to resolve concerns between disagreeing parties (Certo, 1994; Dunkel & Schreiber, 1990).
Diversity promotion	Bulin (1995); Certo (1994); Cole (2002); Creamer & Winston (1999); Dalton (2003); Ricks, Ginn, & Daughtrey (1995); Winston & Hirt (2003)	7	Promote diversity within one's staff by facilitating the interaction of people who are different	Skills that relate to: 1) aiding supervisees to be aware of and understand the uniqueness of individuals and 2) developing a work environment where each employee is supported and can do his or her best work (Dunkel & Schreiber, 1990), 1990; Ricks, Ginn & Daughtrey, 1995).
Empowerment	Cole (2002); Ladew (1998); Kirkpatrick (2001)	3	Empower supervisees to reach goals	Passing on responsibility and authority to an employee through supportive techniques utilized by a supervisor (Dunkel & Schreiber, 1990).
Feedback	Cole (2002) Dalton (2000); Haynes (1984)	3	Provide clear feedback to supervisees	The act of providing a return of accurate information to employees about their related performance on tasks and work responsibilities (Bulin, 1995).
Human relations	Cole (2002); Dalton (2000); Daresh (1989); Evans (1992); Kirkpatrick (2001); Koren (1996); Ladew (1998); Leonard & Hilgert, 2004; Moglia	12	Utilize human relations (people) skills to supervise staff in order to meet unit goals	The ability to work with and through individuals to accomplish work related tasks (Leonard & Hilgert, 2004)

	(1997); Ricks, Ginn, & Daughtrey (1995); Stokes & Humphrey (2000); Von Der Embse (1987)			
Mentoring	Carr (1989); Cole (2002); Grote (1996); Harned & Murphy (1998); Ladew (1998); Ricks, Ginn, & Daughtrey (1995); Winston & Hirt (2003)	7	Serve as mentor (guide) to supervisees	Skills utilized by a supervisor serving as a role model and teacher. The mentor acts as a guide to the new employee and provides advice on job tasks and the organizational environment (Bulin, 1995).
Motivational	Arminio & Creamer (2001); Bulin (1995); Carr (1989); Cole (2002); Creamer & Janosik (2003); Dalton (2003); Daresh (1989); Evans (1992) Frye & Dean (2007); Fuller (1994); Grote (1996); Haynes (1991); Javorek (2003); Jennings (1993); Kirkpatrick (2001); Koren (1996); Leonard & Hilgert (2004); Mills (2000); Moglia (1997); Ricks, Ginn, & Daughtrey (1995); Stock-Ward & Javorek (2003); Upcraft (1988)	22	Utilize effective techniques to motivate supervisees	A supervisor providing incentives to employees that influence their behavior to act in desired ways to accomplish organizational goals (Certo, 1994; Dunkel & Schreiber, 1990; Ricks, Ginn, & Daughtrey, 1995).
Relationship building	Bunker & Wijnberg (1998); Carelli (2004); Carroll (1996); Cole (2002); Davis (2004); Evans (1992); Frye & Dean (2007); Garubo & Rothstein (1998); Harned & Murphy (1998); Ignelzi & Whitley (2004); Janosik & Creamer (2003); Moglia (1997); Pajak (1990); Ricks, Ginn, & Daughtrey (1995); Schuh & Carlisle (1991); Smith (2005); Winston & Creamer (1997); Winston & Creamer (1998); Winston & Creamer (2002)	19	Use appropriate approaches to aid supervisees in building relationships (networking)	Aiding a supervisee in building a network of mutually supportive formal and informal relationships with others within and outside of the work environment (Cole, 2002).
Role modeling	Arminio & Creamer (2001); Carroll (1996); Certo (1994); Dalton (2003); Ladew (1998); Molia (1997); Stock-Ward & Javorek (2003); Winston & Creamer (1997); Winston & Creamer	10	Serve as a positive example to staff by modeling appropriate professional behavior	Setting an example as supervisor for the ethical and work related behaviors that are expected by employees of the organization.

	(2002); Winston & Hirt (2003)			
Stress management	Certo (1994); Dalton (2003); Haynes (1991); Ladew (1998)	4	Implement strategies to minimize the level of stress for your staff	Utilizing stress reduction techniques to limit and manage the stress levels of one's staff.
Supporting	Davis (2004); Glickman, Gordon, & Ross-Gordon (1998); Ladew (1998); Schneider (1998); Schuh & Carlisle (1991); Smith (2005) Stock-Ward & Javorek (2003)	7	Support (nurture) supervisees	Guiding an employee and ensuring that he or she knows what to do, how to do it well, and making sure he or she is encouraged and nurtured as a team member (Carr, 1989).
Team building	Bulin (1995); Bunker & Wijnberg (1998); Carelli (2004); Carr (1989); Carroll (1996); Certo (1994); Cole (2002); Dalton (2003); Daresh (1989); Evans (1992); Fuller (1994); Glickman, Gordon, & Ross-Gordon (1998); Haynes (1984); Haynes (1991); Hirt & Winston (2003); Kirkpatrick (2001); Ladew (1998); Marsh (2001); Moglia (1997); Winston & Creamer (1997)	20	Build effective work teams	The process: 1) developing team member abilities, 2) removing obstacles which prevent effective team function, 3) clarifying tasks, and 4) motivating members to accomplish work related goals (Certo, 1994; Cole, 2002; Evans, 1992).

Category 2: Technical

Skill	Citations	# of Citations	Stem	Definition
Analytical	Cole (2002); Glickman, Gordon, & Ross-Gordon (1998); Winston & Creamer (1998)	3	Utilize analytical (logical) reasoning methods to make work related decisions	The utilization of logical reasoning to address issues, develop programs, resolve conflicts, and make decisions.
Clarifying objectives and goals	Bunker & Wijnberg (1998); Carroll (1996); Glickman, Gordon, & Ross-Gordon (1998); Janosik & Creamer (2003); Ricks, Ginn, & Daughtrey (1995)	5	Clarify unit objectives and goals for supervisees	Understanding institutional goals and objectives and effectively interpreting and communicating them for supervisees (Dunkel & Schreiber, 1990).
Diagnostic	Davis (2002); Davis (2004); Davis Barham & Winston (2006); Kirkpatrick (2001)	4	Diagnose work related challenges in an expedient manner	A review and analysis of a performance related issue in order to decide if training is the most economic and effective method to enhance staff performance (Kirkpatrick, 2001).
Need assessment	Cole (2002); Harned & Murphy (1998); Kirkpatrick (2001)	3	Utilize appropriate strategies to identify staff	Understanding how to determine supervisee needs through effective use of assessment techniques (Dunkel & Schreiber, 1990).

			needs	
Performance appraisal and skill assessment	Bulin (1995); Carelli (2004); Carroll (1996); Cole (2002); Creamer & Janosik (2003); Creamer & Winston (1999); Dalton (1996); Daresh (1989); Evans (1992); Frye & Dean (2007); Garubo & Rothstein (1998); Glickman, Gordon, & Ross-Gordon (1998); Greer & Plunkett (2000); Grote (1996); Haynes (1984); Haynes (1991); Janosik & Creamer (2003); Jennings (1993); Kirkpatrick (2001); Koren (1996); Ladew (1998); Marsh (2001); Moglia (1997); Schneider (1998); Schuh & Carlisle (1991); Smith (2005); Upcraft (1998); Winston & Creamer (1998); Winston & Creamer (2002); Winston & Hirt (2003)	30	Conduct periodic staff performance appraisals to evaluate staff skill levels	Providing staff with informal and formal performance evaluation that is systematic and ongoing and details how well a staff member is performing the duties of his or her job (Dunkel & Schreiber, 1990; Leonard & Hilgert, 2004).
Program evaluation	Armino & Creamer (2001); Cole (2002) Hirt & Winston (2001)	3	Utilize assessment techniques to determine program effectiveness	The process of assessing the effectiveness, value, and outcome achievement of a program or service (Daresh, 1989).
Self-assessment	Bulin (1995); Carroll (1996); Glickman, Gordon & Ross-Gordon (1998); Cole (2002)	4	Make use of appropriate self-assessment techniques to maximize work related performance	A critical review of one's level of skill, strengths, and weaknesses in relation to one's job performance (Dunkel & Schreiber, 1990; Leonard & Hilgert, 2004).
Teaching (instruction)	Arminio & Creamer (2001); Carroll (1996); Garubo & Rothstein (1998); Haynes (1991); Kirkpatrick (2001); Koren (1996); Moglia (1997); Winston & Creamer (1998); Winston & Creamer (2002)	9	Instruct (teach) supervisees	Imparting one's own knowledge of a topic on a subject to his or her employees (Dunkel & Schreiber, 1990).
Technological	Fuller (1994); Humphrey & Stokes (2000); Ladew (1998)	8	Utilize appropriate technology to better meet unit goals	Utilizing technological advancements and applying them to work with one's staff (Dunkel & Schreiber, 1990).
Writing	Carroll (1996); Evans (1992); Humphrey & Stokes (2000);	7	Author appropriate correspondence	A form of communication that: 1) provides a permanent record and preserves information that may be

	Kirkpatrick (2001); Moglia (1997); Ricks, Ginn, & Daughtrey (1995); Winston & Creamer (1998)		related to supervisory duties	critical to the operation of an organization and 2) serves as a way to transmit information. Examples of writing skills include authoring reports, memo composition, performance evolutions, etc. (Daresh, 1989).
--	--	--	-------------------------------	---

Category 3: Administrative

Skill	Citations	# of Citations	Stem	Definition
Budgeting	Carelli (2004); Cole (2002); Evans (1992); Koren (1996); Ladew (1998); Moglia (1997); Ricks, Ginn, & Daughtrey (1995)	7	Utilize appropriate budget management techniques	The process of managing a formally prepared financial projection that is necessary in order for a unit to carry out programs, operations, and services (Evans, 1992; Koren, 1996).
Controlling (rule enforcement)	Bulin (1995); Certo (1994); Haynes (1991); Jennings (1993); Ladew (1998); Ricks, Ginn, & Daughtrey (1995)	6	Enforce departmental rules (procedures)	Monitoring employee performance to make sure that work is completed as planned in an ethical manner and making necessary corrections when rules are violated (Certo, 1994).
Crisis management	Fuller (1994); Ladew (1998) Moglia (1997)	3	Aid supervisees with crisis management through the use of appropriate leadership techniques	Utilizing techniques to effectively respond to an unstable or frustrated person or crisis situation (Dunkel & Schreiber, 1990).
Delegation	Bulin (1995); Carelli (2004); Carr (1989); Certo (1994); Cole (2002); Fuller (1994); Hayes (1990); Koren (1996); Ladew (1998); Leonard & Hilgert (2004); Moglia (1997); Ricks, Ginn, & Daughtrey (1995); Schneider (1998); Winston & Hirt (2003)	14	Delegate appropriate tasks to supervisees	The process of a supervisor entrusting work related responsibilities to a supervisee (Leonard & Hilgert, 2004; Ricks, Ginn, & Daughtrey, 1995).
Directing	Armino & Creamer (2001); Dalton (2003); Emanuel, Gould, & Simpson (1985); Glickman, Gordon, & Ross-Gordon (1998); Ladew (1998); Schuh & Carlisle (1991); Winston & Hirt (2003)	7	Direct staff in order to complete work related tasks	Communicating expectations to a supervisee in order to complete a work related task or address a problem (Daresh, 1989; Glickman, Gordan, & Ross-Gordan, 1998).
Discipline	Bulin (1995); Certo (1994); Haynes (1984); Haynes (1991); Kirkpatrick (2001); Moglia (1997)	6	Administer employee disciplinary procedures	Use of established principles of employee rights by a supervisor to take corrective action when an employee has violated an organization's rules or failed to meet performance goals (Bulin, 1995; Dunkel & Schreiber, 1990).
Distribution (coordination)	Cole (2002); Haynes (1991); Marsh (2001); Winston & Creamer	4	Coordinate supervisee work activities	The organization, distribution, and integration of work activities within a unit to achieve work related goals

on) of work activities	(1997)			(Bulin, 1995).
Interviewing	Evans (1992); Bulin (1995); Carelli (2004); Certo (1994); Cole (2002); Moglia (1997); Ricks, Ginn, & Daughtrey (1995)	7	Interview candidates for jobs	Communication for a specific purpose where one individual controls the tone and pace of the interaction. There are multiple types of interviews: employment, appraisal, disciplinary, and instruction to name a few (Evans, 1992).
Job analysis and description development	Evans (1992); Jennings (1993); Kirkpatrick (2001); Ricks, Ginn, & Daughtrey (1995)	4	Develop job descriptions	The process of determining and defining the necessary factors required to complete a job in a satisfactory manner. During the process task are determined, responsibilities are identified, and necessary personal attributes are stated (Evans, 1992; Ricks, Ginn, & Daughtrey, 1995).
Meeting management and facilitation	Bulin (1995); Certo (1994); Cole (2002); Fuller (1994); Glickman, Gordon, & Ross-Gordon (1998); Haynes (1991); Kirkpatrick (2001); Ladew (1998); Leonard & Hilgert (2004)	9	Manage staff meetings	The management and facilitation of an assembly of employees working on job related tasks (Evans, 1992).
Monitoring work	Carroll (1996); Marsh (2001); Von Der Embse (1987); Winston & Creamer (1997)	4	Monitor staff work assignments	Paying attention to the work of employees in order to identify successes, challenges, failures, and opportunities for improvement (Ricks, Ginn, & Daughtrey, 1995).
Organizing	Bulin (1995); Carelli (2004); Emanuel, Gould, & Simpson (1985); Evans (1992); Fuller (1994); Haynes (1991); Jennings (1993); Koren (1996); Moglia (1997); Ricks, Ginn, & Daughtrey (1995); Stock-Ward & Javorek (2003); Winston & Creamer (1998)	12	Organize staff to maximize the accomplishment of unit goals	The process of a supervisor grouping activities to be performed by employees into manageable components and assigning them in such a way as to achieve the unit's goals and objectives (Ricks, Ginn, & Daughtrey, 1995).
Project management	Haynes (1984); Haynes (1991); Stokes & Humphrey (2000)	3	Effectively manage projects to accomplish work related goals	Setting project goals and determining how to effectively manage and meet those goals (Certo, 1994).
Recruitment	Bulin (1995); Cole (2002); Evans (1992); Ricks, Ginn, & Daughtrey (1995)	4	Recruit candidates to fill open positions	The process of building an applicant pool of qualified individuals to fill open staff positions (Bulin, 1995; Ricks, Ginn, & Daughtrey, 1995).
Resource management and acquisition	Bulin (1995); Cole (2002); Fey & Carpenter (1996); Harned & Murphy (1998); Humphrey & Stokes (2000); Kirkpatrick (2001); Ladew (1998); Pajak (1990); Ricks, Ginn, &	11	Manage the acquisition of resources (i.e., personnel, financial, time, facilities) to meet unit goals	Utilize networking, communication, and administrative skills to analyze an environment to determine available resources, acquire resources, and provide one's team with those resources to help them excel and reach unit goals (Humphrey & Stokes, 2000).

	Daughtrey (1995); Saunders & Cooper (1999); Saunders, Cooper, Winston, Chernow (2000)			
Staffing	Bulin (1995); Carr (1989); Cole (2002); Emanuel, Gould, & Simpson (1985); Garubo & Rothstein (1998); Haynes (1991); Kirkpatrick (2001); Leonard & Hilgert (2004); Ricks, Ginn, & Daughtrey (1995); Schneider (1998); Von Der Embse (1987)	6	Implement staff selection methods	The administrative process of obtaining and maintaining a capable workforce that can meet the goals of the organization (Bulin, 1995).
Time management	Bulin (1995); Certo (1994); Cole (2002); Emanuel, Gould, & Simpson (1985); Evans (1992); Fuller (1994); Haynes (1991); Ladew (1998); Leonard & Hilgert (2004); Ricks, Ginn, & Daughtrey (1995); Winston & Creamer (1998)	11	Effectively manage time to complete supervisory responsibilities	The practices of controlling the way a supervisor as well as the supervisor's employees utilize time in order to complete work related tasks (Certo, 1994).
Training	Certo (1994); Carelli (2004); Cole (2002); Dalton (1996); Evans (1992); Fuller (1994); Haynes (1991); Kirkpatrick (2001); Ladew (1998); Moglia (1997); Ricks, Ginn, & Daughtrey (1995); Schneider (1998); Smith (2005); Stock-Ward & Javorek (2003); Upcraft (1988)	15	Direct staff training programs	Supervisor directed experiences and activities developed to provide staff with skills and knowledge to complete job responsibilities in an effective manner (Dunkel & Schreiber, 1990; Ricks, Ginn, & Daughtrey, 1995).

Category 4: Conceptual

Skill	Citations	# of Citations	Stem	Definition
Change management	Daresh (1989); Evans (1992); Kirkpatrick (2001); Ricks, Ginn, & Daughtrey (1995); Ladew (1998)	5	Aid staff to effectively manage change	The process of managing unplanned and or systematic planned change within an organization (Ricks, Ginn, & Daughtrey, 1995).
Decision making	Bulin (1995); Certo (1994); Evans (1992); Fuller (1994); Jennings (1993); Kirkpatrick (2001); Leonard & Hilgert (2004); Moglia (1997); Ricks, Ginn, & Daughtrey (1995)	9	Ability to implement decisions you make in a supervisory capacity	Decision making consists of: identifying concerns, gathering information regarding the concern, identifying possible resolution methods, and weighing the pros and cons of each choice in order to determine a course of action to address an issue or concern (Fuller, 1994).
Employee professional	Bunker & Wijnberg (1998); Haynes (1991);	16	Utilize appropriate	Enhancing an employee's abilities in order to improve his or her future job

Development and performance improvement	Humphrey & Stokes (2000); Kirkpatrick (2001); Ricks, Ginn, & Daughtrey, 1995		techniques to aid in the development of supervisees	performance (Ricks, Ginn, & Daughtrey, 1995).
Environmental management	Bulin (1995); Ladew (1998); Ricks, Ginn, & Daughtrey (1995) Saunders, Cooper, Winston, & Chernow (2000)	4	Assist staff with the management of various environmental (intrinsic and extrinsic) factors	The management and monitoring of the human and nonhuman resources in an organization and the interaction among those resources with the environment (Ricks, Ginn, & Daughtrey, 1995).
Forecasting	Bulin (1995); Evans (1992); Ricks, Ginn, & Daughtrey (1995)	3	Utilize forecasting (prediction) techniques to anticipate unit staffing needs	Critically looking into the future through prediction and analysis techniques to determine future staffing needs (Koren, 1996; Ricks, Ginn, & Daughtrey, 1995).
Goal setting, development, and implementation	Carelli (2004); Cole (2002); Creamer & Janosik (2003); Creamer & Winston (1999); Dalton (1996); Dalton (2003); Evans (1992); Frye & Dean (2007); Fuller (1994); Janosik & Creamer (2003); Ladew (1998); Marsh (2001); Moglia (1997); Saunders, Cooper, Winston, & Chernow (2000); Smith (2005); Winston & Creamer (1997); Stock-Ward & Jaorek (2003); Winston & Creamer (1998); Winston & Hirt (2003)	19	Implement developed unit goals	The process of establishing specific priorities to be achieved, deciding what needs to be accomplished, determining completion deadlines, and assigning priority levels for each goal in relation to the unit's mission (Fuller, 1994).
Innovation/creativity	Evans (1992); Hirt & Winston (2003); Winston & Creamer (1998); Winston & Hirt (2003)	4	Use appropriate techniques to promote supervisee creativity (innovation)	The ability to invent new programs, techniques, services, or events in relation to the work environment.
Interpretation	Dalton (2003); Greer & Plunkett (2000); Schneider (1998)	3	Interpret institutional policies (procedures) to address staff concerns	The process of accepting, perceiving, and organizing the many messages that a supervisor is required to address and provide prospective on those messages to his or her staff (Bulin, 1995).
Leadership	Bulin (1995); Certo (1994); Dalton (2000); Daresh (1989); Evans (1992); Haynes (1991); Jennings (1993); Kirkpatrick (2001); Koren (1996); Ladew (1998); Moglia (1997); Ricks, Ginn, & Daughtrey (1995);	14	Practice applicable strategies to serve as a leader to supervisees	The process of motivating and inspiring employees to work together to accomplish unit goals (Ricks, Ginn, & Daughtrey, 1995).

	Schuh & Carlisle (1991); Winston & Creamer (1998)			
Planning (general and strategic)	Arminio & Creamer (2001); Bulin (1995); Bunker & Wijnberg (1998); Carr (1989); Emanuel, Gould, & Simpson (1985); Evans (1992); Frye & Dean (2007); Glickman, Gordon, & Ross-Gordon (1998); Harned & Murphy (1998); Haynes (1991); Jennings (1993); Kirkpatrick (2001); Koren (1996); Ladew (1998); Leonard & Hilgert (2004); Ricks, Ginn, & Daughtrey (1995); Smith (2005); Stock-Ward & Javorek (2003); Von Der Embse (1987); Winston & Creamer (2002); Winston & Hirt (2003)	21	Make use of appropriate strategic planning techniques	The development, structuring, and organization of plans and steps by which short and long range organizational goals can be achieved (Dunkel & Schreiber, 1990).
Problem solving	Bulin (1995); Bunker & Wijnberg (1998); Carelli (2004); Certo (1994); Cole (2002); Emanuel, Gould, & Simpson (1985); Evans (1992); Garubo & Rothstein (1998); Glickman, Gordon, & Ross-Gordon (1998); Marsh (2001); Moglia (1997); Pajak (1990); Ricks, Ginn, & Daughtrey (1995); Saunders, Cooper, Winston, & Chernow (2000); Von Der Embse (1987); Winston & Creamer (1997); Winston & Creamer (2002)	17	Use appropriate techniques to solve work related problems	The act of determining the appropriate course of action to manage and address a matter of concern (Ricks, Ginn, & Daughtrey, 1995).
Reorganization	Dalton (2003); Marsh (2001); Winston & Creamer (2002)	3	Reorganize staff responsibilities to achieve unit goals	A function that restructures work groups, reallocates resources, or reassigns work to better achieve unit goals (Bulin, 1995; Certo, 1994; Ricks, Ginn, & Daughtrey, 1995).
Vision development	Armino & Creamer (2001); Dalton (2003); Pajak (1990)	3	Develop a vision for your area of responsibility	The act of developing a long-range organizational direction and course of action that motivates employees to complete unit goals (Certo, 1994).

APPENDIX O

PARTICIPATING ACUHO-I INSTITUTIONS

1	Arizona State University
2	Baylor University
3	Boston University
4	California State University-Chico
5	California University of Pennsylvania
6	Calvin College
7	Central Michigan University
8	Cleveland State University
9	Colorado State University-Pueblo
10	Eastern Illinois University
11	Florida Atlantic University
12	Florida Southern College
13	Framingham State College
14	Georgetown University
15	Georgia Southern University
16	Gettysburg College
17	Hollins University
18	Humboldt State University
19	Illinois Wesleyan University
20	Iowa State University
21	Ithaca College
22	John Carroll University
23	Kansas State University
24	Kennesaw State University
25	Kent State University
26	Lehigh University
27	Longwood University
28	Longwood University
29	Louisiana State University
30	Lynn University
31	Marquette University
32	Marquette University
33	Maryland Institute College of Art
34	Massachusetts College of Pharmacy & Health Sciences
35	Mercer University
36	Missouri State University
37	Morehead College
38	New York University
39	North Carolina State University
40	Northern Kentucky University
41	Oxford College of Emory University
42	Rochester Institute of Technology
43	Rochester Institute of Technology
44	Rutgers, State University of NJ-Camden Campus

45	San Jose State University
46	Seattle University
47	Shawnee State University
48	Southern Methodist University
49	St. Cloud State University
50	State University of New York at Plattsburgh
51	SUNY Fredonia
52	SUNY Geneseo
53	Texas A & M University
54	Texas Tech
55	The Ohio State University
56	The University of Akron
57	The University of Iowa
58	The University of Mississippi
59	The University of Tampa
60	The University of Vermont
61	Trinity University
62	Truman State University
63	Union College
64	University of California at Berkeley
65	University of California-Los Angeles
66	University of California-Santa Barbara
67	University of Central Oklahoma
68	University of Denver
69	University of Georgia
70	University of Louisville
71	University of Maryland Baltimore County
72	University of Maryland College Park
73	University of Massachusetts at Amherst
74	University of Massachusetts at Amherst
75	University of Minnesota-Twin Cities
76	University of Missouri
77	University of Nevada, Reno
78	University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill
79	University of North Carolina at Charlotte
80	University of South Florida
81	University of St. Thomas
82	University of Texas at Austin
83	University of Utah
84	University of West Florida
85	University of Wisconsin-La Crosse
86	University of Wisconsin-Madison
87	University of Wisconsin-Stevens Point
88	University of Wisconsin-Stout
89	Valdosta State University
90	Washington University in St. Louis
91	Western Kentucky University
92	Western Michigan University

93	Western Oregon University
94	Western Washington University
95	Yavapai College

APPENDIX P
DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION

Variable	n	Percent*
<u>Gender</u>		
Male	41	2.8%
Female	61	38.7%
Transgender	1	0.9%
Missing	3	2.8%
<u>Ethnicity</u>		
African American	10	9.4%
Asian/Pacific Islander	6	5.7%
Caucasian	81	76.4%
Hispanic/Latino/Latina	1	0.9%
Native American	1	0.9%
Multiracial	2	1.9%
Other	2	1.9%
Missing	3	2.8%
<u>Held a Graduate Assistantship</u>		
Yes	104	98.1%
No	1	0.9%
Missing	1	0.9%
<u>Housing/Residence Life Graduate Assistantship</u>		
Yes	91	85.8%

No	13	12.3%
Missing	1	0.9%
<u>Supervisory Responsibilities During Graduate School</u>		
Yes	92	86.8%
No	11	10.4%
Missing	3	2.8%
<u>Months of Employment</u>		
0-2	2	1.9%
3-6	1	0.9%
6-9	90	84.9%
10-12	10	9.4%
Missing	3	2.8%
<u>Work Full-Time Prior to Graduate School</u>		
Yes	41	38.7%
No	64	60.4%
Missing	1	0.9%
<u>Supervisory Responsibilities Pre-Masters Full-Time Job</u>		
Yes	19	17.9%
No	22	20.8%
Missing	64	60.4%
Valid	1	0.9%

**Note.* Percent calculated with the missing items included in the data set