

JANIE SHAY DAVIS

Perceptions of Critical Skills of Chief Student Affairs Officers  
(Under the Direction of DIANE L. COOPER)

The purposes of this study were to (a) identify themes in the literature with respect to critical skills of the Chief Student Affairs Officer (CSAO), (b) assess the perceptions of CSAOs about the importance of each of the critical skills identified, (c) assess the perceptions of CSAOs about the individual philosophies guiding their day-to-day work, and (d) determine if there are differences in the importance CSAOs placed on critical skills based on their guiding philosophy.

The CSAOs at NASPA member institutions in Regions II and III were surveyed using the *Chief Student Affairs Officer Critical Skills Inventory* developed by the researcher. Four hundred and ninety-one NASPA Voting Delegates (CSAOs) were mailed the survey and 256 returned the survey for a 52% response rate. CSAOs were asked to rate the importance of 69 critical skills and rank the three guiding philosophies (student services, student development, student learning) in order of importance both in their day-to-day work and in an ideal setting. Responses included 102 women (40%) and 152 men (60%); 208 (82%) Caucasian CSAOs and 46 (18%) CSAOs of Color; 142 (55%) CSAOs were in their first five years in their current position; 165 CSAOs (65%) held only one position; and 173 (68%) had earned a doctorate.

For their day-to-day work, CSAOs were evenly divided as to their guiding philosophy with 37% choosing student services, 39% choosing student learning, and 24% choosing student development. For an ideal environment, 12% of CSAOs selected student services, 56% chose student learning, and 32% chose student development. When examining the importance placed on critical skills with respect to gender, ethnicity,

years of professional experience at the time of attaining the first CSAO position, tenure in position, field of degree, reporting category (whether they report to the president or provost), Carnegie classification of institution, and guiding philosophy, many responses were statistically significant. The skill rated the most important was “maintain integrity in decision making.” The skill rated the lowest was “hold office in professional associations.”

INDEX WORDS: Chief student affairs officer, Critical skills, Management, Student personnel services, Guiding philosophy, Higher education administration

PERCEPTIONS OF CRITICAL SKILLS OF CHIEF STUDENT AFFAIRS OFFICERS

by

JANIE SHAY DAVIS

B. A., Baylor University, 1991

M. S., Oklahoma State University, 1994

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

2002

© 2002

Janie Shay Davis

All Rights Reserved

PERCEPTIONS OF CRITICAL SKILLS OF CHIEF STUDENT AFFAIRS OFFICERS

by

JANIE SHAY DAVIS

Approved:

Major Professor: Diane L. Cooper

Committee: Merrily S. Dunn  
Rosemary Phelps  
Patricia Daugherty  
Thomas Burke

Electronic Version Approved:

Maureen Grasso  
Dean of the Graduate School  
The University of Georgia  
December 2002

## DEDICATION

This manuscript is dedicated in honor of my parents, Colonel (Retired) and Mrs. Charles Taylor Davis. They have made many sacrifices on my behalf over the years. Although those sacrifices are too numerous to mention here, their constant love and support both for me and for each other provided a strong foundation for me to achieve this goal. Thank you, Mom and Dad, for all you have done and for never wavering in your belief that I was capable of earning this degree!

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

First, I must thank Dr. Diane L. Cooper, my major professor, for all her support and encouragement over the last four and a half years. She has constantly challenged me and pushed me to achieve my highest expectations while at the same time never failing in her belief in my abilities. She has regularly set aside time to meet with me so that I could stay on track and complete all the requirements for this degree. I certainly could not have accomplished this task without her support. Thank you, Diane, for keeping me headed in the right direction all these years!

To the other members of my committee Dr. Thomas Burke, Dr. Pat Daugherty, Dr. Merrily Dunn, and Dr. Rosemary Phelps I owe numerous thanks for their support and patience. Each has supported me in different ways by editing papers for class, this manuscript, and my publishable paper; meeting with me individually to discuss the methodology for this and other projects; asking me how I was doing and how I was making progress; and spending one-on-one time to discuss the results of this project. Thank you for all the things each of you has done! In addition to these committee members, Dr. Roger Winston and Dr. Sue Saunders served on my committee earlier in my doctoral program, and, even though they are no longer serving as official members of my doctoral committee, I appreciate all they did to support me in the classroom and to help me see the rewards of being a scholar who is also a practitioner.

As a part-time doctoral student, I could not have been successful without the support of my supervisors and department head. Dr. Jim Day, Director of University

Housing, has always encouraged staff to pursue additional degrees and education, and his support of me has been unwavering. Thank you for giving me release time to attend classes and participate in research teams. Ms. Cindi Avery and Mr. Rick Gibson served as my direct supervisors at different times while I pursued this degree, and they each supported me throughout this process. I appreciate their willingness to allow me to work a modified work schedule at some times and to fill in for me when my academic responsibilities took me away from the residence halls. Finally, I must acknowledge the other staff in University Housing for their encouragement and support.

Several individuals offered their support to my dissertation research. Dr. Bobbi Lathrop, Director of Student Life Studies, worked to put my survey on the Division of Student Affairs web site which simplified the data collection and analysis process. Mr. Mike Campbell also assisted in the technical aspects of putting the survey on-line. Dr. Richard H. Mullendore, Vice President for Student Affairs and Associate Provost, wrote a letter of support for this project, which was mailed to all participants. Dr. Alice Mitchell in the National Association of Student Personnel Administrators (NASPA) Office was instrumental in providing me with mailing labels as well as approval from NASPA to conduct this research. I feel certain this project would not have been completed as successfully as it has been without each of the unique contributions of these individuals.

One of the qualities of my doctoral program that is important to me is that of a supportive cohort of students. I appreciate all the words of support and wisdom from each of you. To those students who went ahead of me, thank you for sharing all those



unwritten “little things” you learned along the way. I appreciate each of you, and I have learned so much from our discussions! Lastly, I want especially to thank Ralphel L. Smith for his constant support. We began new jobs at the University of Georgia at the same time, and we began the doctoral program at the same time. Thank you, Ralphel, for inspiring me to pursue this degree and for being the catalyst for me to get all the paperwork together to apply to the program. I have learned so much from you!

Finally, I want to thank my family. My parents have been a strong support system not only through the doctoral program but always. Their love and support is most appreciated. My brother, Taylor, and sister-in-law, Amy, have shown support and patience to me throughout this experience and I am grateful. Many other family members have sent me supportive notes and verbally encouraged me in my pursuit of this degree. Thanks to each of you for all you have done to show me that you believed in me. I could not have done it without you!

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS .....	v
LIST OF TABLES .....	xi
CHAPTER	
1 INTRODUCTION .....	1
Statement of the Problem .....	3
Purpose of the Study .....	3
Research Questions and Hypotheses .....	4
Operational Definitions .....	6
Limitations .....	9
Significance .....	10
Chapter Summary .....	11
2 REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE .....	12
History of the CSAO Position .....	12
Descriptive Studies on the CSAO .....	15
Prior Experience of CSAOs .....	20
CSAO Job Functions .....	22
Competencies in Management and Higher Education .....	23
Chapter Summary .....	31
3 METHODOLOGY .....	33

The Critical Skills Identified .....	33
Instrumentation .....	44
Participants .....	46
Data Collection .....	46
Data Analysis .....	47
4 RESULTS .....	51
Statistical Power .....	53
Analysis of the Scales .....	53
Research Question 1 .....	54
Research Question 2; Null Hypothesis 1 .....	59
Research Question 2; Null Hypothesis 2 .....	71
Research Question 2; Null Hypothesis 3 .....	77
Research Question 2; Null Hypothesis 4 .....	77
Research Question 2; Null Hypothesis 5 .....	83
Research Question 2; Null Hypothesis 6 .....	89
Research Question 2; Null Hypothesis 7 .....	89
Research Question 2; Null Hypothesis 8 .....	89
Research Question 3; Null Hypothesis 9 .....	102
Research Question 3; Null Hypothesis 10 .....	102
Research Question 3; Null Hypothesis 11 .....	102
Research Question 3; Null Hypothesis 12 .....	102
Research Question 4 .....	102

Research Question 5 .....	104
Chapter Summary .....	111
5 CONCLUSION .....	114
Summary of the Study .....	114
Summary of Significant Findings .....	115
Discussion of Findings .....	122
Implications for Practice .....	128
Need for Future Research .....	132
Chapter Summary .....	133
REFERENCES .....	135
APPENDICES	
A CHIEF STUDENT AFFAIRS OFFICERS CRITICAL SKILLS	
INVENTORY COVER LETTER .....	149
B UNIVERSITY OF GEORGIA CSAO LETTER OF SUPPORT .....	151
C CHIEF STUDENT AFFAIRS OFFICER CRITICAL SKILLS	
INVENTORY .....	152
D REMINDER POSTCARD .....	156

## LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1	Source in Literature for Each Critical Skill . . . . . 34
2	Demographic Characteristics of the Sample . . . . . 55
3	Statistical Power . . . . . 60
4	Reliability Analysis for the Seven Scales (Alpha) . . . . . 61
5	Ordered Critical Skills by Mean . . . . . 62
6	Independent $t$ -test for Gender (Hypothesis 1) . . . . . 66
7	Independent $t$ -test for Ethnicity (Hypothesis 2) . . . . . 72
8	Pearson Correlation Coefficients for Years in Position and Experience Upon Attainment of CSAO Position with the Critical Skills (Hypotheses 3 and 4) . . . 78
9	Independent $t$ -test for Field of Degree (Hypothesis 5) . . . . . 84
10	Independent $t$ -test for CSAO Reporting Category (Hypothesis 7) . . . . . 90
11	ANOVA Results for Differences in Perceived Importance of the Critical Skills Based on Carnegie Classification of Institution (Hypothesis 8) . . . . . 96
12	ANOVA Results for Differences in Perceived Importance of Critical Skills Based on the Guiding Philosophy Ranking (Research Question 4) . . . . . 105
13	Summary of Significant Findings . . . . . 112

## CHAPTER 1

### INTRODUCTION

In 1890, the first dean of students was appointed at Harvard (Appleton, Briggs, & Rhatigan, 1978). At that time, specific duties for the dean were not yet clearly developed, although having a dean to handle disciplinary situations and to take a personal interest in the students had become necessary. It might have been difficult for this first dean of students to imagine the complexity and challenges faced by those in the same position today, more than a century later. Legal constraints, larger and more intricate student affairs units, older and more diverse students, financial aid considerations, and the increasing complexity of the political climate of the academy are all realities of today's chief student affairs officer. In order to train future professionals to be successful in the political climate of the institution, and to be aware of what is required to position the student affairs unit as an essential one in the larger picture of the academic and support units on campus, a better understanding of the skills necessary to perform this role on college campuses is needed.

The administrator charged with the responsibility for students and campus life is the Chief Student Affairs Officer (CSAO), sometimes referred to as the Senior Student Affairs Officer (SSAO). The individual overseeing the student affairs unit may hold a number of titles, including but not limited to Vice President for Student Affairs, Vice President for Student Services, Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs, or Dean of Students. Units typically reporting to the CSAO include financial aid, orientation, student activities,

housing, Greek life, leadership programs, campus recreation, health center, judicial programs, and multicultural programs. Most of the units shaping the campus co-curricular life report to the CSAO. Defining the role of the CSAO and the skills necessary to be successful in that role is critical to achieving an overall understanding of the political, bureaucratic, and organizational issues in the institution.

What skills are essential for the CSAO's role in the academy? For younger professionals aspiring to become a CSAO, what skills should they be sharpening? Are communication skills important? What about the role of the CSAO as a politician? What leadership skills are critical? What relationships or issues should the CSAO focus upon? Although some research exists on the CSAO, such as the career path to becoming a CSAO, descriptive studies outlining the demographics of those holding the CSAO position, and the role that gender plays in perceptions of CSAO critical skills, little research has been conducted on the critical skills of the CSAO within the last twenty years.

In recent years, funding of higher education has been dropping significantly as elementary and secondary education, along with departments of correction, face more and more challenging problems that require additional funds. As politicians talk during their political campaigns, the focus seems to be on all important societal issues other than higher education. In addition, the economy is in a state of uncertainty. In this time of tightening budgets and reprioritizing tasks, the work of student affairs staff has come under increased scrutiny. Given the political backdrop of the academy, the CSAO should be aware of the skills needed to be successful in this position.

### Statement of the Problem

Although one author has offered his suggestions on the qualities needed (Sandeen, 1991; Sandeen, 2001), no recent empirical research has been conducted which identifies critical skills. Studies have been published in which stress and life satisfaction of CSAOs were examined. Also, descriptive studies were published in the 1970s outlining who held CSAO positions, how student affairs was organized, and what educational backgrounds CSAOs had. The earlier roles of the dean of students, as well as the dean of men and dean of women, at colleges in the early twentieth century have been explored. Finally, career paths and the career ladder in student affairs have been researched.

Only limited work, however, has been dedicated to examining CSAO skills. Several scholars studied this question of CSAO competencies more than fifteen years ago (O'Brien, 1977; Ryan, 1983; Spigner-Littles, 1985). Ryan and Spigner-Littles evaluated CSAO performance with their findings. Much has changed in higher education since the latest study in 1985, and more work is needed in this area. Analoui, Labbaf, and Noorbakhsh (2000) state that "the contributions made towards further understanding of the perception and needs of the senior managers for their increased effectiveness will hopefully lead to practical results for the improved performance of the organization as the whole" (p. 220-221). As professionals, we can learn much by continuing to explore the issue of CSAO skills.

### Purpose of the Study

The purposes of this study are to (a) identify current themes in the literature with respect to critical skills of the CSAO, (b) assess the perceptions of CSAOs about the



importance of each of the critical skills identified in the literature review, (c) assess the perceptions of CSAOs about their individual philosophies guiding ‘the work and resources of their divisions’ (Ender, Newton, & Caple, 1996; p. 8), and (d) determine if there are any differences in the importance CSAOs placed on critical skills based on the guiding philosophy.

The study will focus on CSAOs working at institutions on the East Coast of the United States. This area is defined by regions II and III of the National Association of Student Personnel Administrators (NASPA). Voting Delegates (all of whom are CSAOs) as identified by the NASPA Office will be the target of the survey.

#### Research Questions and Hypotheses

The key research questions (RQ) and null hypotheses ( $H_0$ ) of this study are:

RQ 1: What are the critical skills needed to be a chief student affairs officer as identified in the literature?

RQ 2: How important are the CSAO critical skills as identified in the literature, according to current CSAOs?

$H_01$ : There will be no differences in perceptions of the importance of critical skills based on the gender of the CSAOs.

$H_02$ : There will be no differences in perceptions of the importance of critical skills based on the ethnicity of the CSAOs.

$H_03$ : There will be no correlation in perceptions of the importance of critical skills based on length of time in position.

H<sub>0</sub>4: There will be no correlation in perceptions of the importance of critical skills based on the years of professional experience upon attainment of the first CSAO position.

H<sub>0</sub>5: There will be no differences in perceptions of the importance of critical skills based on field of degree.

H<sub>0</sub>6: There will be no differences in perceptions of the importance of critical skills based on whether or not the CSAO is currently in his or her first CSAO position or has held more than one CSAO position.

H<sub>0</sub>7: There will be no differences in perceptions of the importance of critical skills based on whether the CSAO reports directly to the president or provost.

H<sub>0</sub>8: There will be no differences in perceptions of the importance of critical skills based on Carnegie classification of the CSAO's employing institution.

RQ 3: What are the perceptions of CSAOs with respect to the individual philosophies guiding their work in the student affairs division?

H<sub>0</sub>9: There are no differences in the guiding philosophies of CSAOs based on Carnegie classification.

H<sub>0</sub>10: There are no differences in the guiding philosophies of male and female CSAOs.

H<sub>0</sub>11: There are no differences in the guiding philosophies of CSAOs who have been in this position for more than five years and those who have been in this position for fewer than five years.

H<sub>0</sub>12: There are no differences in the guiding philosophies of CSAOs based on whether the CSAO reports directly to the president or provost.

RQ 4: Are there differences in the importance CSAOs place on the critical skills based on their individual guiding philosophies (student services model, student development model, or a student learning model)?

RQ 5: Is engagement in professional development activities seen as important by CSAOs?

### Operational Definitions

There are many definitions that are important to articulate for this study. The following definitions will provide clarification and a framework for the impending discussions reported in this study.

#### The CSAO and NASPA Voting Delegate

The Chief Student Affairs Officer (CSAO) is the highest ranking professional in the division of student affairs. This person is responsible for all activities and functions of the units comprising the division of student affairs. NASPA, one of the major professional organizations in student affairs, requires an institutional fee for membership. The senior professional in the division of student affairs is designated by NASPA as the Voting Delegate. For member institutions, the Voting Delegate casts one vote on behalf of the institution he or she represents. In summary, all Voting Delegates are CSAOs; however, only those CSAOs who are employed at NASPA member institutions are Voting Delegates. Many postsecondary institutions are members of NASPA. For the

purposes of this study, the terms CSAO and Voting Delegate will be used interchangeably.

### Critical Skills

As will be explained in more detail in Chapter 3, the first phase of this study involved a review of the current literature concerning the CSAO position. Throughout this process, themes outlining the skills necessary to be an effective chief student affairs officer were identified. Many scholars noted skills and abilities required of the CSAO. For the purposes of this study, these critical skills are those (categorized under seven major theme areas) that were identified in this analysis. These critical skills will be shown to CSAOs in order to obtain their perceptions of the importance of each skill.

### Guiding Philosophy

There has been much debate over the last several years with the publication of *The Student Learning Imperative: Implications for Student Affairs* (American College Personnel Association, 1994). What should the focus of a division of student affairs be? Ender, Newton, and Caple (1996) have identified three major models that guide student affairs work. The Student Services Model espouses the idea that providing services to students supports the academic success of students in the classroom. Professionals working within this framework “seek to meet the basic needs of students” (p. 8). Secondly, Ender, Newton, and Caple identified the Student Development Model. Staff using this guiding philosophy are focused on structuring programming and services in a way that addresses students’ developmental needs as defined by various psychosocial, person-environment interaction, moral-ethical, and cognitive theorists. Finally, the focus

of the Student Learning Model is on creating a collegiate environment where faculty, administrators, and students are all working and living in a seamless learning environment. Importance is placed on creating an academic climate throughout the campus. For this study, assessing these three guiding philosophies will serve as a foundation for measuring the importance of CSAO critical skills.

### Institutional Type

Institutional type will be defined according to the Carnegie classification (Carnegie Foundation, 2000). The first classification is Doctorate-granting Institution. These universities are comprehensive, research institutions that grant doctoral degrees in a variety of areas. Second is the Master's College/University. These institutions offer a wide variety of baccalaureate programs as well as graduate programs through the master's degree. The Baccalaureate Colleges are primarily undergraduate colleges with a focus on granting liberal arts degrees. The Associate's Colleges are the colleges that offer associate's degrees and certificate programs. Finally, Specialized Institutions have a concentrated focus on particular technical skills.

### Educational Background

For the purposes of this study, educational background is defined as the field of study of the highest degree earned by the CSAO. The degree ( e.g., higher education, student affairs administration, or history) will be assessed. In addition, whether the highest degree earned by the CSAO is a Ph.D./Ed.D., a master's degree, or a professional degree will be ascertained. Analysis of the data will include both level of degree earned and the field of study of the highest degree earned.

### Tenure in Position

Two aspects of tenure in position are utilized in this study. The first component is the length of time a participant has held the CSAO position. Responses from CSAOs will be examined in terms of whether or not their tenure in position is less than or more than five years. The second component is whether or not a participant has held more than one CSAO position.

### Reporting Structure

For this study, the reporting structure of the CSAO is defined in terms of who supervises the CSAO. Whether the CSAO reports directly to the President/Chancellor or to a Provost, Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs, Senior Vice President for Business Affairs or another administrator will be determined.

### Limitations

There are several limitations to this study. These include the fact that there is no actual measure of CSAO performance; only CSAOs are asked to rate the importance of critical skills, and only NASPA voting delegates in two regions on the East Coast will be surveyed.

First, no attempt is made in this study to establish a relationship between the importance participants place on critical skills and performance of CSAOs. Good or effective performance of a CSAO is difficult to define, and articulating measures of effective performance are even more challenging to describe and assess. Since a noticeable gap in the literature has been noted regarding the length of time since CSAO

critical skills were reviewed and identified, this study is focused only on understanding CSAO perceptions of the importance of critical skills.

Second, only current CSAOs are asked to rate the importance of the skills noted in the literature. Student affairs department heads, the CSAO's supervisors, and college presidents might offer different perspectives that are not captured in this study. Since this area of research is still in its infancy, this limitation should be strongly considered in orchestrating future research designs.

Furthermore, the Voting Delegates included in the sample for this study are from institutions on the East Coast. With this in mind, how generalizable are these results in regard to CSAOs at institutions beyond this geographical area? It is assumed that the sample will reflect the general population (NASPA member institutions) and CSAOs (NASPA Voting Delegates), but this may not be the case.

### Significance

The results of this study can make significant contributions to our understanding of the critical skills needed by a CSAO. The examination of the relationship (or lack thereof) between critical skills identified in the literature and the importance placed on those skills by current CSAOs can be informative for both current CSAOs and those professionals aspiring to be CSAOs in the future. Professional organizations can utilize this information in planning professional development experiences for those professionals. This can also lead to the development of a future strain of research that will only deepen our understanding of the complexities of the management of the student affairs division.

Knowing and understanding the skills needed and required of CSAOs is also important within the context of examining the overall relationship between student affairs and other campus units. This study can provide a piece in the foundation of knowledge that will enable student affairs to position itself as a significant contributor to the mission of the institution and to higher education in general.

### Chapter Summary

The role of the Chief Student Affairs Officer is a complex one. Both the position and the role the CSAO plays in the institution have changed dramatically since the position's inception in the late nineteenth century. Although there are many ways to assess the skills required of the CSAO, this study will focus on three main areas: review of the literature for critical skills, assessing the perceptions of CSAOs concerning the critical skills identified in the literature, and an assessment of CSAOs' individual guiding philosophies of the division of student affairs. It is anticipated that this study will contribute to the gap in the literature concerning CSAO competencies and provide one aspect of knowledge surrounding the increasing complexities and challenges of the CSAO position and its corresponding role in the academy.



## CHAPTER 2

### REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

#### History of the CSAO Position

In 1915, Lois Kimball Mathews wrote a book entitled *The Dean of Women*. Notably, this was the first book of its kind describing the responsibilities of a student personnel worker. She describes the role of the Dean of Women as being, “the care and supervision of women students” (p. 1). Sturtevant and Hayes authored a book in 1930 that gave more practical advice to deans of women. This text is filled with suggestions for filing systems, how to manage an office efficiently, and the oversight of residence halls. While the role of the CSAO has evolved since these writings, critical skills of the CSAO have been discussed only minimally in the literature. Throughout the late 1960' s and into the 1970' s, most articles on the CSAO in the field's major journals, *NASPA Journal* or *The Journal of College Student Personnel*, discussed the necessity of the role of the CSAO. From personal essays on the position (Evans, 1974; Hecklinger, 1972; Lavendar, 1972; Trueheart, 1977) to a deeper analysis (Bloland, 1979; Eberle & Muston, 1969; Rueckel, 1971), most of the literature was descriptive of both the role of the CSAO as well as the individuals holding the position.

Reflective of the unrest of the nation during the Vietnam War era, student personnel administrators at this time struggled to find their niche in the academy. The student personnel profession had abandoned its philosophy of *in loco parentis*, and professionals still grappled with what would be the new calling of the profession.

Professional meetings during the time were filled with articles on these new challenges, as well as a call to achieve the goals set forth many years before in the 1937 *Student Personnel Point of View* published by the American Council on Education. Rueckel (1971) and Eberle and Muston (1969) focused on more specific strategies or recommendations for the CSAO. Rueckel challenged the CSAO to be innovative and to seek out and solve problems on the campus. She also advocated that the CSAO take the lead with faculty in teaching them more about the modern student and the protests of the day. Eberle and Muston concentrated their essay on the CSAO role with the residence halls. Some of their recommendations in dealing with challenges in the residence halls are still relevant to the CSAO today. Incorporating the halls into the academic experience of the academy, promoting research which measures learning and development as it relates to students' participating in hall activities and programs, and encouraging participation in hall programs by all stakeholders on campus are all applicable to today's CSAO as he or she makes programmatic decisions.

As campuses grew in size and complexity during this time, restructuring in student affairs or student services units was inevitable. Some of the implications of these restructuring activities impacted professionals working as deans of women. Whitney (1971) discusses the movement away from an administrative model in which a dean of women and a dean of men served separate, yet parallel functions. Most campuses were moving to a structure that incorporated one dean of students or dean of student affairs. In a survey conducted in 1926, Jones (1928) and Sturtevant and Strang (1928) reported that 83.6 percent of institutions indicated a woman held the position of dean of women.

Ayers, Tripp, and Russel (1966) found that this was true at 70 percent of institutions in their sample nearly forty years later. In addition, Sturtevant, Strang, and Kim (1940) reported that 86 percent of their sample indicated that the dean of women reported directly to the president. By the mid-1960' s, however, Ayers, Tripp, and Russel reported this was true of only 29.5 percent of institutions.

Schwartz (1997) discusses the long history of women in the dean's role. From the first appointment of a dean of women in 1892 to the establishment of the program at Teacher's College, designed especially for women aspiring to be deans of women, women have made significant contributions to the field of student affairs. Jones' (1928) study reported that 75 percent of women holding the title "dean of women" also held academic rank at their institution. More than half of the sample of 238 dean of women also held titles of associate professor or professor. As Schwartz states, "In short, the deans of women were not academic lightweights" (p. 423).

In light of this restructuring taking place across the nation on college campuses, several articles appeared in one of the field's leading journals, *NASPA Journal*. Lavendar (1972) and Hecklinger (1972) wrote essays on the state of the dean of students position. Hecklinger argued that this position is not needed and the custodial functions of the position (such as managing curfews, dress codes, and social regulations) should be eliminated. Also, he advocated that the discipline function should be handed over to those with more training in legal issues and police work. This is a curious recommendation given the widespread student unrest and protests during this time. His comments are in essence a cry to simply have an auxiliary unit to supplement traditional

student affairs departments. Lavendar, on the other hand, envisioned the dean position to play a key role in the academy of the future. He saw the dean's office as one that is ready to respond to the challenges of the day and be responsible for the oversight of key student affairs units.

Scholars throughout the decade of the 1970's continued to waiver with respect to their opinions of the role of the CSAO. Clemens and Akers (1973) called "professionals on each campus . . . to identify, articulate, and state publicly their commitments to students and the campus community, and to implement programs to accomplish them" (p. 218). Interestingly, in an article written in 1974, Evans asserted that there would always be a need for the dean of students. His view was that academic administrators will always want the student affairs staff handling the student protests, mental health issues, discipline cases or angry parents. He also advocated working closely with faculty and students in each functional unit. Trueheart (1977) presented a rather cynical contrast to Evans' essay on the CSAO. Trueheart bemoaned the routine politics of the institution, the low pay and minimal benefits, and even the adversarial relationship he had at times with the students.

#### Descriptive Studies on the CSAO

In a key survey conducted in 1972, Brooks and Avila reported descriptive data on the CSAOs surveyed. Fewer than half (47 %) held a doctorate, while 44% held a Master's degree. The most common title for the CSAOs completing this survey was "dean of students." Very few women (9%) and even fewer persons of color (4%) held the title of CSAO. "Fifty-six percent of the chief student personnel administrators reported

that they hold academic rank” (p. 44). The results of this survey also support the information previously presented in that most institutions were working under one unit to assist both male and female students. The titles of dean of men and dean of women were found in less than one fourth of the institutions responding. Membership in the National Association of Student Personnel Administrators (NASPA) was the most cited professional association.

The Brooks and Avila (1972) article was the first in a series of articles published in the *NASPA Journal* over the course of the next decade which reported descriptive information on the CSAO position. Crookston (1974) examined the use of titles by the CSAOs at NASPA institutions in 1962 and 1972 by reviewing the NASPA membership rosters of those years. The title “vice president” began emerging more significantly as it was reported by 18 % of institutions as the title of the CSAO. Crookston also notes, however, “the most frequently used title is ‘dean of students’, which has remained constant over 20 years: 50 % in 1972, 51 % in 1962; and the same percentage was found in a 1950 study by Carroll” (p. 4). Although professional organizations continued the use of the word ‘personnel’ in their titles, Crookston found that “only 4 % of CSAOs used the word in their titles in both 1962 and 1972 NASPA rosters, a marked contrast to the appearance of ‘personnel’ in 32 % of the titles identified in the 1950 Carroll study” (p. 5).

By 1980, Paul and Hoover noted changes in several trends noted in prior research. The primary focus of their study included age, sex, title, institutional type, training type, training level, recency of degree, and length of CSAO experience. “The title ‘dean of students’ is no longer the prevalent title of CSPAs [CSAOs], having been replaced by

‘vice president for student affairs’” (p. 34). Specifically, 76 % reported the ‘vice president’ title, while only 24 % noted the ‘dean of students’ title.

As previously stated, Brooks and Avila (1972) found that 47 % of CSAOs held a doctorate. In 1980, Paul and Hoover reported 82 % of CSAOs had doctorates. Brooks and Avila found the mean number of years in the CSAO position to be 4.25. Eight years later, Paul and Hoover reported this mean as 8.7 years. In 1980, CSAOs were more experienced than those surveyed in 1972. With respect to women in the CSAO position, ‘only 11 % of respondents were women while 89 % were men. Women had not made much progress in penetrating the ranks of the CSAO’ (Paul & Hoover, 1980, p. 37). By 1990, Rossi (as cited in Daugherty, Randall, & Globetti, 1997) reported that only one in four CSAOs was a woman. This figure is particularly discouraging given the increasing numbers of women in the field at all other levels.

Rickard (1985) summarized some trends of the previous decades in his study focusing on titles of CSAOs, gender, and institutional type and size. The following trends actually decreased: use of the ‘dean of students’ title, use of the word ‘personnel’ in titles, and use of ‘academic administration’ titles. On the other hand, the use of ‘vice president’ titles, use of ‘student affairs’ in titles, and the use of ‘student development’ in titles increased. Rickard also noted the use of dual titles in his 1985 study, but this had not been mentioned in any prior study.

Several later studies describing those holding the CSAO position had a narrow focus. California system CSAOs (Blaine, 1997), CSAOs in the southeast (Scharre, 1996), and the history of the CSAO position at one institution (Herdlein, 1985) have all

been the topic of inquiry in recent years. While only twenty CSAOs participated in the Blaine study, he reports that having a terminal degree, being a director of a student affairs unit, and having upper level student affairs experience are all important if one's career goal is to be a CSAO. In a separate study, Scharre sought to profile CSAOs in the Southeast. He focused on the job functions of the CSAO and found that the CSAOs were focused on budget administration, student conduct, and staffing issues. CSAOs reportedly wanted to be learning more about staff development, budgets, student conduct, residence life, and staffing issues. Finally, using a qualitative approach resulting in archival reviews and some interviews, Herdlein examined the CSAO position at the University of Pittsburgh and found that the evolution of this position followed the national trends in management of student affairs work mentioned previously in this chapter.

### Women as CSAOs

There is a collection of articles on women in the CSAO position; these researchers clearly identified as one purpose the focus of studying the female CSAO. Most studies of this type have been published within the last fifteen to twenty years. Given Paul and Hoover's 1980 statistic that only 11 % of CSAOs were female, this should not be surprising. Daugherty, Randall, and Globetti (1997) studied women CSAOs and their Myers-Briggs types. "Women holding the senior student affairs position . . . are predominately NTJ, although NFs make up a higher percentage than is usually seen in executive positions in other fields" (p. 28). More than half of the women were extroverted and a vast majority were 'judging' types.

White (2000) studied female CSAOs and their leadership styles as perceived both by the CSAOs themselves and by their direct reports. Although CSAOs consistently rated themselves higher on the scale over their direct reports, in general both the female CSAOs and their direct reports noted the CSAO leadership style as a transformational one.

In 1986, Finlay studied career advancement of female CSAOs. Men and women responded to her questionnaire, and their opinions varied not only on the skills needed to become a senior administrator but also on the strategies needed to increase female representation in the senior administrative ranks. In another study on career development issues, Anderson (1993) used a qualitative approach to explain women CSAOs' processes of acquiring professional skills and experiences. Women in her study reported not having a balanced personal and professional life and also reported that having a continuous work history and significant involvement in professional organizations were both essential to their career paths.

Lerner (1995) found that women senior administrators were what she called "stacked" into the CSAO role over other senior administrative positions. This practice of limiting the number of minorities in certain types of positions was evident in New England colleges. Although no figures could be found comparing the number of women in CSAO positions in comparison to other senior administrative positions for the same year, this study is curious. Even though the number of women in CSAO positions is low, the question of whether or not women are more represented in our field than in other administrative roles is still unanswered.



As one might expect, job satisfaction combined with sources of stress and coping strategies is another specific area of research on the CSAO (Anderson, 1998; Scott, 1992). In light of mounting pressures to maintain or increase enrollment, the complexity of the campus administration, and the challenge to provide services and support for a more diverse student body, how well our current CSAOs manage all the pressure to succeed should be of great concern. Sandeen's (2001) recent work supports this idea in that one of the three main themes in all of his discussions with CSAOs was the ability to deal with stress positively. Differences in perceptions of stress by male and female CSAOs were evident. Furthermore, the coping strategies utilized by men and women differed as well. Differences between men and women holding the CSAO position were also evident in the job satisfaction research conducted by Anderson (1998). Overall, female CSAOs "were less satisfied with their jobs and lives, and experienced more inter-role conflict, than their male counterparts" (p. ix). A finding worth noting, however, is that Blackhurst, Brandt, and Kalinowski (1998b) found that female CSAOs had greater job satisfaction than women working at other levels of student affairs. Blackhurst, Brandt, and Kalinowski (1998a) also observed that "higher levels of conflict and ambiguity in the work setting were associated with significantly . . . lower life satisfaction" (p. 93) for female CSAOs.

#### Prior Experience of CSAOs

In another area of scholarship, some researchers still doubted the need for specific training in counseling and student personnel. In particular, Bloland (1979) described his assessment of the role of the CSAO. He advocated that almost any individual could

aspire to be a CSAO, given the specific needs of the hiring institution. The administrative function was paramount in this role, and the other areas of counseling, student development, and an emphasis on “the whole student” (American Council on Education, 1937) were secondary. According to Bloland, an educational background in these core areas was not necessary for success.

Another focus of the literature in more recent years has been that of the career path to becoming a CSAO. In other words, what are the essential experiences for an aspiring CSAO? Kuh, Evans, and Duke (1983) state it best, “Because there is no one best . . . way to the top in student affairs we can offer little in the way of advice to those interested in eventually obtaining CSAO positions. Perhaps the best suggestion is to obtain increasingly more responsible management positions . . . ” (p. 46). They found differences in the years of experience, number of positions previously held, and educational backgrounds of CSAOs at both small private colleges and larger public institutions. Ostroth, Efird, and Lerman (1984) would agree with this assertion that there is not one clear path to the CSAO position. Their findings also support Bloland’s (1979) claim that professional preparation in student affairs is not necessary to become a CSAO. Ostroth, Efird, and Lerman note that “one third of the respondents were appointed directly to executive positions without previous experience in the profession” (p. 447). In a similar study, Lunsford (1984) examined “the relationship that the academic training and/or experience as a student personnel professional had on advancement to the position of chief student affairs officer” (p. 49). CSAOs reported that length and variety of job experiences, most recent job experience, quality and strength of references, degrees

earned, and professional/personal network contributed the most to advancement. Several years later, Letts (1988) reported nearly identical findings with respect to these characteristics or qualifications critical to the attainment of the CSAO position. Seventy percent of the respondents held a terminal degree (mostly reported as either a Ph.D. or an Ed.D.) in the Lunsford study. Although this might be seen as an asset when pursuing a CSAO position, job experiences were given an “overriding emphasis” (Lunsford, 1984, p. 54).

### CSAO Job Functions

Much of the literature to date is descriptive of both the organizational structure of the CSAO position as well as the demographics of those holding the CSAO position. Sandeen’s (1991) book on the CSAO was a milestone in the work on the position and integrates his vision on the main components of the position: leader, manager, mediator, and educator. His work was the first significant one to integrate the litany of research conducted on the role of the CSAO. In addition, much of his writing is based on his many years of experience as a CSAO. Last year, Sandeen (2001) published a qualitative study of successful CSAOs. Their insights about their own experiences and the factors that contributed to their success are thoughtful, and they contribute to our current understanding of the critical skills needed for the CSAO. In the unique way that qualitative research can contribute, the successful CSAOs in this project shared personal insights about their careers. Courage, integrity, sense of humor, and a personalized style of leadership were identified as essential. In the last twenty years, however, there has yet to be a systematic attempt to empirically identify these critical skills.

## Competencies in Management and Higher Education

There is some research on competencies and skill areas in both management and higher education administration that is useful to examine more closely, given this study's focus on competencies and critical skills of CSAOs. In the sections to follow, a brief review of relevant management and business literature will be presented along with a synopsis of the work in higher education administration evaluation. This section will conclude with a discussion on the job functions of the CSAO position.

### Managerial Activities in the Business Literature

For many years, scholars in the business arena have studied managerial behavior. Hambrick and Mason published an article in 1984 describing the characteristics of the upper echelon of management. Their propositions have been well cited in many articles over the last eighteen years. Hambrick and Mason's propositions or predictions of managerial activities are based on a variety of demographic characteristics. For instance, they have proposed that young managers will be more likely to engage in risky behaviors than older managers. In addition, a firm will be more likely to exhibit strategies in new areas or with new ventures when senior managers have less experience in that firm. The opposite also is proposed. When senior managers have more experience in the same firm, the firm will focus on the traditional markets of that firm rather than exploring new ventures. Thus, senior managers of this second type will not take many risks in new business opportunities. Hambrick and Mason even postulate that socioeconomic backgrounds of senior managers will impact the diversification strategies of firms where senior managers from lower socioeconomic groups will pursue more diversification.

Even before the publication of Hambrick and Mason's (1984) propositions, an extensive amount of research had been published on managerial activities. These studies focused on different levels of management. Analoui, Labbaf, and Noorbakhsh (2000) have written a concise, thorough history of the major models or taxonomies of managerial skills. In 1955, Katz introduced the first classification of managerial skills. Technical, human or people, and conceptual skills are the "three observable interrelated sets of skills" (Analoui, Labbaf, & Noorbakhsh, p. 219). Katz argued that technical skills are used most by lower level managers, people skills are most used by front line supervisors and middle managers, while conceptual skills are the unique general management point of view from the top.

Many years later, Whetten and Cameron (1984) developed a learning model based on Bandura's (1977) research in social learning theory. Through both a study of their own and a comparison of their results to those of other researchers, Whetten and Cameron noted four important points on this topic of essential management skills. First, interpersonal skills are the foundation of effective management. Next, skills noted as being critical were also characteristics of proven managers who were singled out as effective. In addition, all skills noted are trainable and can be learned. Finally, the skills are neither specific to the manager's position in the hierarchy nor the organizational make-up. Analoui, Labbaf, and Noorbakhsh (2000) state:

The selected set of nine skills are: developing self awareness, managing time and stress, solving problems creatively, establishing supportive communication, gaining power and influence, improving employees' performance through a motivation related reward system, delegation and decision-making, managing conflict and, finally, conducting effective group meetings (p. 220).

Even more recently, Analoui (1993, 1995) has published his view of critical skills for managers. His ideas are akin to Katz's (1955) view that perhaps some skills are hierarchical. More specifically, Analoui believes senior managers need to be proficient in certain unique skill areas in order to be successful. He (1993) has delineated these skill areas as task-related skills, people-related skills, and analytical and self-reported skills. Analoui states that task-related skills are those that involve meeting objectives, planning, and organizing. Interpersonal skills involve managing conflict, communication, and appraising and developing people. The analytical skills are related to the development of one's own potential.

These authors (Katz, 1955; Whetten & Cameron, 1984; Analoui, 1993; Analoui, 1995) and several others not mentioned in depth here (Mintzberg, 1973; Stewart, 1970; Luthans, 1988) all to some degree described several categories or types of skills of effective managers, it should be noted that there is significant overlap in those categories. According to Katz, "in practice these skills are so closely interrelated that it is difficult to determine where one ends and the other begins"(p. 102). With all this scholarship in the business literature, it is interesting to compare and contrast the work in higher education administrator skills identification and development. In addition, more directly linked to the purposes of this study is a question: How can this information contribute to our focus of CSAO competencies and critical skills identification and assessment?

#### Higher Education Administrator Competencies

Several articles and books have been written on the topic of administrator performance in education (Deegan, 1981; Farmer, 1979; MacPhail-Wilcox & Forbes,

1990). MacPhail-Wilcox & Forbes assert that the three main goals of an appraisal system are public accountability, professional and organizational development, and personnel decisions. Because the student population and broader constituency of the general public are concerned and have an interest in the performance of the administrators in education, public accountability is important. With respect to the work of administrators in educational settings, many skill areas have been identified. The following list is a summary of skills areas that are noted by Anderson (1979), Bennis (1976), Farmer (1979), Foxley (1980), and MacPhail-Wilcox and Forbes (1990):

- \$ Education and experience
- \$ Personal qualities
- \$ Managing the political environment
- \$ Managing fiscal and other resources
- \$ Administrative efficiency
- \$ Leadership
- \$ Managing conflict

MacPhail-Wilcox and Forbes suggest that identifying the specific administrator skill areas can be accomplished by gathering expert opinions, reviewing job descriptions, conducting a job analysis, utilizing position goals or targets as a factor of job functions, and doing independent research. Some of the scholars mentioned above have outlined administrator appraisal processes or steps to follow in determining a system appropriate for a specific institution. Most of the literature in this area is broad in scope and focuses on the administration of primary and secondary schools. The most helpful insight on administrator competencies can best be gained through the examination of research on student affairs administrators.

#### CSAO Competencies

An important beginning point for a discussion on CSAO competencies is asking a simple question: Just what does a CSAO do throughout the day? Two studies focusing on the time allocation of CSAOs provide some interesting answers. Rusbosin (1989) centered his research on the Council for Advancement of Standards (CAS) and its dimensions of student development, administration, and counseling. He found that most CSAOs spent more time on student development related tasks than counseling or administrative tasks. Female CSAOs tended to spread out their work activities more evenly among these three areas than did their male counterparts. In a more recent study, Brodzinski (1991) reports that CSAOs spend more than half of their time in meetings, mostly interacting with their staff and other administrators, and spend little time on planning. Participants in his study did not do research or regularly interact with faculty and students. Brodzinski did note, however, that CSAOs spent significant time with colleagues and were involved in professional association activities.

What other tasks demand the attention of the CSAO? In 1996, Hays studied CSAO knowledge of legal issues, particularly surrounding the First Amendment. His results were mixed on the knowledge expressed by CSAOs. Only 63% of the total responses were correct. In contrast, boundary spanning activities of CSAOs were the focus of research conducted by Pruitt (1995) and Pruitt and Schwartz (1999). Boundary spanning activities can be described as those collaborative efforts, initiated by the CSAO, amongst both internal and external stakeholders. Pruitt reported that both inter-organization and intra-organization boundary spanning activities were essential to the success of the CSAO. The focus of a study by Armour (1990) was AIDS (Acquired



Immune Deficiency Syndrome) education and programming. He examined the relationship between CSAO tolerance or intolerance of AIDS related attitudes and the level of AIDS education programming and AIDS policy development. He found that the more tolerant the CSAO was, the more likely there would be permanent AIDS education programming on campus. No other relationships were found.

In another group of studies, researchers attempted to define the important aspects of the role of the CSAO by asking college and university presidents about the important tasks of the CSAO. Shay (1984, 1993) has published several articles on this subject and his writings rely heavily on his experience as both a CSAO and a college president. Shay notes in both articles that fundraising is a key component of the CSAO job, according to presidents surveyed. In addition, Sandeen (2001) found in his interviews with successful CSAOs that they considered the relationship with the president to be a critical one. In 1995, Roper identified a series of factors (or clusters of more specific items) identified by college presidents as the most important of their role. Those factors are student life, administration, special students, education and advising, the extracurricular, international students, and academics. Roper also noted that the views of college presidents were the same as the CSAOs he surveyed. The CSAOs and college presidents were employed at small, private religious colleges. In another study at Bible colleges, Held (1994) noted that discipline, student development, student services, spiritual life of students, legal issues, activities, financial aid, and academics were the important functions of the CSAO noted by the college presidents. Held also found that the CSAOs and presidents participating in this study were in general agreement when identifying the important

functions of the CSAO. In a recent study, Taylor (2001) notes that presidents indicated that CSAOs should be responsive to campus crisis situations, yet at the same time these presidents placed little value on CSAOs being risk takers.

In sharp contrast, the research just presented, a study by Carreathers (1981) found striking differences between the views of the college presidents and CSAO when examining the issue of CSAO competencies in Texas public institutions. Presidents noted that the most important role of the CSAO was controlling student behavior and providing services. On the other hand, CSAOs reported that serving as a facilitator of student growth was their overarching role. Carreathers also noted that the CSAO was not meeting the expectations of the college community in completing job responsibilities.

Several studies in the early 1980's stated that a major purpose of the research was to identify the essential skill areas or competencies of the CSAO. Ryan (1983) developed an instrument for measuring the performance of CSAOs. His instrument was based on the work of O'Brien (1977) who had identified six broad categories for evaluation of CSAOs: planning, organizing, coordinating, communicating, budgeting, and interacting. Ryan's instrument is based on the original 96 items in O'Brien's study. Ryan asked CSAOs to place these items into the six main categories above. Although he did this as a preliminary step to studying the relationship between performance and leader behavior, this was a pivotal study in the exploration of CSAO performance. Ryan did note, however, that CSAO demographic characteristics were not found to be related to performance levels of CSAOs. Meanwhile, Redzich (1989) was focused on the evaluation process of CSAOs and used a qualitative approach to outline a process for skill

identification and a time line for the evaluation itself. A panel of experts knowledgeable in administrator evaluation and current CSAOs were the participants.

In 1984, Siera utilized Ryan's (1983) Chief Student Affairs Officer Performance Scale (CSAOPS) to examine the relationship between CSAO performance and professional development. He reported interesting findings as well. The only factor significantly related to professional development was number of years of service in student affairs. With respect to performance, best descriptors include a positive effect for professional experience and educational preparation in student affairs along with a negative effect for having earned a doctorate. Student leaders consistently rated the CSAOs lower on performance than the CSAOs' supervisors did, and this was especially true when the CSAO had a doctorate.

Spigner-Littles (1985) continued this line of research with her work on the skills and competencies needed to become an effective CSAO. She conducted a review of the literature to identify over 90 skills. After review by a panel of experts, those skills were reduced to 54 major skills. She developed a survey, and a panel of graduate students reviewed these items for clarity and judged whether or not they were essential. The 46 items that resulted from this final review were included in her instrument. In a factor analysis, two major factors appeared: conceptual skills and technical skills. Both gender and educational background had different effects on the conceptual skills factor. Examination of the technical skills factor showed no significant differences. Spigner-Littles identified the top five skills as (1) understanding the institution as a whole system, (2) organizing and administering student personnel division, (3) leading and motivating

others, (4) working effectively with and relating to diverse types of people, and (5) understanding student personnel functions in fulfilling institutional objectives.

In several more recent studies, Taylor (2001) and White (2000) looked at leadership and the CSAO. Taylor used primarily a qualitative approach to look at effective leadership practices of five CSAOs. He identified the following skills as being the five most important roles of the CSAO: (1) involvement and participation in decisions and policy matters at the institutional level, (2) development of a shared vision for the division, (3) creation of an environment where student involvement is encouraged and supported, (4) exhibition of good ethical behavior, and (5) effective response to campus crisis situations. CSAOs, their supervisors and their supervisees all contributed to Taylor's final list of CSAO roles. In addition, White focused on female CSAOs and their leadership style. Transformation leadership behavior was perceived as more effective.

Although these studies contribute to our understanding of the necessary competencies and critical skills required of the CSAO, only a small amount of empirical research has been conducted on the topic in almost twenty years. Given the significant changes in higher education since the early 1980's, a study examining the critical skills of the CSAO is sorely needed.

### Chapter Summary

The role of the chief student affairs officer has evolved dramatically since the first dean of students was appointed in the late nineteenth century. While the college student population changed from a group of very young, Caucasian men in the early American colonial colleges to the older, more diverse, coeducational student body of today, the role

and complexity of the CSAO position was also ever increasing. In the beginning, the dean of students focused on student discipline and only general supervision of student behavior outside the classroom. In student affairs organizations today, the chief student affairs officer is responsible for a variety of units, possibly including financial aid, campus recreation, housing, student activities, student leadership, and judicial affairs. The chief student affairs officer has to be prepared to deal with the media, respond to complaints from a variety of groups and individuals, and be well versed in the legal issues of higher education.

Throughout the last forty years, many articles have been published on the CSAO position. From personal essays on the role of the CSAO to basic descriptive studies on demographic qualities of those in the CSAO position, the profession's major journals do note many attempts by scholars to look into this unique role. In addition, studies have been conducted on life satisfaction of CSAOs, job stress and coping strategies, the career ladder to becoming a CSAO, and the role of the dean of women.

Many studies fall under a broad category of senior executive management and administration. Managerial activities and skills studied in the business literature can be helpful in examining the research questions for this study. Several scholars have grouped skills together for ease of analysis; however, most caution that there is overlap in each of the skill areas. A brief review of higher education administrator skill identification and performance evaluation was also presented. Finally, studies focusing on the competencies and skill areas of the chief student affairs officer were reviewed and some significant findings of those studies presented.

## CHAPTER 3

### METHODOLOGY

The purpose of this chapter is to describe the critical skills identified via a review of the literature, identify the participants in the study, explain the data collection methods, articulate the development of the survey instrument, identify the research design, and determine how data were analyzed.

#### The Critical Skills Identified

As stated in Chapter 1, the first purpose of this study is to identify current themes in the literature with respect to critical skills of the CSAO. The researcher first reviewed literature beginning with the early 1900' s for relevant publications on the CSAO position. There are several recurring themes in the literature documenting important critical skills needed to perform the CSAO job: communication skills, a strong presidential relationship, focus on student education and growth, staffing and management issues, the political role, personal attributes, and planning and goal setting. A summary of each of these major theme areas follows. Table 1 identifies the sources for each of the sixty-nine critical skills identified for this study.

Strong communication skills are essential for the CSAO. Silverman (1980), Moore (1991), Ambler (1993), and Sandeen (1991) all articulate the importance of solid communication skills and maintaining an open line of communication with staff, peers, and the senior leadership team at the institution. Ambler and Sandeen also emphasize that every CSAO should appreciate being kept up-to-date on concerns and issues.

Table 1

Source in Literature for Each Critical Skill

Question	Citations
<u>Communication</u>	
1 maintain open line of communication	Ambler (1993); Analoui (1993), Moore (1991); Ottinger (2000); Ryan (1983); Sandeen (1991); Silverman (1980)
2 expect staff to keep you informed	Ambler (1993); Ottinger (2000); Sandeen (1991)
3 share information with students & staff	O'Brien (1977); Ottinger (2000)
4 speak with media during crisis	Moore (1991); O'Brien (1977)
5 speak with media on general issues	Moore (1991); O'Brien (1977)
6 share research with staff	Clemens & Akers (1973); O'Brien (1977); Spigner-Littles (1985)
7 interpret legislation to staff	Held (1994); Taylor (2001)
8 share institutional objectives with staff	O'Brien (1977); Ottinger (2000); Ryan (1983)
9 brief the president about incidents	Ottinger (2000); Ryan (1983); Sandeen (1991)
10 interpret policies	Clemens & Akers (1973); O'Brien (1977); Ryan (1983)
11 present student affairs purposes to faculty	Garland (1985); Ottinger (2000); Ryan (1983); Spigner-Littles (1985)
12 facilitate policy development	Garland (1985); Lilley (1974); Ottinger (2000); Ryan (1983); Taylor (2001)

### Presidential Relationship

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| 1 meet regularly<br>with president  | DeWitt (1991); Moore (1991); Ottinger (2000) Shay (1984, 1993) |
| 2 assist president in<br>handling crisis  | Ryan (1983); Taylor (2001)                                     |
| 3 assist president in<br>setting goals  | Shay (1984, 1993)  |
| 4 assist president in<br>developing relationships<br>with external stakeholders | Shay (1984, 1993); Taylor (2001)                               |
| 5 assist president with<br>fund raising   | Mackey (1979); Ottinger (2000); Rigg (1978); Shay (1984, 1993) |
| 6 share student opinions<br>with president                                      | Garland (1985); Sandeen (1991)                                 |
| 7 support the president<br>in public  | Sandeen (1991; 2001)   |
| 8 assist president with<br>community issues                                     | O'Brien (1977); Shay (1984, 1993); Taylor (2001)               |
| 9 advise president on<br>student concerns                                       | Clemens & Akers (1973); Sandeen (2001)                         |

### Student Education & Growth

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| 1 value student<br>education and growth       | Carreathers (1981); Clemens & Akers (1973); O'Brien (1977);<br>Ottinger (2000); Sandeen (2001); Spigner-Littles (1985); Taylor<br>(2001) |
| 2 incorporate student<br>affairs in academics | DeWitt (1991); Garland (1985); Ottinger (2000); Rueckel (1971)<br>Sandeen (1991); Taylor (2001)  |
| 3 serve as a student<br>expert                | Garland (1985); Ottinger (2000); Spigner-Littles (1985)  |
| 4 advocate for student<br>concerns            | Clemens & Akers (1973); Garland (1985); Ottinger (2000);<br>Ryan (1983)  |
| 5 encourage student<br>involvement            | Clemens & Akers (1973); Evans (1974); Ottinger (2000);<br>Taylor (2001)  |



- |   |                                     |   |
|---|-------------------------------------|---|
| 6 | assess student development outcomes | DeWitt (1991); Evans (1974); Ottinger (2000); Sandeen (1991); Spigner-Littles (1985); Taylor (2001) |
| 7 | maintain accessibility to students  | DeWitt (1991); Evans (1974)   |
| 8 | seek student opinions on issues     | Evans (1974); Ottinger (2000); Taylor (2001)  |

### Managing the Political Environment

- |    |   |  |
|----|---|--|
| 1  | understand CSAO role as politician              | Anderson (1979); Bennis (1976); Clemens & Akers (1973); Farmer (1979); Foxley (1980); Garland (1985); MacPhail-Wilcox & Forbes (1990); O'Brien (1977); Ottinger (2000); Spigner-Littles (1985) |
| 2  | network with other administrators               | Clemens & Akers (1973); DeWitt (1991); Ottinger (2000) Ryan (1983); Spigner-Littles (1985)   |
| 3  | problem solve with senior staff                 | Analoui (1993); DeWitt (1991); Sandeen (1991)  |
| 4  | demonstrate respect for others                  | Barr (1988); Ottinger (2000)   |
| 5  | respect for institutional processes             | Barr (1988); Clemens & Akers (1973); DeWitt (1991); Garland (1985); Ottinger (2000); Spigner-Littles (1985)  |
| 6  | gather information on institutional processes   | Barr (1988); Clemens & Akers (1973); Garland (1985) Ottinger (2000)  |
| 7  | gather information on senior staff interests    | O'Brien (1977); Ottinger (2000)  |
| 8  | observe others' behaviors                       | Barr (1988); Ottinger (2000)   |
| 9  | know formal dimensions of institutional culture | Garland (1985); Mamarchev & Williamson (1991); Ottinger (2000); Sandeen (1991); Silverman (1980)   |
| 10 | know informal dimensions of culture             | Garland (1985); Mamarchev & Williamson (1991); Ottinger (2000); Sandeen (1991); Silverman (1980)   |

- |  |  |
|--|--|
| 11 know institutional issues             | Garland (1985); Mamarchev & Williamson (1991); Ottinger (2000); Sandeen (1991); Silverman (1980); Spigner-Littles (1985) |
| 12 know institutions history and lore    | Sandeen (1991); Smith (1991)   |
| 13 develop credibility with faculty      | Evans (1974); DeWitt (1991); Garland (1985); Lilley (1974) Ottinger (2000)   |
| 14 understand faculty governance process | Clemens & Akers (1973); DeWitt (1991); Evans (1974); Garland (1985)  |

### Personal Qualities

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| 1 develop a 'public presence'               | Anderson (1979); Bennis (1976); Clemens & Akers (1973); Farmer (1979); Foxley (1980); MacPhail-Wilcox & Forbes (1990); Moore (1991); O'Brien (1977); Ottinger (2000); Sandeen (1991) |
| 2 be visible at key institutional events    | O'Brien (1977); Ottinger (2000); Sandeen (1991)  |
| 3 choose events to attend                   | O'Brien (1977); Sandeen (1991)   |
| 4 maintain integrity in decision making     | Moore (1991); Ottinger (2000); Sandeen (1991); Taylor (2001)   |
| 5 manage stress effectively                 | Scott (1992); Spigner-Littles (1985)   |
| 6 make one-on-one connections with students | O'Brien (1977)   |

### Planning and Goal Setting

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1 have clearly stated goals              | Analoui (1993); Deegan (1981); Evans (1974); Olivero (1990); Priest, Alphenaar, & Boer (1980); Rueckel (1971); Ryan (1983); Taylor (2001) |
| 2 plan for facilities improvements       | O'Brien (1977); Ottinger (2000); Taylor (2001)  |
| 3 plan for implementing short term goals | Evans (1974); O'Brien (1977)  |

4 use a model for systematic planning      Analoui (1993); DeWitt (1991); O'Brien (1977); Ottinger (2000); Priest, Alphenaar, & Boer (1980); Ryan (1983); Spigner-Littles (1985)

5 tie planning model to budgeting process      DeWitt (1991); Gold, Golden, & Quatroche (1993)

### Leadership and Supervision

1 develop individualistic leadership style      Analoui (1993); Anderson (1979); Appleton, Briggs, & Rhatigan (1978); Bennis (1976); Clemens & Akers (1973); Farmer (1979); Foxley (1980); MacPhail-Wilcox & Forbes (1990); O'Brien (1977); Ottinger (2000); Sandeen (1991); Taylor (2001)

2 manage budget process      Anderson (1979); Bennis (1976); Clemens & Akers (1973); DeWitt (1991); Douglas (1991); Farmer (1979); Foxley (1980); Lilley (1974); MacPhail-Wilcox & Forbes (1990); O'Brien (1977); Ottinger (2000); Ryan (1983); Sandeen (1991); Spigner-Littles (1985); Taylor (2001); Woodard (1993)

3 develop efficient administrative tasks      Anderson (1979); Bennis (1976); Clemens & Akers (1973); Farmer (1979); Foxley (1980); MacPhail-Wilcox & Forbes (1990); O'Brien (1977); Ottinger (2000); Sandeen (1991)

4 develop process for recruitment & selection      DeWitt (1991); Lilley (1974); O'Brien (1977); Ottinger (2000); Priest, Alphenaar, & Boer (1980); Ryan (1983); Spigner-Littles (1985); Winston & Creamer (1997)

5 delegate tasks      O'Brien (1977); Ryan (1985); Sandeen (1991)

6 delegate management of units to directors      O'Brien (1977); Ryan (1985); Sandeen (1991)

7 meet regularly with direct reports      DeWitt (1991); Guido-DiBrito (1990); Guido-DiBrito, Chavez, Wallace, & DiBrito (1997); Lilley (1974); O'Brien (1977); Ottinger (2000); Priest, Alphenaar, & Boer (1980); Winston & Creamer (1997)

8 utilize effective time management strategies      Sandeen (1991); Spigner-Littles (1985)

### Professional Development

1 attend professional conferences      McDade (1989), Sandeen (1991)

2 present sessions at conferences	McDade (1989)
3 hold office in professional associations	Lunsford (1984); McDade (1989); O'Brien (1977); Sandeen (1991)
4 attend seminars on special topics	McDade (1989); Sandeen (1991)
5 serve as adjunct faculty	Sandeen (1991)
6 submit articles for publication	Sandeen (1991)
7 consult with colleagues on difficult issues	Ryan (1983)

---

Communication with key leaders and students, particularly in times of crisis, is essential. O'Brien (1977) identified this skill in his work on the competencies of CSAOs as well. Moore (1991) stresses the importance of working with the media.

John Shay (1984, 1993) has published several pieces on another CSAO skill - the CSAO's presidential relationship. He asserts, "The effective CSAO must be able to step back from operational issues (which may be the primary concern of most of his or her staff) and analyze how he or she can help the president handle some of the external, future-oriented issues with which the chief executive must deal" (Shay, 1984, p. 56). In another article, Shay (1993) shares his perspective, as a former CSAO and now college president, on the issue of fund raising and working with donors. Several others (Mackey, 1979; Ottinger, 2000; Rigg, 1978) concur with Shay placing an equally high value on the CSAO's presidential relationship. In an era of tightening budgets, the fund raising role of the CSAO seems to be ever increasing. Similarly, in another study Bollheimer (1982) found that college presidents ranked financial aid as one of the most important issues facing divisions of student affairs. Sandeen (1991) focuses on the presidential relationship right away in his seminal work on the CSAO. Sandeen states that the president allows the work of the CSAO to move forward. Moore (1991) agrees and emphasizes that the CSAO will struggle in many areas if this relationship is not a positive one. Successful management of the presidential relationship was critical to the success of CSAOs who held their positions for more than twenty years and survived the transition of the presidency many times (Sandeen, 2001).

Likewise, the theme of student education and growth has been identified in numerous articles, book chapters and other publications throughout the years. Each author sees this function with a different lens. Garland (1985) and Sandeen (1991) focus on the CSAO's contribution to the overall quality of the academic experience. Garland also mentions, along with Ottinger (2000), that the CSAO should be the expert on students, their expectations, needs, and interests. Garland also extends the CSAO's responsibilities to include acting as an advocate for students and their issues. Evans (1974) asserted that CSAOs should welcome student involvement in campus discussions. Sandeen (1991) stresses the role of the CSAO in overseeing an assessment process where student development outcomes are measured. Overall, the successful CSAOs interviewed by Sandeen (2001) all believed in the essential goodness of students and were dedicated to furthering students' growth and education.

Another portion of the literature centers on leadership and supervision-related issues. The literature shows the components of the day-to-day responsibilities of the CSAO, from managing a large division and being aware of staffing issues (DeWitt, 1991; Priest, Alphenaar, & Boer, 1980; Winston & Creamer, 1997) to serving as a significant leader on the campus (McDade, 1989; Silverman, 1980). Appleton, Briggs, & Rhatigan (1978) maintain, "There is not one administrative style. You achieve that style which is successful for you only by beginning with yourself and continuing to be yourself" (p. 5). Significantly, White (2000) found that female CSAOs exhibited strong characteristics of a transformational leader. Furthermore, several studies (Guido-DiBrito, 1990; Guido-DiBrito, Chavez, Wallace, & DiBrito, 1997) focus on loyalty issues with the CSAO and

his or her staff. Given the political environment of the academy (Birnbaum, 1988), this relationship is critical. There are many facets to this component of the CSAO's work. From fiscal management (Douglas, 1991; Ottinger, 2000; Woodard, 1993) to management efficiency (Sandeen, 1991) to the hiring and selection of staff (Winston & Creamer, 1997), the overall administrative function and role is another critical component to the CSAO's success.

Management in higher education cannot be discussed without mentioning the political climate of the academy. A CSAO must be a masterful politician, able to navigate the political landscape of the university and all its constituents. Again, different scholars view this area in a variety of ways, but the theme of the CSAO as politician is evident. From the most basic perspective, Ottinger (2000) discusses the importance of networking to develop support on issues. Sandeen (1991) asserts that problem solving skills cannot be overemphasized. Barr (1988) emphasizes the vital importance of demonstrating respect, gathering information, and learning to observe and analyze both individual and organizational behavior patterns. Knowing formal and informal dimensions of the academy's culture is important as well (Mamarchev & Williamson, 1991).

Several scholars point out that knowing the institution, the institutional issues, and the institutional environment are key in this dimension (Garland, 1985; Sandeen, 1991; Silverman, 1980). Dickson (1987) identified major factors that contribute to the influence of the CSAO. The top factors include institutional decision-making, general knowledge and perceptiveness, internal relationships, and personal and departmental reputation. Smith (1991) extends this idea to include a working knowledge of the history

of the institution that might provide the CSAO with cues for approaching recurrent issues. Finally, Garland introduces another interesting facet to this area- the importance of developing credibility with faculty. With the strong voice of faculty in the academy, this is no surprise.

Personal attributes have also risen as a theme in the literature with respect to the success of the CSAO. "Public presence" (p.153), as outlined by Ottinger (2000) and Moore (1991), cannot be devalued by the CSAO. Oftentimes for someone in this high administrative position, many opinions will be based on the formal, many times brief, interactions or comments made by the CSAO. In Sandeen's (1991) book on the CSAO, he discusses the CSAO's personality and how individuals including students, faculty, administrators, and other constituents will make judgments about the CSAO even from very brief public, ceremonial appearances. Sandeen (2001) noted that the successful CSAOs interviewed all mentioned that personal qualities are important. According to Sandeen, "the diversity of styles and their individuality of method" (p. 14, 2001) were contributors to their success. Integrity was also a strong theme in Sandeen's (2001) work on successful CSAOs. Moore (1991) also noted that integrity is an important characteristic.

The final theme for consideration presented in the literature surrounds the planning and goal setting process. Deegan (1981) presents this function as the foundation of management. The development of clear policies and objectives can go a long way in the implementation of the CSAO's vision (Olivero, 1990). Priest, Alphenaar, and Boer (1980) stress the importance of long-range planning. They make a call to CSAOs to



consider the state of higher education. If this is done, they argue that a systematic planning process will be the foundation for the attainment of funding and strategic action in the evolving challenges of higher education. Gold, Golden, and Quatroche (1993) also stress the role of the CSAO in long term planning and fund raising.

### Instrumentation

This review of the literature and identification of critical skills for the CSAO position was the first phase of this study. From this analysis of the literature, a total of 69 items were generated in the seven theme areas. Ryan's (1983) and Deegan's (1981) writings and work in the area of CSAO performance and administrative evaluation, respectively, were critical to the development of these items, along with other scholars noted in the literature review. During this study, CSAOs will be asked to rate the 68 items based on a 5 point scale where 5 denotes an "extremely important skill" and 1 denotes an "unimportant skill." Items were shared with selected faculty, graduate students, and several senior administrators for review of the seven theme areas and clarity of each item. Recommended changes were incorporated into the final version before being mailed to the CSAOs in the sample.

Notably, an additional section on professional development activities was added to this survey. It was discovered in the review of the literature that a noticeable gap in the literature was present with respect to the CSAO and professional development. What professional development activities are important? To what professional associations do the CSAOs belong? Do CSAOs value engagement in research or publication activities? Do CSAOs hold office in any professional organizations? Do CSAOs attend professional

conferences and present sessions at conferences? Do CSAOs serve as adjunct faculty members in their field of study? How important do CSAOs believe these professional development activities to be? Each CSAO participating in the study will be asked these questions in the professional development section of the instrument.

The final purpose of this study is to assess the CSAOs' guiding philosophies of their divisions. Ender, Newton, and Caple (1996) identified three major models or guiding philosophies of student affairs. The first is the *student services model*. In this model, the 'primary purpose of student services is to support the academic mission of the institution by providing the numerous adjunctive services' (p. 8). Individuals identifying with this model strive to meet basic student needs. In the second model, the *student development model*, practitioners rely heavily on current student development ideologies such as cognitive, psychosocial, person-environment, and moral ethical theories to set policy and programmatic goals. Student affairs professionals utilizing this model would always keep the growth and maturation of students in the forefront. Finally, administrators who adhere to the *student learning model* maintain a student learning focus, and are found collaborating with faculty and the academic administration 'to achieve a more integrated or seamless learning experience' (p. 8). Learning outcomes are top priority for professionals who value this model.

In order to assess the CSAO's orientation with respect to the three models, student services, student development, and student learning, two survey items were developed. Respondents were asked to (1) rank the three models that they predominately used in their

day-to-day work and (2) rank the three models that they believe student affairs professionals should use in their day-to-day work.

The final section of the instrument contains demographic questions. Gender, ethnicity, tenure in CSAO position, number of CSAO positions held, highest degree earned, field of study of highest degree earned, years of professional experience at the time of attainment of the first CSAO position, CSAO reporting structure, CSAO job title, and institutional Carnegie classification will all be questions included in this section.

### Participants

CSAOs in the National Association of Student Personnel Administrators (NASPA) Regions II and III were included in this study. These regions include almost all states east of the Mississippi River. In the organization of NASPA, each institution receives only one vote on all NASPA business. Each institution must pay a membership fee to NASPA in order to obtain voting privileges. The Voting Delegate for each member institution is the CSAO. NASPA maintains accurate records of the mailing addresses for all voting delegates. The NASPA Office provided the researcher with two sets of mailing labels for all the Voting Delegates in Regions II and III. Four hundred and ninety-three surveys were mailed out to Voting Delegates, and 256 surveys were returned for a response rate of fifty-two percent.

### Data Collection

A packet was mailed to 493 CSAOs in NASPA Regions II and III on July 8, 2002. This packet included: a paper copy of the survey, a return self-addressed and stamped envelope, a cover letter (including informed consent information), and a letter from the

University of Georgia's CSAO encouraging participation. On July 29, 2002, reminder postcards were mailed to all participants who had not returned the survey.

### Data Analysis

The statistical analysis procedures that were used to analyze the data for each hypothesis statement are as follows:

RQ 1: What are the critical skills needed to be the chief student affairs officer as identified in the literature?

Descriptive statistics were used in conducting the first phase of data analysis. Noting the means of the responses from each item provides a first look at the opinions of the CSAOs as to which skills are indeed critical. Skills were ranked overall using this information.

RQ 2: How important are the CSAO critical skills as identified in the literature according to current CSAOs?

H<sub>0</sub>1: There will be no differences in perceptions of the importance of critical skills based on the gender of the CSAOs.

A t-test was used to examine the stated differences in importance of critical skills between male and female CSAOs.

H<sub>0</sub>2: There will be no differences in perceptions of the importance of critical skills based on the ethnicity of the CSAOs.

Stated differences in the importance of critical skills based on ethnicity were evaluated using a t-test comparing Caucasian/White CSAOs and CSAOs of Color.

H<sub>0</sub>3: There will be no differences in perceptions of the importance of critical skills based on length of time in position.

A correlation was used to evaluate differences in the importance of critical skills based on length of time in position.

H<sub>0</sub>4: There will be no differences in perceptions of the importance of critical skills based on educational background.

A t-test procedure was used to evaluate differences in the importance of critical skills based on educational background (higher education/student personnel and other fields of degree).

H<sub>0</sub>5: There will be no differences in perceptions of the importance of critical skills based on whether or not the CSAO is currently in his/her first CSAO position or has held more than one CSAO position.

A t-test was used to evaluate differences in the importance of critical skills based on the number of CSAO positions held (one position or more than one position).

H<sub>0</sub>6: There will be no correlation in perceptions of the importance of critical skills based on the amount of time it took the individual to become a CSAO initially.

This hypothesis was tested using Pearson's coefficient to examine this relationship.

H<sub>0</sub>7: There will be no differences in perceptions of the importance of critical skills based on whether or not the CSAO reports directly to the president or provost.

A t-test was used to evaluate differences in the importance of critical skills based on whether or not the CSAO reports directly to the president or provost.

H<sub>0</sub>8: There will be no differences in perceptions of the importance of critical skills based on Carnegie classification of the CSAO's employing institution.

An ANOVA was used to evaluate differences in the importance of critical skills based on Carnegie classification.

RQ 3: What are the perceptions of CSAOs with respect to the individual philosophies guiding their work in the student affairs division?

H<sub>0</sub>9: There are no differences in the guiding philosophies of CSAOs based on Carnegie classification.

A Chi Square procedure was used to evaluate differences in the guiding philosophies based on Carnegie classification.

H<sub>0</sub>10: There are no differences in the guiding philosophies of male and female CSAOs.

A Chi Square was used to evaluate differences in the guiding philosophies based on gender of the CSAO.

H<sub>0</sub>11: There are no differences in the guiding philosophies of CSAOs based on length of time in the position.

A Chi Square was used to evaluate differences in the guiding philosophy based on length of time in position.

H<sub>0</sub>12: There are no differences in the guiding philosophies of CSAOs based on whether or not they report directly to the president or provost.

A Chi Square was used to evaluate differences in the guiding philosophy based on whether or not the CSAO reports directly to the president or provost.

RQ 4: Are there differences in the importance CSAOs placed on critical skills based on the individual guiding philosophies (student services model, student development model, or a student learning model)?

Mean scores of each theme area were examined for CSAOs in each of the three guiding philosophies. Importance of each critical skill means was compared to each of the three groups of CSAOs (student development, student services, and student learning) using an ANOVA.

## CHAPTER 4

### RESULTS

This chapter details the results of the *Chief Student Affairs Officer Critical Skills Inventory*. Data responding to each research question are presented in the order in which the questions were originally outlined in Chapter 1. Survey participants had the option to complete the survey on paper and return it by mail to the researcher or to complete the survey on-line. The researcher entered all mailed surveys on-line into a Perseus database. The Office of Student Life Studies in the Division of Student Affairs at the University of Georgia maintained the data on a server throughout data collection. Of a total of 256 surveys returned, 232 surveys (90.6%) were mailed to the researcher. Only 24 surveys (9.4%) were completed directly on-line by participants. The data were then converted from the Perseus file directly into an SPSS 11.0 (statistical program) file for analysis. To prepare for data analysis, some results were converted into new categories.

All data collected for each hypothesis statement where significance was found on any item are included in tables in this chapter. Each table includes the section heading and the question number with a brief description of that item. A copy of the complete survey is included in Appendix C.

Survey respondents varied in gender, ethnicity, years in current position, total years of experience as a CSAO, number of CSAO positions held, degree held, field of degree, reporting category, guiding philosophy, and years of experience upon attainment of first CSAO position. Demographic information is included in Table 2. In summary, the



respondents were approximately 60% male and 40% female. With respect to ethnicity, over 200, or 82%, were Caucasian/White; CSAOs of Color made up the remainder of the sample. Years in current position ranged from 1 year to 42 years. Most CSAOs had been in their current positions for 1-5 years (55.7%) and a less for 6-10 years (22.7%). The remainder of the participants had experience in their current position ranging from 11-42 years. The vast majority of CSAOs, or 228 participants (89.4%), reported having been in one or two CSAO positions. One respondent reported having held 20 positions. With respect to total years of experience in all CSAO positions, the vast majority of respondents, or 168 participants (65.9%), had anywhere from 1-10 years of experience. One hundred and seventy-three CSAOs had earned a Doctorate (67.8%), while 73 had earned Master's degrees (28.6%). The field of degree of the respondents was near evenly divided with 116 (45.5%) having a degree in higher education/student personnel and 138 (54.1%) having a degree in another field (including professional degrees). Years of experience upon attainment of the first CSAO position ranged from zero to 37. One hundred and forty-five participants (56.8%) became a CSAO for the first time having had no more than fifteen years of professional experience. Two hundred CSAOs (78.1%) indicated that they report directly to the institution's president/chancellor. The remaining respondents report either to the provost or another senior administrator. Finally, CSAOs represented a variety of institutions as classified by the Carnegie Foundation. Master's Colleges and Universities represented 36.1% of the sample while Doctorate-granting Institutions constituted 25.1% of the sample.

The results varied in terms of the CSAO's rankings of the guiding philosophies of student affairs. With respect to the question concerning which philosophy the CSAO mainly uses day-to-day, respondents were almost evenly spread over the three choices in making their first choice. One hundred CSAOs (39.2%) noted that student learning was their first choice; this philosophy was the most popular choice for this question. In addition, on the question regarding the preferred philosophy that would be used in an ideal setting, CSAOs again most often chose the student learning approach. One hundred and forty respondents selected student learning as their first choice (54.9%).

#### Statistical Power

For almost all research questions and hypothesis statements, power in this study is at or above .80. Using Cohen's (1992) table of sample and effect sizes, it was determined that in most cases, a medium effect size had been achieved with the sample sizes. Only H<sub>0</sub>8 and H<sub>0</sub>9 had very large effect sizes and very low power, thus increasing the chances of Type II error. In analyzing data on these two questions, it is important to examine both the statistical and meaningful significance of the findings, given the low power. For H<sub>0</sub>2 and H<sub>0</sub>7, a large effect size was achieved with the group sizes in the sample. Thus, a larger deviation from the mean will be needed in order for significance to be found for these questions. Complete information related to statistical power is presented in Table 3.

#### Analysis of the Scales

Each of the seven scales was examined, and the reliability coefficients were created as well. For all scales, the alpha figures ranged from .6590 for the *Personal Qualities* scale to .8844 for the *Managing the Political Environment* scale. After examining each scale

and each alpha reported if a particular item was removed, it was revealed that removing any of the scales would not significantly impact (either positively or negatively) the overall alpha for each scale. Complete results are listed in Table 4. More research will be needed on these scales to complete the reliability and validity process.

As previously stated, several types of statistical analyses were used in this study, including independent t-tests, Pearson correlations, one way ANOVA, and Chi Square. When the data were analyzed using an independent t-test, Levine's test for equality of variances was used; equality of variances is assumed where appropriate. All statistical tests were evaluated at the .05 level.

#### Research Question 1

Critical skills were first analyzed using descriptive statistics for all 69 questions. They are presented in Table 5 in ascending order by the value of the mean. The item with the highest mean is from the *Personal Qualities* section, maintaining integrity in decision making ( $M = 4.93$ ,  $SD = .250$ ). Of the items with the top ten mean values, three items are from the *Communication* section, and three items are from the *Presidential Relationship* section. Two items are from the *Managing the Political Environment* section while only one item is from *Personal Qualities* and one item is from *Student Growth and Education*.

The item with the lowest mean is from the *Professional Development* section, hold office in professional associations ( $M = 3.28$ ,  $SD = .838$ ). Of the items with the bottom ten mean values, five items are from the *Professional Development* section. Two

Table 2

Demographic Characteristics of the Sample

Variable	<u>n</u>	Percent*
<u>Gender</u>		
Females	102	40.0%
Males	152	59.6%
<u>Ethnicity</u>		
African American/Black	38	14.9%
Asian/Pacific Islander	0	0.0%
Caucasian/White	208	81.6%
Hispanic/Latino	2	0.8%
Multiracial	4	1.6%
Native American	2	0.8%
Other	0	0.0%
<u>Years in Current Position</u>		
1 - 5	142	55.7%
6 - 10	58	22.7%
11 - 15	31	12.2%
16 - 20	10	4.0%
21 - 25	5	2.0%
26 - 30	4	1.6%
31 - 35	1	0.4%

36 - 40	1	0.4%
41 - 45	1	0.4%
<u>Number of CSAO Positions Held</u>		
1	165	64.7%
2	63	24.7%
3	17	6.7%
4	3	1.2%
5	1	0.4%
6	2	0.8%
7	1	0.4%
8	0	0.0%
9	1	0.4%
20	1	0.4%
<u>Total Years as a CSAO (in all positions)</u>		
1 - 5	98	38.4%
6 - 10	70	27.5%
11 - 15	32	12.5%
16 - 20	22	8.6%
21 - 25	10	4.0%
26 - 30	14	5.5%
31 - 35	5	2.0%
36 - 40	1	0.4%

41 - 45	1	0.4%
---------	---	------

Degree Held

Bachelor's	1	0.4%
------------	---	------

Master's	73	28.6%
----------	----	-------

Doctorate	173	67.8%
-----------	-----	-------

Professional (J.D., etc.)	5	2.0%
---------------------------	---	------

Other	2	0.8%
-------	---	------

Field of Degree Category

Higher Education/Student Personnel	116	45.5%
------------------------------------	-----	-------

Other	138	54.1%
-------	-----	-------

Reporting Category

President	200	78.1%
-----------	-----	-------

Provost	26	10.2%
---------	----	-------

Other	29	11.3%
-------	----	-------

Carnegie Classification of Institution

Doctorate-granting Institutions	64	25.1%
---------------------------------	----	-------

Master's Colleges and Universities	92	36.1%
------------------------------------	----	-------

Baccalaureate Colleges	66	25.9%
------------------------	----	-------

Associate's Colleges	25	9.8%
----------------------	----	------

Specialized Institutions	5	2.0%
--------------------------	---	------

Tribal Colleges and Universities	0	0.0%
----------------------------------	---	------

Years of Experience Upon Attainment of the First CSAO Position

0 - 5	25	9.8%
6 - 10	60	23.5%
11 - 15	60	23.5%
16 - 20	59	23.1%
21 - 25	30	11.8%
26 - 30	10	4.0%
31 - 35	1	0.4%
36 - 40	1	0.4%

Guiding Philosophy Ranked First

Predominately Used in Day-to-Day Work

Student Services Philosophy	92	36.1%
Student Learning Philosophy	100	39.2%
Student Development Philosophy	61	23.9%

Should be Used in an Ideal Setting

Student Services Philosophy	31	12.2%
Student Learning Philosophy	140	54.9%
Student Development Philosophy	80	31.4%

---

\* Percentages will not always add up to 100% as there is some data missing.

items are from both the *Communication* and *Managing the Political Environment* sections while one item is from the *Presidential Relationship* section.

#### Research Question 2; Null Hypothesis 1

With respect to gender, independent  $t$ -tests were used to analyze the data. All results are presented in Table 6. For Item *Communication* 3, sharing information with students and staff,  $t(248) = 2.011$ ,  $p = .045$ . For Item *Communication* 8, sharing institutional objectives with staff,  $t(245.825) = 2.031$ ,  $p = .043$ . The next item, briefing the president of significant incidents (*Communication* 9),  $t(250.363) = 2.498$ ,  $p = .013$ . With respect to Item *Communication* 10, interpret policies,  $t(247) = 1.986$ ,  $p = .048$ .

Two items in the *Presidential Relationship* section yielded significant results. For Item 6, share student opinions with the president,  $t(230.911) = 2.648$ ,  $p = .009$ . For Item 7, support the president in public,  $t(247.426) = 2.140$ ,  $p = .033$ . No items in the *Student Education and Growth* section were significant.

Three items in the *Managing the Political Environment* were significant. For Item 2, network with other administrators regularly,  $t(238.569) = 2.290$ ,  $p = .023$ . For Item 3, problem solve with other senior staff,  $t(244.456) = 2.311$ ,  $p = .022$ . Lastly, Item 13, develop credibility with faculty,  $t(250.562) = 2.662$ ,  $p = .008$ . No items in the *Personal Qualities* and *Planning and Goal Setting* sections were significant. For *Leadership and Supervision* Item 2, effectively manage the budget process,  $t(240.927) = 1.968$ ,  $p = .050$ .

Item 7, consult with colleagues at other institutions, in the *Professional Development* section was significant. For this item,  $t(252) = 2.297$ ,  $p = .022$ . In every case of significance, the mean for women was always higher than the mean for men.



Table 3

Statistical Power

<u>Null Hypothesis/ Research Question</u>	<u>Type of Test</u>	<u>Independent Variable(s)</u>	<u>Group Sizes</u>	<u>Effect Sizes</u>
H <sub>0</sub> 1	t-test	Gender	101/152	Medium
H <sub>0</sub> 2	t-test	Ethnicity	46/207	Large
H <sub>0</sub> 3	Pearson Correlation	Yrs. In Position	252	Medium
H <sub>0</sub> 4	Pearson Correlation	Experience Before CSAO	245	Medium
H <sub>0</sub> 5	t-test	Field of Degree	115/137	Medium
H <sub>0</sub> 6	t-test	No. of Positions Held	165/89	Medium
H <sub>0</sub> 7	t-test	Reporting Category	199/26	Large
H <sub>0</sub> 8	ANOVA	Carnegie Classification	5-92	V. Large
H <sub>0</sub> 9	Chi Square	Rank One/Carnegie Class.	5-92	V. Large
H <sub>0</sub> 10	Chi Square	Rank One/Gender	101/152	Medium
H <sub>0</sub> 11	Chi Square	Rank One/Tenure	252	Medium
H <sub>0</sub> 12	Chi Square	Rank One/Reporting Cat.	199/26	Medium
RQ 4	ANOVA	Rank One	61-100	Medium

Notes.

Group sizes vary for each item. Reported group sizes here are typical.

All cases assume Power is equal to or greater than .80 except for H<sub>0</sub>8 and H<sub>0</sub>9 in which Power is less than .25.

Table 4

Reliability Analysis for the Seven Scales (Alpha)

<u>Scale</u>	<u>N</u>		<u>Alpha</u>
	<u>Of Cases</u>	<u>Of Items</u>	
Communication	243	12	.7562
Presidential Relationship	252	9	.7903
Student Growth and Development	254	8	.7676
Managing the Political Environment	249	14	.8844
Personal Qualities	253	6	.6590
Planning and Goal Setting	251	5	.7847
Leadership and Supervision	251	8	.7592
Professional Development	253	7	.8298

Table 5

Ordered Critical Skills by Mean

Item	Section	No.	M	SD
Maintain integrity in decision making	Personal Qualities	4	4.93	.250
Brief the president about incidents	Communication	9	4.90	.304
Advise president on student issues	President Relationship	9	4.90	.328
Open line of communication	Communication	1	4.86	.349
Value student education and growth	Student Education	1	4.86	.361
Assist president in handling crises	President Relationship	2	4.85	.402
Demonstrate respect for others	Politics	4	4.85	.375
Support president in public	President Relationship	7	4.83	.419
Expect staff to keep you informed	Communication	2	4.78	.441
Problem solve with other senior staff	Politics	3	4.76	.437
Share institutional objectives with staff	Communication	8	4.74	.473
Advocate for student concerns	Student Education	4	4.72	.485
Develop credibility with faculty	Politics	13	4.72	.491
Effectively manage budget process	Leadership	2	4.72	.468
Maintain accessibility to students	Student Education	7	4.69	.496
Manage stress effectively	Personal Qualities	5	4.69	.490
Be visible at key institutional events	Personal Qualities	2	4.68	.492
Assist president in setting goals	President Relationship	3	4.67	.547
Seek student opinions on issues	Student Education	8	4.67	.495

Respect for campus processes and culture	Politics	5	4.67	.504
Know institutional issues	Politics	11	4.66	.490
Share student opinions with president	President Relationship	6	4.65	.555
Present student affairs purposes	Communication	11	4.62	.583
Utilize effective time management strategies	Leadership	8	4.62	.526
Meet regularly with president	President Relationship	1	4.61	.635
Have a goals and objectives statement	Planning	1	4.61	.549
Meet regularly with direct reports	Leadership	7	4.61	.543
Delegate management to directors	Leadership	6	4.59	.532
Develop a public presence	Personal Qualities	1	4.55	.573
Incorporate student affairs into academics	Student Education	2	4.57	.563
Know informal dimensions of culture	Politics	10	4.57	.597
Network regularly with administrators	Politics	2	4.56	.557
Plan to implement short term goals	Planning	3	4.56	.513
Develop efficiency in administrative tasks	Leadership	3	4.52	.524
Share information with students/staff	Communication	3	4.51	.568
Delegate tasks to direct reports	Leadership	5	4.51	.574
Interpret policies	Communication	10	4.49	.589
Facilitate policy development	Communication	12	4.49	.596
Develop individual leadership style	Leadership	1	4.49	.640
Know formal dimensions of culture	Politics	9	4.48	.595
Serve as a student expert	Student Education	3	4.47	.644

Make connections with students	Personal Qualities	6	4.47	.600
Tie planning model to budgeting	Planning	5	4.40	.691
Plan for facilities improvements	Planning	2	4.39	.571
Develop recruitment and selection process	Leadership	4	4.39	.635
Understand role of CSAO as politician	Politics	1	4.38	.681
Understand faculty governance process	Politics	14	4.37	.663
Assess student development outcomes	Student Education	6	4.34	.668
Use a systematic planning model	Planning	4	4.31	.642
Seek student involvement on committees	Student Education	5	4.29	.630
Assist president with community issues	President Relationship	8	4.28	.739
Know institution's history and lore	Politics	12	4.28	.649
Consult with colleagues on difficult issues	Professional Dev.	7	4.28	.724
Choose which institutional events to attend	Personal Qualities	3	4.26	.619
Gather information on culture and processes	Politics	6	4.25	.627
Interpret legislation to staff	Communication	7	4.18	.739
Attend professional conferences	Professional Dev.	1	4.16	.681
Speak with media during crisis	Communication	4	4.11	.834
Assist president with external stakeholders	President Relationship	4	4.07	.793
Observe behavior patterns of others	Politics	8	4.07	.777
Share current research with staff	Communication	6	4.05	.646
Attend seminars on special topics	Professional Dev.	4	4.05	.638
Gather information for other senior staff	Politics	7	3.92	.751

Speak with media in general	Communication	5	3.79	.751
Assist president with fund raising	President Relationship	5	3.62	.976
Present sessions at national conferences	Professional Dev.	2	3.58	.758
Serve as an adjunct faculty member	Professional Dev.	5	3.50	.965
Submit articles, etc. for publication	Professional Dev.	6	3.33	.846
Hold office in professional associations	Professional Dev.	3	3.28	.838

---

Table 6

Independent t-test for Gender (Hypothesis 1)

Question	<u>Female</u>			<u>Male</u>			<u>t</u>	<u>p</u>
	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>n</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>n</u>		
<u>Communication</u>								
1 maintain open line of communication	4.87	.337	101	4.85	.360	152	0.502	.616
2 expect staff to keep you informed	4.84	.393	101	4.74	.469	151	1.828	.069
3 share information with students & staff	4.60	.569	100	4.45	.563	150	2.011	.045*
4 speak with media during crisis	4.14	.884	101	4.08	.802	152	0.556	.578
5 speak with media on general issues	3.78	.820	101	3.79	.706	152	0.075	.940
6 share research with staff	4.06	.614	101	4.03	.665	152	0.320	.749
7 interpret legislation to staff	4.20	.711	100	4.16	.759	152	0.373	.710
8 share institutional objectives with staff	4.81	.393	100	4.70	.516	152	2.031	.043*
9 brief the president about incidents	4.95	.218	101	4.86	.346	152	2.498	.013*
10 interpret policies	4.58	.535	100	4.43	.618	149	1.986	.048*
11 present student affairs purposes to faculty	4.69	.524	101	4.57	.617	151	1.707	.089
12 facilitate policy development	4.54	.540	100	4.45	.630	150	1.214	.226

Presidential Relationship

1 meet regularly with president	4.66	.621	102	4.58	.646	152	0.975	.340
2 assist president in handling crises	4.88	.353	102	4.82	.432	152	1.212	.227
3 assist president in setting goals	4.72	.552	102	4.64	.545	152	1.012	.312
4 assist president in developing relationships with external stakeholders	4.05	.849	102	4.09	.754	152	0.359	.720
5 assist president with fund raising	3.62	1.117	102	3.61	.869	152	0.044	.965
6 share student opinions with president	4.75	.516	102	4.57	.571	152	2.648	.009*
7 support the president in public	4.89	.344	101	4.78	.459	152	2.140	.033*
8 assist president with community issues	4.26	.783	101	4.30	.710	151	0.427	.670
9 advise president on student concerns	4.92	.305	102	4.88	.344	152	0.950	.343

Student Education & Growth

1 value student education and growth	4.90	.300	101	4.83	.395	152	1.645	.101
2 incorporate student affairs in academics	4.64	.523	102	4.53	.586	152	1.579	.116
3 serve as a student expert	4.48	.625	102	4.45	.660	152	0.320	.749
4 advocate for student concerns	4.72	.495	102	4.72	.480	152	0.023	.982
5 encourage student involvement	4.34	.621	102	4.26	.638	152	0.990	.323



6 assess student development outcomes	4.41	.619	102	4.30	.699	152	1.354	.177
7 maintain accessibility to students	4.68	.530	102	4.70	.472	152	0.433	.666
8 seek student opinions on issues	4.66	.517	102	4.68	.483	152	0.327	.744

#### Managing the Political Environment

1 understand CSAO role as politician	4.43	.622	102	4.34	.718	152	1.099	.273
2 network with other administrators	4.66	.497	102	4.50	.587	152	2.290	.023*
3 problem solve with senior staff	4.83	.375	102	4.71	.469	152	2.311	.022*
4 demonstrate respect for others	4.88	.324	102	4.84	.406	152	1.019	.309
5 respect for institutional processes	4.72	.472	101	4.63	.523	152	1.441	.151
6 gather information on institutional processes	4.31	.612	101	4.20	.634	152	1.283	.201
7 gather information on senior staff interests	4.02	.703	101	3.85	.779	152	1.818	.070
8 observe others' behaviors	4.19	.741	102	3.99	.796	151	1.944	.053
9 know formal dimensions of institutional culture	4.55	.538	101	4.43	.627	152	1.579	.116
10 know informal dimensions of culture	4.65	.556	101	4.52	.620	151	1.829	.075
11 know institutional issues	4.73	.470	102	4.62	.501	152	1.733	.088
12 know institutions history and lore	4.26	.673	101	4.28	.635	152	0.305	.761

13 develop credibility with faculty	4.81	.391	102	4.66	.541	152	2.662	.008*
14 understand faculty governance process	4.37	.628	102	4.37	.687	152	0.049	.961
<u>Personal Qualities</u>								
1 develop a 'public presence'	4.60	.531	101	4.51	.598	152	1.358	.176
2 be visible at key institutional events	4.68	.470	102	4.68	.508	151	0.089	.929
3 choose events to attend	4.32	.566	102	4.22	.653	152	1.259	.209
4 maintain integrity in decision making	4.95	.217	102	4.92	.271	152	0.934	.351
5 manage stress effectively	4.72	.475	102	4.66	.501	152	0.816	.451
6 make one-on-one connections with students	4.39	.662	102	4.53	.551	152	1.773	.078
<u>Planning and Goal Setting</u>								
1 have clearly stated goals	4.58	.570	101	4.63	.537	151	0.636	.526
2 plan for facilities improvements	4.39	.547	101	4.40	.590	152	0.206	.837
3 plan for implementing short term goals	4.60	.492	101	4.53	.527	151	1.140	.255
4 use a model for systematic planning	4.29	.739	101	4.32	.572	151	0.451	.652
5 tie planning model to budgeting process	4.42	.778	101	4.39	.631	152	0.311	.756
<u>Leadership and Supervision</u>								
1 develop individualistic leadership style	4.48	.671	102	4.50	.620	151	0.198	.843

2 manage budget process	4.78	.413	102	4.67	.499	152	1.968	.050*
3 develop efficient administrative tasks	4.55	.538	102	4.50	.515	152	0.731	.466
4 develop process for recruitment & selection	4.41	.635	102	4.38	.639	152	0.451	.653
5 delegate tasks	4.54	.539	102	4.48	.598	152	0.801	.424
6 delegate management of units to directors	4.60	.531	102	4.58	.534	152	0.280	.780
7 meet regularly with direct reports	4.67	.512	101	4.57	.560	150	1.460	.146
8 utilize effective time management strategies	4.69	.507	102	4.57	.535	152	1.717	.087
<u>Professional Development</u>								
1 attend professional conferences	4.24	.692	102	4.10	.669	152	1.547	.117
2 present sessions at conferences	3.60	.721	102	3.57	.786	152	0.331	.741
3 hold office in professional associations	3.25	.875	102	3.30	.815	151	0.401	.698
4 attend seminars on special topics	4.11	.673	102	4.02	.614	152	1.078	.282
5 serve as adjunct faculty	3.43	1.010	102	3.55	.936	151	0.995	.340
6 submit articles for publication	3.32	.858	102	3.33	.844	152	0.050	.960
7 consult with colleagues on difficult issues	4.40	.761	102	4.19	.688	152	2.297	.022*

\*Items are significant at the  $p < .05$ .

### Research Question 2; Null Hypothesis 2

With respect to ethnicity, the data were analyzed using an independent  $t$ -test. All results are presented in Table 7. Several tests yielded significant results. One question in the *Communication* section was significant. For Item 6, share current research with staff,  $t(59.755) = 2.050$ ,  $p = .045$ . No items in the *President Relationship* was significant. In the *Student Education and Growth* section, one item, number 6, assess student development outcomes, was significant where  $t(252) = 2.020$ ,  $p = .044$ . In *Managing the Political Environment*, Item 4, demonstrate respect for others, was significant where  $t(102.110) = 2.140$ ,  $p = .035$ . Item 14, understanding the faculty governance process, was also significant where  $t(252) = 2.476$ ,  $p = .014$ . No items in the *Personal Qualities* section were significant.

The *Planning and Goal Setting* section yielded significant results on Items 1, 4, and 5. For Item 1, having a clearly stated goals and objectives statement,  $t(90.652) = 3.319$ ,  $p = .001$ . With respect to Item 4, using a model for systematic planning  $t(250) = 1.979$ ,  $p = .049$ . Lastly, Item 5, tying the planning model to the budgeting process,  $t(251) = 2.532$ ,  $p = .012$ . No items in the *Leadership and Supervision* section were significant.

In the *Professional Development* section, significance was found on Items 3, 6, and 7. For Item 3, holding office in professional associations,  $t(251) = 2.654$ ,  $p = .008$ . On Item 6, submit articles and book chapters for publication,  $t(87.755) = 5.356$ ,  $p = .000$ . For Item 7, consulting with colleagues at other institutions,  $t(252) = 2.575$ ,  $p = .011$ . In every case where significance was found, the mean for CSAOs of Color was always higher than the mean for Caucasian/White CSAOs.

Table 7

Independent t-test for Ethnicity (Hypothesis 2)

Question	<u>Caucasian</u>			<u>Of Color</u>			<u>t</u>	<u>p</u>
	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>n</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>n</u>		
<u>Communication</u>								
1 maintain open line of communication	4.85	.358	207	4.89	.315	46	0.719	.473
2 expect staff to keep you informed	4.79	.430	207	4.73	.495	45	0.810	.418
3 share information with students & staff	4.50	.583	205	4.56	.503	45	0.567	.571
4 speak with media during crisis	4.12	.857	207	4.04	.729	46	0.590	.557
5 speak with media on general issues	3.79	.733	207	3.78	.841	46	0.039	.969
6 share research with staff	4.00	.615	207	4.24	.736	46	2.050	.045*
7 interpret legislation to staff	4.15	.751	206	4.33	.668	46	1.502	.134
8 share institutional objectives with staff	4.75	.468	206	4.72	.502	46	0.390	.697
9 brief the president about incidents	4.89	.315	207	4.93	.250	46	0.925	.356
10 interpret policies	4.46	.599	203	4.61	.537	46	1.517	.131
11 present student affairs purposes to faculty	4.46	.608	206	4.74	.444	46	1.884	.063
12 facilitate policy development	4.51	.583	205	4.38	.650	45	1.322	.187

Presidential Relationship

1 meet regularly with president	4.62	.634	208	4.59	.652	46	0.274	.785
2 assist president in handling crises	4.85	.383	208	4.83	.486	46	0.379	.705
3 assist president in setting goals	4.67	.548	208	4.70	.553	46	0.306	.760
4 assist president in developing relationships with external stakeholders	4.03	.810	208	4.26	.681	46	1.806	.072
5 assist president with fund raising	3.60	1.003	208	3.70	.840	46	0.626	.532
6 share student opinions with president	4.64	.555	208	4.65	.566	46	0.088	.930
7 support the president in public	4.85	.384	207	4.72	.544	46	1.571	.122
8 assist president with community issues	4.28	.751	206	4.28	.688	46	0.009	.993
9 advise president on student concerns	4.88	.349	208	4.96	.206	46	1.850	.067

Student Education & Growth

1 value student education and growth	4.86	.361	208	4.84	.367	45	0.271	.786
2 incorporate student affairs in academics	4.55	.571	208	4.65	.526	46	1.083	.280
3 serve as a student expert	4.50	.629	208	4.30	.695	46	1.872	.062
4 advocate for student concerns	4.72	.493	208	4.72	.455	46	0.013	.989
5 encourage student involvement	4.29	.640	208	4.33	.598	46	0.365	.715

6 assess student development outcomes	4.30	.674	208	4.52	.623	46	2.020	.044*
7 maintain accessibility to students	4.68	.506	208	4.74	.444	46	0.699	.485
8 seek student opinions on issues	4.66	.503	208	4.70	.465	46	0.398	.691
<u>Managing the Political Environment</u>								
1 understand CSAO role as politician	4.37	.503	208	4.39	.682	46	0.190	.850
2 network with other administrators	4.55	.683	208	4.63	.532	46	0.907	.365
3 problem solve with senior staff	4.76	.563	208	4.76	.431	46	0.018	.986
4 demonstrate respect for others	4.84	.439	208	4.93	.250	46	2.140	.035*
5 respect for institutional processes	4.67	.396	207	4.65	.566	46	0.235	.815
6 gather information on institutional processes	4.24	.501	207	4.28	.720	46	0.449	.654
7 gather information on senior staff interests	3.91	.605	208	3.96	.788	46	0.390	.697
8 observe others' behaviors	4.06	.746	207	4.13	.778	46	0.570	.569
9 know formal dimensions of institutional culture	4.47	.780	207	4.52	.658	46	0.497	.619
10 know informal dimensions of culture	4.57	.581	207	4.58	.753	45	0.078	.938
11 know institutional issues	4.67	.561	208	4.61	.577	46	0.707	.482
12 know institutions history and lore	4.27	.470	207	4.28	.720	46	0.114	.909

13 develop credibility with faculty	4.73	.634	208	4.70	.591	46	0.378	.706
14 understand faculty governance process	4.32	.468	208	4.59	.617	46	2.476	.014*
<u>Personal Qualities</u>								
1 develop a 'public presence'	4.54	.665	207	4.57	.620	46	0.258	.797
2 be visible at key institutional events	4.68	.563	208	4.67	.477	45	0.198	.843
3 choose events to attend	4.23	.497	208	4.41	.686	46	1.812	.071
4 maintain integrity in decision making	4.93	.602	208	4.96	.206	46	0.701	.484
5 manage stress effectively	4.67	.295	208	4.76	.480	46	1.179	.273
6 make one-on-one connections with students	4.47	.492	208	4.52	.505	46	0.565	.573
<u>Planning and Goal Setting</u>								
1 have clearly stated goals	4.57	.621	206	4.80	.401	46	3.319	.001*
2 plan for facilities improvements	4.39	.570	207	4.41	.717	46	0.194	.847
3 plan for implementing short term goals	4.54	.537	206	4.63	.488	46	1.077	.285
4 use a model for systematic planning	4.27	.518	206	4.48	.586	46	1.979	.049*
5 tie planning model to budgeting process	4.35	.651	207	4.63	.645	46	2.532	.012*
<u>Leadership and Supervision</u>								
1 develop individualistic leadership style	4.48	.637	207	4.52	.658	46	0.370	.712



2 manage budget process	4.71	.477	208	4.76	.431	46	0.708	.479
3 develop efficient administrative tasks	4.50	.520	208	4.61	.537	46	1.275	.203
4 develop process for recruitment & selection	4.41	.630	208	4.30	.662	46	1.006	.315
5 delegate tasks	4.50	.573	208	4.50	.587	46	0.051	.959
6 delegate management of units to directors	4.57	.534	208	4.65	.526	46	0.923	.357
7 meet regularly with direct reports	4.61	.537	208	4.64	.570	45	0.421	.674
8 utilize effective time management strategies	4.63	.522	208	4.57	.544	46	0.753	.452
<u>Professional Development</u>								
1 attend professional conferences	4.16	.668	208	4.11	.737	46	0.494	.622
2 present sessions at conferences	3.54	.766	208	3.74	.713	46	1.588	.114
3 hold office in professional associations	3.22	.843	208	3.58	.753	45	2.654	.008*
4 attend seminars on special topics	4.04	.639	208	4.11	.640	46	0.628	.531
5 serve as adjunct faculty	3.48	.980	207	3.59	.909	46	0.659	.511
6 submit articles for publication	3.22	.856	208	3.80	.619	46	5.356	.000*
7 consult with colleagues on difficult issues	4.22	.748	208	4.52	.547	46	2.575	.011*

\*These items are significant where  $p < .05$ .

### Research Question 2; Null Hypothesis 3

In examining the Pearson correlation between number of years of experience the CSAOs had in their current position with their ratings of the critical skills, there were some areas of significance. All results are listed in Table 8. No significance was found in the *Communication* and *Presidential Relationship* sections. One item in the *Student Growth and Development* section, number 7, maintaining accessibility to students, had an  $r = .147$ ,  $p = .020$ . In the *Managing the Political Environment* section, Item 12, knowing the institution's history and lore, had an  $r = .146$ ,  $p = .021$ . No items in the *Personal Qualities*, *Planning and Goal Setting*, *Leadership and Supervision*, and *Professional Development* sections were found to be significant.

An additional Pearson correlation was conducted comparing the importance of the critical skills and the total years each participant had been a CSAO (not just the years in their current position). Only one item was significant. Item 7 in the *Student Education and Growth* section, maintain accessibility to students, was significant where  $r = .128$  and  $p = .042$ .

### Research Question 2; Null Hypothesis 4

In examining the Pearson correlation between the number of years of experience upon attainment of the first CSAO position with the CSAOs' ratings of the critical skills, there were some areas of significance. All results are presented in Table 8. In the *Communication* section, Item 8, share institutional objectives with staff,  $r = -0.171$ ,  $p = .007$ . In the *Presidential Relationship* section, Item 8, assisting the president with issues in the surrounding community,  $r = .127$ ,  $p = .047$ . In the *Student Growth and*

Table 8

Pearson Correlation Coefficients for Years in Position and Experience Upon Attainment of CSAO Position with the Critical Skills (Hypotheses 3 and 4)

Question	Mean	<u>Years in Position</u> (M = 6.86)			<u>Experience Before CSAO</u> (M = 14.29)		
		<u>r</u>	<u>p</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>r</u>	<u>p</u>	<u>N</u>
<u>Communication</u>							
1 maintain open line of communication	4.86	-0.055	.384	251	0.003	.964	244
2 expect staff to keep you informed	4.78	0.049	.445	250	-0.013	.844	243
3 share information with students & staff	4.51	0.019	.766	248	-0.036	.580	241
4 speak with media during crisis	4.11	0.037	.561	251	-0.015	.816	244
5 speak with media on general issues	3.79	0.025	.699	251	-0.097	.131	244
6 share research with staff	4.05	-0.050	.430	251	-0.108	.092	244
7 interpret legislation to staff	4.18	0.019	.761	250	-0.024	.706	243
8 share institutional objectives with staff	4.74	0.035	.587	250	-0.171	.007*	243
9 brief the president about incidents	4.90	0.019	.759	251	-0.005	.935	244
10 interpret policies	4.49	-0.046	.477	247	-0.074	.254	240
11 present student affairs purposes to faculty	4.62	-0.087	.173	250	-0.038	.558	243
12 facilitate policy development	4.49	-0.041	.522	248	-0.100	.120	241

Presidential Relationship

1 meet regularly with president	4.61	-0.080	.203	252	0.046	.470	245
2 assist president in handling crisis	4.85	0.043	.498	252	-0.015	.818	245
3 assist president in setting goals	4.67	0.047	.458	252	-0.014	.826	245
4 assist president in developing relationships with external stakeholders	4.07	0.011	.864	252	-0.053	.405	245
5 assist president with fund raising	3.62	-0.054	.389	252	0.069	.282	245
6 share student opinions with president	4.65	-0.026	.685	252	-0.008	.896	245
7 support the president in public	4.83	-0.013	.835	251	-0.094	.142	244
8 assist president with community issues	4.28	0.013	.836	250	0.127	.047*	243
9 advise president on student concerns	4.90	-0.083	.189	252	-0.052	.413	245

Student Education & Growth

1 value student education and growth	4.86	-0.012	.849	251	0.026	.682	244
2 incorporate student affairs in academics	4.57	0.008	.895	252	-0.051	.424	245
3 serve as a student expert	4.47	0.092	.146	252	-0.079	.219	245
4 advocate for student concerns	4.72	0.070	.270	252	-0.090	.159	245
5 encourage student involvement	4.29	-0.066	.294	252	-0.013	.840	245

6 assess student development outcomes	4.34	-0.039	.536	252	-0.048	.451	245
7 maintain accessibility to students	4.69	0.147	.020*	252	-0.177	.006*	245
8 seek student opinions on issues	4.67	0.099	.116	252	0.007	.919	245
<u>Managing the Political Environment</u>							
1 understand CSAO role as politician	4.38	-0.120	.057	252	-0.056	.379	245
2 network with other administrators	4.56	-0.047	.453	252	0.002	.977	245
3 problem solve with senior staff	4.76	-0.032	.613	252	-0.023	.715	245
4 demonstrate respect for others	4.85	0.025	.690	252	-0.021	.749	245
5 respect for institutional processes	4.67	0.008	.896	251	-0.010	.881	244
6 gather information on institutional processes	4.25	-0.063	.324	251	0.022	.729	244
7 gather information on senior staff interests	3.92	0.008	.902	252	0.084	.192	245
8 observe others' behaviors	4.07	-0.072	.255	251	0.151	.018*	244
9 know formal dimensions of institutional culture	4.48	0.075	.239	251	0.008	.906	245
10 know informal dimensions of culture	4.57	0.023	.719	250	0.008	.897	244
11 know institutional issues	4.66	0.010	.877	252	0.042	.514	245
12 know institutions history and lore	4.28	0.146	.021*	251	-0.131	.041*	244

13 develop credibility with faculty	4.72	0.034	.589	252	-0.083	.197	245
14 understand faculty governance process	4.37	-0.049	.441	252	0.029	.655	245
<u>Personal Qualities</u>							
1 develop a 'public presence'	4.55	-0.067	.290	251	-0.135	.035*	244
2 be visible at key institutional events	4.68	0.077	.221	251	-0.104	.106	244
3 choose events to attend	4.26	-0.035	.585	252	-0.038	.555	245
4 maintain integrity in decision making	4.93	-0.039	.538	252	-0.051	.423	245
5 manage stress effectively	4.69	-0.048	.452	252	-0.080	.213	245
6 make one-on-one connections with students	4.47	0.023	.711	252	-0.095	.138	245
<u>Planning and Goal Setting</u>							
1 have clearly stated goals	4.61	0.055	.386	250	-0.013	.841	243
2 plan for facilities improvements	4.39	-0.029	.644	251	0.068	.287	244
3 plan for implementing short term goals	4.56	-0.064	.315	250	0.000	.995	243
4 use a model for systematic planning	4.31	-0.015	.817	250	-0.040	.530	243
5 tie planning model to budgeting process	4.40	0.054	.391	251	-0.082	.201	244
<u>Leadership and Supervision</u>							
1 develop individualistic leadership style	4.49	0.040	.526	251	-0.018	.775	244

2 manage budget process	4.72	-0.022	.733	252	-0.001	.982	245
3 develop efficient administrative tasks	4.52	-0.036	.566	252	-0.012	.855	245
4 develop process for recruitment & selection	4.39	0.022	.725	252	-0.086	.182	245
5 delegate tasks	4.51	-0.008	.905	252	-0.061	.344	245
6 delegate management of units to directors	4.59	-0.085	.179	252	0.045	.485	245
7 meet regularly with direct reports	4.61	-0.074	.244	249	0.031	.636	242
8 utilize effective time management strategies	4.62	-0.115	.068	252	0.098	.126	245
<u>Professional Development</u>							
1 attend professional conferences	4.16	0.005	.942	252	0.039	.540	245
2 present sessions at conferences	3.58	0.036	.574	252	-0.010	.876	245
3 hold office in professional associations	3.28	0.038	.545	251	0.056	.385	244
4 attend seminars on special topics	4.05	0.003	.967	252	0.040	.533	245
5 serve as adjunct faculty	3.50	0.080	.208	251	-0.080	.211	244
6 submit articles for publication	3.33	0.037	.555	252	-0.006	.928	245
7 consult with colleagues on difficult issues	4.28	0.054	.396	252	-0.014	.829	245

---

\* Significant at  $p < .05$  level.

*Development* section, Item 7, maintain accessibility to students,  $r = -0.177$ ,  $p = .006$ . In the *Managing the Political Environment* section, Items 8 and 12 were significant. Item 8, observe behavior patterns of others, was  $r = .151$ ,  $p = .018$ . Item 12, know the institution's history and lore, was  $r = -0.131$ ,  $p = .041$ . In the *Personal Qualities* section, Item 1, develop a 'public presence',  $r = -0.135$ ,  $p = .035$ . No items of significance were found in the *Planning and Goal Setting*, *Leadership and Supervision*, and *Professional Development* sections.

#### Research Question 2; Null Hypothesis 5

With respect to field of degree, the data were analyzed using an independent  $t$ -test. Several tests yielded significant results. All results are presented in Table 9. Two items in the *Communication* section yielded significant results. Item 1, maintain an open line of communication, was  $t(210.989) = 1.998$ ,  $p = .047$ . Item 4, speak with the media in times of crisis, was  $t(251) = 2.474$ ,  $p = .014$ . No items in the *Presidential Relationship* and *Student Growth and Development* sections were significant.

Item 6 in the *Managing the Political Environment* section, gather information concerning institutional processes, was  $t(251) = 2.066$ ,  $p = .040$ . No items were significant in the *Personal Qualities* section. One item in *Planning and Goal Setting*, Item 1, have a clearly stated goals statement, was  $t(228.780) = -2.359$ ,  $p = .019$ . No items were significant in the *Leadership and Supervision* and *Professional Development* sections.



Table 9

Independent t-test for Field of Degree (Hypothesis 5)

	<u>Higher Ed/Student Personnel</u>			<u>Other</u>				
<u>Question</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>n</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>n</u>	<u>t</u>	<u>p</u>
<u>Communication</u>								
1 maintain open line of communication	4.81	.395	115	4.90	.303	138	1.998	.047*
2 expect staff to keep you informed	4.77	.465	115	4.80	.423	137	0.543	.587
3 share information with students & staff	4.51	.553	113	4.51	.583	137	0.032	.974
4 speak with media during crisis	4.24	.801	115	3.99	.846	138	2.274	.014*
5 speak with media on general issues	3.83	.679	115	3.75	.809	138	0.763	.446
6 share research with staff	4.03	.561	115	4.05	.708	138	0.200	.842
7 interpret legislation to staff	4.18	.670	115	4.18	.794	137	0.079	.937
8 share institutional objectives with staff	4.71	.510	114	4.77	.440	138	0.948	.344
9 brief the president about incidents	4.90	.295	115	4.89	.312	138	0.339	.735
10 interpret policies	4.56	.611	113	4.43	.567	136	1.654	.099
11 present student affairs purposes to faculty	4.69	.484	115	4.56	.651	137	1.743	.083
12 facilitate policy development	4.52	.536	115	4.45	.643	135	0.924	.356

Presidential Relationship

1 meet regularly with president	4.67	.601	116	4.56	.662	138	1.431	.154
2 assist president in handling crisis	4.85	.401	116	4.84	.405	138	0.253	.800
3 assist president in setting goals	4.72	.524	116	4.64	.566	138	1.129	.260
4 assist president in developing relationships with external stakeholders	4.06	.783	116	4.08	.802	138	0.194	.847
5 assist president with fund raising	3.60	1.046	116	3.62	.914	138	0.161	.873
6 share student opinions with president	4.63	.583	116	4.66	.533	138	0.430	.668
7 support the president in public	4.87	.387	115	4.79	.443	138	1.527	.128
8 assist president with community issues	4.30	.728	115	4.26	.750	137	0.444	.657
9 advise president on student concerns	4.89	.343	116	4.91	.317	138	0.431	.667

Student Education & Growth

1 value student education and growth	4.83	.402	116	4.88	.322	137	1.200	.231
2 incorporate student affairs in academics	4.56	.532	116	4.58	.590	138	0.273	.785
3 serve as a student expert	4.44	.650	116	4.49	.642	138	0.564	.573
4 advocate for student concerns	4.70	.479	116	4.73	.491	138	0.549	.583
5 encourage student involvement	4.27	.637	116	4.32	.628	138	0.648	.518

6 assess student development outcomes	4.32	.641	116	4.36	.693	138	0.514	.608
7 maintain accessibility to students	4.65	.515	116	4.73	.476	138	1.361	.175
8 seek student opinions on issues	4.65	.480	116	4.69	.510	138	0.669	.504

#### Managing the Political Environment

1 understand CSAO role as politician	4.43	.662	116	4.33	.696	138	1.224	.222
2 network with other administrators	4.58	.513	116	4.55	.593	138	0.382	.703
3 problem solve with senior staff	4.75	.435	116	4.77	.440	138	0.328	.743
4 demonstrate respect for others	4.85	.379	116	4.86	.373	138	0.034	.973
5 respect for institutional processes	4.69	.466	115	4.65	.536	138	0.545	.586
6 gather information on institutional processes	4.16	.657	115	4.32	.592	138	2.066	.040*
7 gather information on senior staff interests	3.91	.769	116	3.93	.741	138	0.235	.814
8 observe others' behaviors	4.05	.724	115	4.09	.824	138	0.353	.724
9 know formal dimensions of institutional culture	4.49	.611	116	4.47	.583	137	0.225	.822
10 know informal dimensions of culture	4.59	.604	116	4.55	.594	136	0.573	.567
11 know institutional issues	4.69	.465	116	4.64	.512	138	0.841	.401
12 know institutions history and lore	4.23	.612	115	4.30	.679	138	0.848	.397

13 develop credibility with faculty	4.71	.476	116	4.73	.506	138	0.403	.687
--	------	------	-----	------	------	-----	-------	------

14 understand faculty governance process	4.42	.621	116	4.33	.696	138	1.154	.250
---	------	------	-----	------	------	-----	-------	------

#### Personal Qualities

1 develop a 'public presence'	4.50	.598	115	4.58	.551	138	1.042	.298
----------------------------------	------	------	-----	------	------	-----	-------	------

2 be visible at key institutional events	4.68	.486	116	4.68	.499	137	0.035	.972
---	------	------	-----	------	------	-----	-------	------

3 choose events to attend	4.28	.613	116	4.25	.629	138	0.284	.777
------------------------------	------	------	-----	------	------	-----	-------	------

4 maintain integrity in decision making	4.91	.294	116	4.96	.205	138	1.585	.115
--	------	------	-----	------	------	-----	-------	------

5 manage stress effectively	4.64	.500	116	4.72	.480	138	1.402	.162
--------------------------------	------	------	-----	------	------	-----	-------	------

6 make one-on-one connections with students	4.43	.636	116	4.51	.570	138	1.103	.271
--	------	------	-----	------	------	-----	-------	------

#### Planning and Goal Setting

1 have clearly stated goals	4.52	.583	115	4.69	.511	137	2.359	.019*
--------------------------------	------	------	-----	------	------	-----	-------	-------

2 plan for facilities improvements	4.35	.548	116	4.43	.592	137	1.070	.286
---------------------------------------	------	------	-----	------	------	-----	-------	------

3 plan for implementing short term goals	4.55	.517	116	4.57	.512	136	0.222	.824
---	------	------	-----	------	------	-----	-------	------

4 use a model for systematic planning	4.26	.577	116	4.35	.694	136	1.178	.240
--	------	------	-----	------	------	-----	-------	------

5 tie planning model to budgeting process	4.38	.628	116	4.42	.744	137	0.420	.675
--	------	------	-----	------	------	-----	-------	------

#### Leadership and Supervision

1 develop individualistic leadership style	4.42	.675	115	4.55	.605	138	1.656	.099
---	------	------	-----	------	------	-----	-------	------

2 manage budget process	4.75	.454	116	4.69	.480	138	1.043	.298
3 develop efficient administrative tasks	4.50	.519	116	4.54	.529	138	0.548	.584
4 develop process for recruitment & selection	4.34	.647	116	4.43	.627	138	1.032	.303
5 delegate tasks	4.48	.582	116	4.52	.570	138	0.538	.591
6 delegate management of units to directors	4.55	.549	116	4.62	.517	138	0.958	.339
7 meet regularly with direct reports	4.58	.546	115	4.64	.540	136	0.831	.407
8 utilize effective time management strategies	4.63	.520	116	4.60	.533	138	0.311	.756
<u>Professional Development</u>								
1 attend professional conferences	4.22	.643	116	4.10	.708	138	1.334	.184
2 present sessions at conferences	3.58	.724	116	3.58	.791	138	0.022	.982
3 hold office in professional associations	3.28	.819	116	3.28	.857	137	0.083	.934
4 attend seminars on special topics	4.03	.567	116	4.08	.695	138	0.680	.497
5 serve as adjunct faculty	3.60	.972	115	3.42	.958	138	1.477	.141
6 submit articles for publication	3.34	.812	116	3.32	.879	138	0.162	.871
7 consult with colleagues on difficult issues	4.30	.675	116	4.25	.765	138	0.526	.599

---

\* Significant at  $p < .05$ .

### Research Question 2; Null Hypothesis 6

With respect to number of CSAO positions held, the data were analyzed using an independent  $t$ -test comparing CSAOs having held only one CSAO position with those having held more than one CSAO position. No tests yielded significant results in any of the eight sections of the survey.

### Research Question 2; Null Hypothesis 7

With respect to the reporting category of the CSAOs (either reporting to the president or to the provost), the data were analyzed using an independent  $t$ -test. All results are presented in Table 10. Only three items were found to be significant. All of these items were in the *Communication* section. For Item 4, speak with media in times of crisis,  $t(223) = 2.220$ ,  $p = .027$ . For Item 5, speak with media concerning general campus issues,  $t(223) = 1.996$ ,  $p = .047$ . Finally, for Item 6, share current research with student affairs staff,  $t(223) = 1.971$ ,  $p = .050$ . In each of the items, CSAOs reporting to the provost ranked these skills higher than the CSAOs reporting directly to the president. No items in any of the other seven sections yielded significant results.

### Research Question 2; Null Hypothesis 8

Data were analyzed using a one way ANOVA comparing CSAOs at the different Carnegie classification institutions. Statistical power for this analysis as reported previously is less than .25. All results are presented in Table 11. In the *Communications* section, Item 3, share information with student leaders and staff, was  $F(4, 243) = 3.648$ ,  $p = .007$ . A Tukey HSD post hoc revealed that CSAOs at Associate's Colleges rated this skill higher than CSAOs at Doctorate-granting Institutions did. In addition, Item 12,

Table 10

Independent t-test for CSAO Reporting Category (Hypothesis 7)

	<u>President</u>			<u>Provost</u>				
<u>Question</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>n</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>n</u>	<u>t</u>	<u>p</u>
<u>Communication</u>								
1 maintain open line of communication	4.85	.359	199	4.88	.326	26	0.478	.633
2 expect staff to keep you informed	4.77	.447	198	4.85	.368	26	0.995	.326
3 share information with students & staff	4.51	.577	196	4.58	.504	26	0.561	.575
4 speak with media during crisis	4.08	.831	199	4.46	.761	26	2.220	.027*
5 speak with media on general issues	3.76	.773	199	4.08	.688	26	1.996	.047*
6 share research with staff	4.01	.640	199	4.27	.667	26	1.971	.050*
7 interpret legislation to staff	4.15	.745	198	4.23	.765	26	0.508	.612
8 share institutional objectives with staff	4.76	.461	198	4.69	.471	26	0.730	.466
9 brief the president about incidents	4.92	.265	199	4.81	.402	26	1.443	.160
10 interpret policies	4.49	.612	195	4.54	.508	26	0.408	.683
11 present student affairs purposes to faculty	4.64	.578	198	4.62	.571	26	0.174	.862
12 facilitate policy development	4.51	.568	196	4.35	.629	26	1.366	.173

Presidential Relationship

1 meet regularly with president	4.67	.532	200	4.46	.948	26	1.099	.281
2 assist president in handling crisis	4.87	.357	200	4.88	.431	26	0.257	.797
3 assist president in setting goals	4.70	.513	200	4.54	.582	26	1.441	.151
4 assist president in developing relationships with external stakeholders	4.07	.744	200	3.96	.916	26	0.649	.517
5 assist president with fund raising	3.63	.926	200	3.58	1.102	26	0.269	.788
6 share student opinions with president	4.68	.497	200	4.50	.812	26	1.134	.267
7 support the president in public	4.84	.377	199	4.96	.344	26	1.616	.116
8 assist president with community issues	4.30	.696	198	4.35	.846	26	0.326	.747
9 advise president on student concerns	4.93	.282	200	4.85	.464	26	0.846	.405

Student Education & Growth

1 value student education and growth	4.84	.377	199	4.88	.326	26	0.521	.603
2 incorporate student affairs in academics	4.54	.584	200	4.73	.452	26	2.001	.053
3 serve as a student expert	4.49	.634	200	4.42	.703	26	0.463	.644
4 advocate for student concerns	4.72	.482	200	4.65	.562	26	0.645	.520
5 encourage student involvement	4.29	.623	200	4.27	.604	26	0.161	.873



6 assess student development outcomes	4.33	.672	200	4.35	.689	26	0.151	.880
7 maintain accessibility to students	4.71	.487	200	4.62	.571	26	0.913	.362
8 seek student opinions on issues	4.69	.485	200	4.54	.582	26	1.272	.213
<u>Managing the Political Environment</u>								
1 understand CSAO role as politician	4.37	.690	200	4.50	.583	26	0.919	.359
2 network with other administrators	4.58	.534	200	4.46	.647	26	0.895	.378
3 problem solve with senior staff	4.76	.443	200	4.65	.485	26	1.084	.280
4 demonstrate respect for others	4.85	.390	200	4.81	.402	26	0.458	.648
5 respect for institutional processes	4.66	.517	200	4.58	.504	26	0.726	.468
6 gather information on institutional processes	4.22	.596	199	4.12	.816	26	0.812	.418
7 gather information on senior staff interests	3.90	.730	200	3.92	.845	26	0.149	.882
8 observe others' behaviors	4.05	.767	199	4.04	.774	26	0.042	.966
9 know formal dimensions of institutional culture	4.48	.576	199	4.38	.637	26	0.763	.446
10 know informal dimensions of culture	4.57	.581	198	4.50	.648	26	0.576	.566
11 know institutional issues	4.66	.487	200	4.69	.471	26	0.369	.713
12 know institutions history and lore	4.29	.630	199	4.27	.667	26	0.130	.897

13 develop credibility with faculty	4.73	.467	200	4.81	.402	26	0.810	.419
14 understand faculty governance process	4.39	.663	200	4.46	.582	26	0.524	.601
<u>Personal Qualities</u>								
1 develop a 'public presence'	4.56	.573	199	4.62	.571	26	0.482	.630
2 be visible at key institutional events	4.72	.483	199	4.62	.496	26	1.021	.308
3 choose events to attend	4.29	.613	200	4.23	.587	26	0.426	.670
4 maintain integrity in decision making	4.95	.218	200	4.85	.368	26	1.407	.171
5 manage stress effectively	4.68	.489	200	4.69	.471	26	0.125	.901
6 make one-on-one connections with students	4.49	.601	200	4.50	.583	26	0.120	.905
<u>Planning and Goal Setting</u>								
1 have clearly stated goals	4.59	.569	199	4.62	.496	26	0.192	.848
2 plan for facilities improvements	4.38	.564	199	4.38	.496	26	0.023	.981
3 plan for implementing short term goals	4.55	.519	198	4.50	.510	26	0.468	.640
4 use a model for systematic planning	4.28	.651	199	4.46	.508	26	1.396	.164
5 tie planning model to budgeting process	4.40	.688	199	4.31	.549	26	0.636	.526
<u>Leadership and Supervision</u>								
1 develop individualistic leadership style	4.51	.627	199	4.46	.582	26	0.394	.694

2 manage budget process	4.72	.470	200	4.58	.504	26	1.500	.135
3 develop efficient administrative tasks	4.49	.530	200	4.50	.510	26	0.091	.928
4 develop process for recruitment & selection	4.39	.631	200	4.35	.562	26	0.299	.766
5 delegate tasks	4.51	.576	200	4.42	.578	26	0.766	.445
6 delegate management of units to directors	4.57	.536	200	4.58	.504	24	0.107	.915
7 meet regularly with direct reports	4.59	.541	199	4.58	.584	26	0.082	.935
8 utilize effective time management strategies	4.63	.525	200	4.50	.583	26	1.127	.261
<u>Professional Development</u>								
1 attend professional conferences	4.14	.688	200	4.19	.634	26	0.368	.713
2 present sessions at conferences	3.57	.780	200	3.62	.637	26	0.316	.753
3 hold office in professional associations	3.24	.847	199	3.46	.582	26	1.316	.190
4 attend seminars on special topics	4.07	.635	200	3.85	.543	26	1.679	.095
5 serve as adjunct faculty	3.46	.983	199	3.73	.778	26	1.338	.182
6 submit articles for publication	3.31	.852	200	3.42	.758	26	0.673	.502
7 consult with colleagues on difficult issues	4.29	.720	200	4.23	.652	26	0.399	.691

\* Significance at  $p < .05$ .

facilitate policy development, was significant where  $F(4, 243) = 2.652, p = .034$ . A Tukey HSD post hoc revealed that CSAOs at Associate's Colleges rated this skill higher than CSAOs at Doctorate-granting Institutions did. Several items in the *Presidential Relationship* section were also significant. Item 5, assist president with fund raising activities, was  $F(4, 247) = 3.018, p = .019$ . Tukey HSD post hoc analysis revealed that CSAOs at Associate's Colleges perceived greater importance in this skill than CSAOs at Doctorate-granting Institutions did. Item 8, assist president with issues in the surrounding community, was significant where  $F(4, 245) = 3.094, p = .016$ . Tukey HSD post hoc analysis showed that CSAOs at Master's Colleges/Universities rated this skill significantly higher than CSAOs at Baccalaureate Colleges did. Item 9, advise president concerning student issues, was significant where  $F(4, 247) = 3.039, p = .018$ . Tukey HSD post hoc analysis did not yield any significant results.

In the *Student Education and Growth* section, two items were significant. For Item 6, assess student development outcomes,  $F(4, 247) = 3.387, p = .010$ . Tukey HSD post hoc analysis revealed that CSAOs at Associate's Colleges rated this skill significantly higher than CSAOs at Doctorate granting Institutions did. For Item 7, maintain accessibility to students,  $F(4, 247) = 3.802, p = .005$ . Tukey HSD post hoc analysis showed that CSAOs at Master's Colleges/Universities rated this skill significantly higher than CSAOs at Doctorate granting Institutions did.

Two items in the *Managing the Political Environment* section were significant. For Item 6, gather information concerning institutional processes,  $F(4, 246) = 2.837, p = .025$ . Tukey HSD post hoc analysis did not show any significant results. Item 7, gather

Table 11

ANOVA Results for Differences in Perceived Importance of the Critical Skills Based on Carnegie Classification of Institution (Hypothesis 8)

Question	F	df	p	Tukey
<u>Communication</u>				
1 maintain open line of communication	0.907	250	.460	
2 expect staff to keep you informed	0.715	249	.582	
3 share information with students & staff	3.648	247	.007*	4 > 1
4 speak with media during crisis	1.893	250	.112	
5 speak with media on general issues	1.039	250	.388	
6 share research with staff	0.743	250	.564	
7 interpret legislation to staff	2.226	249	.067	
8 share institutional objectives with staff	1.524	249	.196	
9 brief the president about incidents	0.311	250	.871	
10 interpret policies	0.677	246	.609	
11 present student affairs purposes to faculty	1.620	249	.170	
12 facilitate policy development	2.652	247	.034*	4 > 1

Presidential Relationship

1 meet regularly with president	2.374	251	.053	
2 assist president in handling crisis	1.801	251	.129	
3 assist president in setting goals	1.265	251	.284	
4 assist president in developing relationships with external stakeholders	1.588	251	.178	
5 assist president with fund raising	3.018	251	.019*	1 > 3
6 share student opinions with president	1.827	251	.124	
7 support the president in public	1.358	250	.249	
8 assist president with community issues	3.094	249	.016*	2 > 3
9 advise president on student concerns	3.039	251	.018*	

Student Education & Growth

1 value student education and growth	0.142	250	.966	
2 incorporate student affairs in academics	1.439	251	.222	
3 serve as a student expert	0.318	251	.866	
4 advocate for student concerns	1.201	251	.311	
5 encourage student involvement	0.952	251	.435	

6 assess student development outcomes	3.387	251	.010*	4 > 1
7 maintain accessibility to students	3.802	251	.005*	2 > 1
8 seek student opinions on issues	0.542	251	.705	

**Managing the Political Environment**

1 understand CSAO role as politician	2.224	251	.067	
2 network with other administrators	1.660	251	.160	
3 problem solve with senior staff	1.174	251	.323	
4 demonstrate respect for others	0.906	251	.461	
5 respect for institutional processes	0.889	250	.471	
6 gather information on institutional processes	2.837	250	.025*	
7 gather information on senior staff interests	2.559	251	.039*	
8 observe others' behaviors	0.735	250	.569	
9 know formal dimensions of institutional culture	1.431	250	.224	
10 know informal dimensions of culture	1.621	249	.169	
11 know institutional issues	1.262	251	.286	
12 know institutions history and lore	1.358	250	.249	

13 develop credibility with faculty	1.197	251	.313
--	-------	-----	------

14 understand faculty governance process	1.392	251	.237
---	-------	-----	------

#### Personal Qualities

1 develop a 'public presence'	0.653	250	.625
----------------------------------	-------	-----	------

2 be visible at key institutional events	0.790	250	.533
---	-------	-----	------

3 choose events to attend	2.109	251	.080
------------------------------	-------	-----	------

4 maintain integrity in decision making	0.532	251	.712
--	-------	-----	------

5 manage stress effectively	1.119	251	.348
--------------------------------	-------	-----	------

6 make one-on-one connections with students	2.956	251	.021*
--	-------	-----	-------

#### Planning and Goal Setting

1 have clearly stated goals	1.659	249	.160
--------------------------------	-------	-----	------

2 plan for facilities improvements	0.958	249	.431
---------------------------------------	-------	-----	------

3 plan for implementing short term goals	1.464	249	.214
---	-------	-----	------

4 use a model for systematic planning	3.842	249	.005*    4 > 3
--	-------	-----	----------------

5 tie planning model to budgeting process	1.668	250	.158
--	-------	-----	------

#### Leadership and Supervision

1 develop individualistic leadership style	1.308	250	.267
---	-------	-----	------



2 manage budget process	1.180	250	.320	
3 develop efficient administrative tasks	1.373	251	.244	
4 develop process for recruitment & selection	1.085	251	.364	
5 delegate tasks	0.630	251	.642	
6 delegate management of units to directors	1.813	251	.127	
7 meet regularly with direct reports	1.891	248	.113	
8 utilize effective time management strategies	1.425	251	.226	
<u>Professional Development</u>				
1 attend professional conferences	3.364	251	.011*	4 > 1
2 present sessions at conferences	4.449	251	.002*	1 > 5, 4 > 5 2 > 5
3 hold office in professional associations	5.790	250	.000*	4 > 1, 2 > 3 4 > 3, 4 > 5
4 attend seminars on special topics	2.037	251	.009*	
5 serve as adjunct faculty	2.094	250	.082	
6 submit articles for publication	3.103	251	.016*	
7 consult with colleagues on difficult issues	0.135	251	.969	

---

\* Significance at the  $p < .05$ .

1 = Doctorate granting Institutions

2 = Master's Colleges/Universities

3 = Baccalaureate Colleges

4 = Associate's Colleges

5 = Specialized Institutions

information concerning other senior staff interests, was significant where  $F(4, 247) = 2.559$ ,  $p = .039$ . Tukey HSD post hoc analysis showed no significant results.

One item in the *Personal Qualities* section was significant. For Item 6, make one-on-one connections with students,  $F(4, 247) = 2.956$ ,  $p = .021$ . Tukey HSD post hoc analysis showed no significant results. One item in the *Planning and Goal Setting* section, Item 4, use a model for systematic planning, was significant where  $F(4, 245) = 3.842$ ,  $p = .005$ . Tukey HSD post hoc analysis showed CSAOs at Associate's Colleges rated this skill significantly higher than CSAOs at Baccalaureate Colleges did.

No items in the *Leadership and Supervision* section were significant. However, five of the seven items in the *Professional Development* section were significant. First, Item 1, attend professional conferences, was significant where  $F(4, 247) = 3.364$ ,  $p = .011$ . Tukey HSD post hoc analysis revealed that CSAOs at Associate's Colleges rated this skill higher than CSAOs at Doctorate-granting Institutions did. Item 2, present sessions at professional conferences, was significant where  $F(4, 247) = 4.449$ ,  $p = .002$ . Tukey HSD post hoc analysis revealed that CSAOs at Doctorate-granting Institutions, CSAOs at Master's Colleges/Universities, and CSAOs at Associate's Colleges all rated this skill significantly higher than CSAOs at Specialized Institutions. For Item 3, hold office in professional associations,  $F(4, 246) = 5.790$ ,  $p = .000$ . Tukey HSD post hoc analysis showed that CSAOs at Master's Colleges/Universities and CSAOs at Associate's Colleges both rated this skill significantly higher than CSAOs at Baccalaureate Colleges did. In addition, CSAOs at Associate's Colleges rated this skill significantly higher than both CSAOs at Doctorate-granting Institutions and CSAOs at Specialized Institutions did.

For Item 4, attend seminars on special topics,  $F(4, 247) = 2.037$ ,  $p = .009$ . For Item 6, submit articles for publication,  $F(4, 247) = 3.103$ ,  $p = .016$ . The Tukey HSD post hoc analysis for Items 4 and 6 did not yield significant results.

#### Research Question 3; Null Hypothesis 9

Data were analyzed using a Chi Square analysis. The results showed no statistically significant relationship between the first ranking of the student affairs philosophies and the institutional type as classified by the Carnegie Foundation.

#### Research Question 3; Null Hypothesis 10

Data were analyzed using a Chi Square analysis. The results showed no statistically significant relationship between the first ranking of the student affairs philosophies and the gender of the CSAOs.

#### Research Question 3; Null Hypothesis 11

Data were analyzed using a Chi Square analysis. The results showed no statistically significant relationship between the first ranking of the student affairs philosophies and tenure in position of the CSAOs.

#### Research Question 3; Null Hypothesis 12

Data were analyzed using a Chi Square analysis. The results showed no statistically significant relationship between the first ranking of the student affairs philosophies and reporting structure of the CSAOs (whether they report to the president or provost).

#### Research Question 4

The importance placed on the critical skills (survey questions 1-69) was assessed using a one-way ANOVA with the number one rank of the philosophies of student affairs

responses. All results are presented in Table 12. In the *Communication* section, item 8, share institutional objectives with staff,  $F(2, 248) = 3.979, p = .020$ . Tukey HSD post hoc comparison revealed significant differences between those CSAOs preferring a student services philosophy and those preferring a student development philosophy. Overall, participating CSAOs ranked student development significantly higher than student services. In the *Presidential Relationship* section, Item 4, assist president in developing relationships with external stakeholders,  $F(2, 250) = 4.337, p = .014$ . Tukey HSD post hoc comparison revealed significant differences between those CSAOs preferring a student learning philosophy and those preferring a student development philosophy. Again, student learning was ranked significantly higher than student development. No significance was found for items in the *Student Growth and Development* section.

In the *Managing the Political Environment* section, Item 14, understanding the faculty governance process,  $F(2, 250) = 3.675, p = .027$ . Tukey HSD post hoc comparison revealed significant differences between those CSAOs preferring a student development philosophy and those preferring a student services philosophy. Student development was ranked significantly higher than student services. In the *Personal Qualities* section, Item 4, maintain integrity in decision making,  $F(2, 250) = 3.662, p = .027$ . Tukey HSD post hoc comparison revealed significant differences between those CSAOs preferring a student learning philosophy and those preferring a student development philosophy. CSAOs ranked student development significantly higher than student learning. No items in the *Planning and Goal Setting* section were significant. In Item 1 in *Leadership and*

*Supervision*, develop an individualistic style of leadership,  $F(2, 249) = 4.105, p = .018$ . Tukey HSD post hoc comparison revealed significant differences between those CSAOs preferring a student development philosophy over those preferring a student learning philosophy as well as over those preferring a student services philosophy. Two items in the *Professional Development* section yielded significant results. For Item 2, present sessions at conferences,  $F(2, 250) = 5.291, p = .006$ . Tukey HSD post hoc comparison revealed significant differences between those CSAOs preferring a student learning philosophy and those preferring a student services philosophy with student learning rank being significantly higher than student services. Lastly, Item 6, submit articles and book chapters for publication,  $F(2, 250) = 4.172, p = .017$ . Tukey HSD post hoc comparison revealed significant differences between those CSAOs preferring a student learning philosophy and those preferring a student services philosophy. In addition, student learning was ranked significantly higher than student services.

#### Research Question 5

In the initial analysis of the *Professional Development* activities, CSAOs rated these skills fairly low compared to the other skills. The item with the lowest mean is from the *Professional Development* section, hold office in professional associations ( $M = 3.28, SD = .838$ ). Of the items with the bottom ten mean values, five items are from the *Professional Development* section (hold office in professional associations, submit articles for publication, serve as an adjunct faculty member, present sessions at national conferences, attend seminars on special topics).

Table 12

ANOVA Results for Differences in Perceived Importance of Critical Skills Based on the Guiding Philosophy Ranking (Research Question 4)

Question	F	df	p	Tukey
<u>Communication</u>				
1 maintain open line of communication	0.713	251	.491	
2 expect staff to keep you informed	0.004	250	.996	
3 share information with students & staff	2.344	248	.098	
4 speak with media during crisis	0.307	251	.736	
5 speak with media on general issues	0.128	251	.880	
6 share research with staff	1.883	251	.154	
7 interpret legislation to staff	0.210	250	.811	
8 share institutional objectives with staff	3.979	250	.020*	3 > 1
9 brief the president about incidents	0.583	251	.559	
10 interpret policies	1.789	247	.169	
11 present student affairs purposes to faculty	0.460	250	.632	
12 facilitate policy development	0.598	248	.551	
<u>Presidential Relationship</u>				
1 meet regularly with president	0.456	252	.635	

2 assist president in handling crisis	1.128	252	.325	
3 assist president in setting goals	0.146	252	.864	
4 assist president in developing relationships with external stakeholders	4.337	252	.014*	2> 3
5 assist president with fund raising	2.501	252	.084	
6 share student opinions with president	0.034	252	.967	
7 support the president in public	2.563	251	.079	
8 assist president with community issues	0.690	250	.503	
9 advise president on student concerns	1.888	252	.154	
<b><u>Student Education &amp; Growth</u></b>				
1 value student education and growth	2.552	251	.080	
2 incorporate student affairs in academics	1.655	252	.193	
3 serve as a student expert	0.193	252	.825	
4 advocate for student concerns	0.467	252	.627	
5 encourage student involvement	2.832	252	.061	
6 assess student development outcomes	0.804	252	.449	
7 maintain accessibility to students	0.087	252	.917	

8 seek student opinions on issues	1.723	252	.181	
<u>Managing the Political Environment</u>				
1 understand CSAO role as politician	0.918	252	.401	
2 network with other administrators	0.554	252	.575	
3 problem solve with senior staff	0.438	252	.646	
4 demonstrate respect for others	1.279	252	.280	
5 respect for institutional processes	0.091	251	.913	
6 gather information on institutional processes	0.995	251	.371	
7 gather information on senior staff interests	0.771	252	.464	
8 observe others' behaviors	0.562	251	.571	
9 know formal dimensions of institutional culture	0.179	252	.836	
10 know informal dimensions of culture	0.421	251	.657	
11 know institutional issues	0.013	252	.988	
12 know institutions history and lore	0.760	251	.469	
13 develop credibility with faculty	1.674	252	.190	
14 understand faculty governance process	3.675	252	.027*	3 > 1



Personal Qualities

1 develop a 'public presence'	1.073	251	.343	
2 be visible at key institutional events	0.425	251	.654	
3 choose events to attend	0.738	252	.479	
4 maintain integrity in decision making	3.662	252	.027*	3 > 2
5 manage stress effectively	0.719	252	.488	
6 make one-on-one connections with students	0.355	252	.701	

Planning and Goal Setting

1 have clearly stated goals	1.684	250	.188	
2 plan for facilities improvements	0.992	251	.372	
3 plan for implementing short term goals	1.473	250	.231	
4 use a model for systematic planning	1.653	250	.193	
5 tie planning model to budgeting process	0.100	251	.905	

Leadership and Supervision

1 develop individualistic leadership style	4.105	251	.018*	3 > 1 3 > 2
2 manage budget process	1.422	251	.243	
3 develop efficient administrative tasks	0.051	252	.951	
4 develop process for recruitment & selection	1.943	252	.145	

5 delegate tasks	1.045	252	.353	
6 delegate management of units to directors	0.387	252	.680	
7 meet regularly with direct reports	1.314	249	.271	
8 utilize effective time management strategies	0.530	252	.589	
<u>Professional Development</u>				
1 attend professional conferences	1.652	252	.194	
2 present sessions at conferences	5.291	252	.006*	2 > 1
3 hold office in professional associations	2.870	251	.059	
4 attend seminars on special topics	0.988	252	.374	
5 serve as adjunct faculty	2.824	251	.061	
6 submit articles for publication	4.172	252	.017*	2 > 1
7 consult with colleagues on difficult issues	1.766	252	.173	

---

\* Significant at  $p < .05$ .

1 = CSAOs ranking Student Services Philosophy first

2 = CSAOs ranking Student Learning Philosophy first

3 = CSAOs ranking Student Development Philosophy first

Item 1 in the *Professional Development* section, attend professional conferences, was significant only when comparing the CSAOs ratings of this skill based on the Carnegie classification of their employing institution. Tukey HSD post hoc analysis revealed that CSAOs at Associate's Colleges rated this item significantly higher than CSAOs at Doctorate-granting Institutions. Item 2, present sessions at conferences, was significant in two analyses. First, using a oneway ANOVA to compare CSAOs with different guiding philosophies,  $F(2,250) = 5.291$ ,  $p = .006$ . A Tukey HSD post hoc determined CSAOs ranking the student learning philosophy first regarded this item as more important than the CSAOs ranking the student services philosophy first did. When comparing CSAOs at different Carnegie classification institutions,  $F(4, 247) = 4.449$ ,  $p = .002$ . Tukey HSD post hoc analysis revealed that CSAOs at Doctorate-granting Institutions, CSAOs at Master's Colleges/Universities, and CSAOs at Associate's Colleges all rated this skill significantly higher than CSAOs at Specialized Institutions did. With respect to ethnicity, Item 3, hold office in professional associations, was significant where  $t(251) = 2.654$ ,  $p = .008$ . CSAOs of Color rated this skill significantly higher than Caucasian/White CSAOs. Item 3 was also significant when comparing CSAOs at different Carnegie classification institutions where  $F(4, 246) = 5.790$ ,  $p = .000$ . Tukey HSD post hoc analysis showed that CSAOs at Master's Colleges/Universities and CSAOs at Associate's Colleges both rated this skill significantly higher than CSAOs at Baccalaureate Colleges did. In addition, CSAOs at Associate's Colleges rated this skill significantly higher than both CSAOs at Doctorate-granting Institutions and CSAOs at Specialized Institutions did. For Item 4, attend seminars on special topics, results were

significant when comparing CSAOs at different Carnegie classification institutions where  $F(4, 247) = 2.037$ ,  $p = .009$ . Tukey HSD post hoc analysis did not reveal any significant differences. Item 5, serve as adjunct faculty, was not significant in any analysis.

Item 6, submit articles for publication, was significant with respect to ethnicity where  $t(87.755) = 5.356$ ,  $p = .000$ , with respect to philosophy rankings where  $F(2, 250) = 4.172$ ,  $p = .017$ , and with respect to Carnegie classification of institution where  $F(4, 247) = 3.103$ ,  $p = .016$ . Tukey HSD post hoc analysis with respect to philosophy rankings showed that CSAOs ranking the student learning philosophy first rated this skill significantly higher than the CSAOs ranking the student services philosophy first did. The Tukey HSD post hoc analysis for Carnegie classification did not yield significant results. Lastly, for Item 7, consult with colleagues on difficult issues, there was significance for gender where  $t(252) = 2.297$ ,  $p = .022$  and women rated this skill higher than men did. With respect to ethnicity, where  $t(252) = 2.575$ ,  $p = .011$ , CSAOs of Color rated this skill higher than Caucasian/White CSAOs did.

### Chapter Summary

With an overall response rate of 52 %, analyses were conducted using independent  $t$ -tests, oneway ANOVA, Pearson correlation, and Chi Square. A number of items were significant when analyzed with respect to gender, ethnicity, field of degree, reporting structure, tenure in position, professional experience at the attainment of the first CSAO position, and ranking of student affairs philosophy. A summary table of the significant findings can be found in Table 13. A discussion of the results follows in Chapter 5.

Table 13

Summary of Significant Findings

Null Hypothesis/ Research Question	Areas of Significance	Critical Skills
H <sub>0</sub> 1: Gender	Women > Men	Share information with students and staff Share institutional objectives with staff Brief the president about incidents Interpret policies Share student opinions with president Support the president in public Network with other administrators Problem solve with senior staff Develop credibility with faculty Manage budget process Consult with colleagues on difficult issues
H <sub>0</sub> 2: Ethnicity	CSAOs of Color > White CSAOs	Share research with staff Assess student development outcomes Demonstrate respect for others Understand faculty governance process Have clearly stated goals Use a model for systematic planning Tie planning model to budgeting process Hold office in professional associations Submit articles for publication Consult with colleagues on difficult issues
H <sub>0</sub> 3: Years In Position	Positive Correlation Positive Correlation	Maintain accessibility to students Know institution's history and lore
H <sub>0</sub> 4: Experience Before Being a CSAO	Negative Correlation Negative Correlation Negative Correlation Positive Correlation Negative Correlation Negative Correlation	Share institutional objectives with staff Support president in public Maintain accessibility with students Observe others' behaviors Know institution's history and lore Develop a 'public presence'
H <sub>0</sub> 5: Field of Degree	Other > Higher Ed Higher Ed > Other Other > Higher Ed Other > Higher Ed	Maintain open line of communication Speak with media during crisis Gather information on institutional processes Have clearly stated goals
H <sub>0</sub> 6: No. of Positions Held		No items were significant

H <sub>0</sub> 7: Reporting Category	Provost > President	Speak with media during crisis Speak with media on general issues Share research with staff
H <sub>0</sub> 8: Carnegie Class	4 > 1 4 > 1 1 > 3 2 > 3  4 > 1 2 > 1   4 > 3 4 > 1 1 > 5, 4 > 5, 2 > 5 4 > 1, 4 > 3, 4 > 5, 2 > 3	Share information with students & staff Facilitate policy development Assist president with fund raising Assist president with community issues Advise president on student concerns Assess student development outcomes Maintain accessibility to students Gather information on institutional processes Gather information on senior staff interests Make on-on-one connections with students Use a model for systematic planning Attend professional conferences Present sessions at conferences Hold office in professional associations Attend seminars on special topics Submit articles for publication
H <sub>0</sub> 9: Rank One/Carnegie Classification		No items were significant
H <sub>0</sub> 10: Rank One/Gender		No items were significant
H <sub>0</sub> 11: Rank One/Tenure		No items were significant
H <sub>0</sub> 12: Rank One/Reporting Category		No items were significant
RQ 4: Rank One	8 > 6 7 > 8  8 > 1 8 > 7 8 > 6, 8 > 7 7 > 6 7 > 6	Share institutional objectives with staff Assist president in developing relationships with external stakeholders Understand faculty governance process Maintain integrity in decision making Develop individualistic leadership style Present sessions at conferences Submit articles for publication

- 1 = Doctorate-granting Institutions  
2 = Master's Colleges/Universities  
3 = Baccalaureate Colleges  
4 = Associate's Colleges  
5 = Specialized Institutions  
6 = CSAOs ranking Student Services Philosophy first  
7 = CSAOs ranking Student Learning Philosophy first  
8 = CSAOs ranking Student Development Philosophy first

## CHAPTER 5

### CONCLUSION

This chapter includes an overall summary of the study, a summary of significant research findings, and a discussion of the meaning of those findings. Implications for current professional practice are presented not only to assist student affairs professionals who are aspiring to become CSAOs but also those who currently hold the CSAO positions. Finally, implications for further research are shared.

#### Summary of the Study

The purposes of this study were to (a) identify current themes in the literature with respect to critical skills of the CSAO, (b) assess the perceptions of CSAOs about the importance of each of the critical skills identified in the literature review, (c) assess the perceptions of CSAOs about the individual philosophies guiding “the work and resources of their divisions” (Ender, Newton, and Caple, 1996, p.8), and (d) determine if there are any differences in the importance CSAOs place on critical skills based on the guiding philosophy. With these purposes in mind, five research questions were written along with twelve null hypothesis statements to be tested.

This study was designed to make significant contributions to the literature surrounding the body of research on the issues surrounding the CSAO position. Specifically, a major goal of this research was to identify critical skills required in the CSAO position as identified in the literature and to examine the importance placed on

these skills by current CSAOs. In addition, another goal was to determine the guiding philosophy of CSAOs for their student affairs units.

The *Chief Student Affairs Officer Critical Skills Inventory* was developed by the researcher after an exhaustive literature review of the CSAO position and related articles. The instrument was comprised of 69 items of the critical skills, two questions concerning the guiding philosophy of the CSAO and his or her student affairs unit, and several demographic questions. The survey was administered in July 2002 through the mail. CSAOs who are NASPA Voting Delegates in Regions II and III received the survey, a cover letter, a letter encouraging participation from the University of Georgia CSAO, and a return self-addressed and stamped envelope. A total of 256 surveys were returned.

Data analyses consisted of descriptive statistics and the ranking of means of the 69 critical skills. When comparisons of the means were made between two groups, an independent samples t-test was used. When more than two groups were compared, a one-way ANOVA was utilized. When statistically significant results were found, Tukey HSD post hoc tests were conducted. For several hypotheses statements, categorical data was compared using a Chi Square analysis. For two hypotheses statements, a Pearson correlation was used to examine the results.

### Summary of Significant Findings

#### Importance of the Critical Skills

The critical skills were first analyzed using descriptive statistics for all 69 questions. The item with the highest mean is from the *Personal Qualities* section, maintaining integrity in decision making. Of the items with the top ten mean values, three items are



from the *Communication* section, and three items are from the *Presidential Relationship* section. Two items are from the *Managing the Political Environment* section while only one item is from *Personal Qualities* and one item is from *Student Growth and Education*.

The item with the lowest mean is from the *Professional Development* section, hold office in professional associations. Of the items with the bottom ten mean values, five items are from the *Professional Development* section. Two items are from both the *Communication* and *Managing the Political Environment* sections while one item is from the *Presidential Relationship* section.

Integrity in decision making along with basic communication skills such as maintaining an open line of communication, sharing information with the president, expecting staff to keep the CSAO informed, and conveying information with staff were some of the most important critical skills. On the other hand, the critical skills related to the professional development of the CSAO are not viewed as important by CSAOs. In addition, two skills in the *Presidential Relationship* category (assist president with fund raising and with external stakeholders) were rated in the bottom group of skills.

#### Differences by Gender

Eleven of the sixty-nine critical skills were significant with respect to gender. Four items were in the *Communication* section, two items in the *Presidential Relationship* section, three items in the *Managing the Political Environment* section, one item in the *Leadership and Supervision* section, and one item in the *Professional Development* section. No items in the *Student Education and Growth*, *Personal Qualities*, or *Planning*

*and Goal Setting* sections were significant. For all items of significance, women rated the skills higher than the men did.

#### Differences by Ethnicity

Ten of the sixty-nine critical skills were significant with respect to ethnicity. One item was in the *Communication* section, one item in the *Student Education and Growth* section, two items in the *Managing the Political Environment* section, three items in the *Planning and Goal Setting* section, and three items in the *Professional Development* section. No items in the *Presidential Relationship, Personal Qualities, and Leadership and Supervision* sections were significant. For all items of significance, CSAOs of Color rated the skills higher than the White/Caucasian CSAOs did.

#### Differences by Tenure in Current Position

Only two items of the critical skills reached statistical significance with respect to tenure in current position. One item in the *Student Education and Growth* section and one item in the *Managing the Political Environment* section were significant. The longer the CSAOs had held CSAO positions, the more likely they were to rate maintaining accessibility to students and knowing the institution's history and lore as very important critical skills. No items in the *Communication, Presidential Relationship, Personal Qualities, Planning and Goal Setting, Leadership and Supervision, and Professional Development* sections were significant.

#### Differences by Years of Experience Upon Attainment of First CSAO Position

Six of the critical skills were significant with respect to the number of years of professional experience at the time of attainment of the first CSAO position. One item in

the *Communication* section, one item in the *Presidential Relationship* section, one item in the *Student Growth and Education* section, two items in the *Managing the Political Environment* section, and one item in the *Personal Qualities* section were significant. A variety of skills were significant including sharing objectives with staff, assisting president with community issues, maintaining accessibility to students, observing others' behavior, and developing a 'public presence.' No items in the *Planning and Goal Setting*, *Leadership and Supervision*, and *Professional Development* sections were significant.

In reviewing the two items of statistical significance for both tenure in position and experience upon attainment of the first CSAO position, an interesting comparison is evident. For both maintaining accessibility to students and knowing the institution's history and lore, the more years of professional experience the CSAO has at the time he or she attains of the first CSAO position, the less important the CSAO rates these critical skills. However, the more years of experience the CSAO has in this role, the more importance the CSAO places on these skills.

#### Differences by Field of Degree

Four of the critical skills were significant with respect to field of degree. Two items in the *Communication* section, one item in the *Managing the Political Environment* section, and one item in the *Planning and Goal Setting* section were significant. No items in the *Presidential Relationship*, *Student Education and Growth*, *Personal Qualities*, *Leadership and Supervision*, and *Professional Development* sections were significant.

CSAOs with degrees in fields other than higher education/student personnel rated the following critical skills higher than CSAOs with higher education/student personnel degrees did maintain open line of communication, gather information on institutional processes, and have clearly stated goals. CSAOs with higher education/student personnel degrees rated speak with media during crisis higher than CSAOs with degrees in other areas.

#### Differences by Number of CSAO Positions Held

No statistically significant differences were found for any of the sixty-nine items of critical skills in any of the eight sections. Respondents having only one CSAO position were compared with those having more than one CSAO position.

#### Differences by Reporting Category

Reporting category refers to whether the CSAO reports to the provost or to the president. With respect to reporting category, only three items were found to be significant. All of these items were in the Communications section. No items in the *Presidential Relationship*, *Student Education and Growth*, *Managing the Political Environment*, *Personal Qualities*, *Planning and Goal Setting*, *Leadership and Supervision*, and *Professional Development* sections were significant. For all items that were significant, the CSAOs reporting to the provost rated these skills more important than CSAOs reporting to the president did.

#### Differences by Carnegie Classification

Sixteen items were significant with respect to the Carnegie classification of the institution. The statistical power for these results is low, however. Two items in the

*Communication* section, three items in the *Presidential Relationship* section, two items in the *Student Education and Growth* section, two items in the *Managing the Political Environment* section, one item in the *Personal Qualities* section, one item in the *Planning and Goal Setting* section, and five items in the *Professional Development* section were significant. No items in the *Leadership and Supervision* section were significant.

In several cases, CSAOs at Associate's Colleges had placed significantly higher importance on the following skills than the CSAOs at Doctorate-granting Institutions: share information with students and staff, facilitate policy development, assess student development outcomes, attend professional conferences, and hold office in professional associations. For the critical skill hold office in professional associations, CSAOs at Associate's Colleges placed significantly higher importance than CSAOs Baccalaureate Colleges and CSAOs at Specialized Institutions did.

#### Differences in Guiding Philosophy and Carnegie Classification

No significant differences were found when examining the guiding philosophy and Carnegie classification of the institution.

#### Differences in Guiding Philosophy and Gender

No significant differences were found when examining the guiding philosophy and gender.

#### Differences in Guiding Philosophy and Tenure in Current Position

No significant differences were found when examining the guiding philosophy and tenure in current position.

### Differences in Guiding Philosophy and Reporting Structure

No significant differences were found when examining the guiding philosophy and reporting structure of the CSAOs.

### Differences in Critical Skills by Guiding Philosophy

Seven of the critical skills were significant with respect to the guiding philosophies of the individual CSAOs. One item from the *Communication* section, one item from the *Presidential Relationship* section, one item from the *Managing the Political Environment* section, one item from the *Personal Qualities* section, one item from the *Leadership and Supervision* section, and two items from the *Professional Development* section were significant. No items from the *Student Education and Growth* and *Planning and Goal Setting* sections were significant.

None of the CSAOs having a student services philosophy rated any critical skills significantly higher than CSAOs having either a student development or a student learning philosophy. For most items, CSAOs with a student development philosophy rated the critical skills significantly higher than the others.

### Differences in the Professional Development Section

Overall, the CSAOs rated these skills lower than most of the other sixty-nine skills. Of the items with the bottom ten mean values, five items are from the *Professional Development* section. Item 1, attend professional conferences, was significant only with respect to Carnegie classification. Item 2, present sessions at conferences, was significant with respect to guiding philosophy and Carnegie classification. Item 3, hold office in professional associations, was significant with respect to ethnicity and Carnegie

classification. Item 4, attend seminars on special topics, was significant with respect to Carnegie classification. Item 5, serve as adjunct faculty, was not significant in any analysis. Item 6, submit articles for publication, was significant with respect to ethnicity, guiding philosophy, and Carnegie classification. Lastly, for Item 7, consult colleagues on difficult issues, was significant with respect to gender and ethnicity.

### Discussion of Findings

#### Importance of the Critical Skills

It was encouraging to note that the critical skill with the highest mean and rating was an item in the *Personal Qualities* section, maintaining integrity in decision making. In his qualitative study, Sandeen (2001) found that integrity was important for CSAOs who had held their positions for over twenty years. In addition, of the top ten critical skills, four items are directly related to the presidential relationship. This supports the work of Shay (1984, 1993) who consistently emphasizes the importance of the working relationship between the president and the CSAO. In addition, Sandeen (2001) also found that the CSAOs who had held their positions for a number of years and had survived a number of presidential transitions discussed their intentional efforts in maintaining a positive relationship with the president. This relationship was crucial to their success on the job. It is interesting to note, however, that some of the lowest rated skills were assist president with fund raising, assist president with external stakeholders, and assist president with community issues. Given the current state of financing in higher education, a stronger emphasis on fund raising and external stakeholders was expected.

These skills were not rated as the most important when compared to the other critical skills.

With the lower rated skills, the items in the *Professional Development* section make up five of the bottom ten skills. Attending seminars on special topics, presenting programs, serving as an adjunct faculty member, submitting articles for publication, and holding office in professional associations were among the lowest rated skills on the survey. The CSAOs in this study obviously viewed the more pressing skills as those that dealt directly with their day-to-day responsibilities, communications, and presidential relationships. At professional conferences, a strong emphasis is placed on presentations and professional association involvement as an important aspect of one's professional development and marketability for future jobs. Once professionals reach the CSAO position, they do not find these skills as important as many of the other skills stated previously.

#### Differences by Gender

In all cases of significance, women rated the skills as more important than did the men. The themes that emerge when considering the critical skills that are significant with respect to gender are relationships and communication. Women consistently rated these items higher than the men did. Sharing information with students and staff, sharing objectives with staff, briefing the president, interpreting policies, sharing student opinions with the president, supporting the president in public, networking with other administrators, problem solving with others, developing credibility with faculty, managing the budgeting process, and consulting with colleagues at other institutions are



skills mostly dealing with either relationships or communication with other staff and/or students. These findings are supported by other research that found that women establish their identities in terms of their relationships to others (Gilligan, 1982); women see themselves as interdependent and judge the merit of their work in light of their concern for others (Ferguson, 1984).

### Differences by Ethnicity

In all items of significance, the CSAOs of Color rated the critical skills higher than the White/Caucasian CSAOs did. The items of significance with respect to ethnicity are all related to achievement and a goal oriented perspective. Sharing research with staff, demonstrating respect for others, understanding the faculty governance process, having clearly stated goals, using a model for systematic planning, and tying planning to budgeting were all significant items. Three items in the *Professional Development* section were significant including holding office in professional associations, submitting articles for publication, and consulting with colleagues on difficult issues. CSAOs of Color rated these professional development activities as more important than the White/Caucasian CSAOs did.

### Differences by Tenure in Current Position

The average number of years in current position is 6.86 for this sample. Examining the years in current position and the importance of the critical skills yielded several interesting correlations. First, the longer the CSAO held his or her position, the more important maintaining accessibility to students was to the CSAO. The same was true for knowing the institution's history and lore. The CSAO must focus on staffing issues when

first in a new position, and once staffing issues are settled or more stable, then the CSAO can pay more attention to building direct relationships with students and learning more about the institution's history.

#### Differences by Years of Experience Upon Attainment of First CSAO Position

When examining the correlation between years of professional experience at the time the CSAO attained his or her first CSAO position, several correlations were significant. For this sample, the average number of years of professional experience in higher education upon attainment of the first CSAO position is 14.29. Negative correlations were found for sharing institutional objectives with staff, maintaining accessibility to students, knowing the institution's history and lore, and developing a 'public presence.' The more years of professional experience the CSAO had at the time attained his or her first CSAO position was attained, the lower the CSAO rated these items. It is interesting to note the connection between these findings and the results of analyzing data for tenure in position. While CSAOs rate the skill, maintain accessibility to students, lower with the more years of professional experience prior to becoming a CSAO, as the CSAO has more years of experience as a CSAO, he or she is more likely to rate this skill higher. Similarly, CSAOs rate the skill, know institution's history and lore, lower with the more years of professional experience prior to becoming a CSAO. As the CSAO has more years of experience as a CSAO, he or she is more likely to rate this skill as more important. The importance of these skills must become more relevant and meaningful for the CSAO with on-the-job experience.

Positive correlations were found for assist president with community issues, and observe others' behaviors. With more professional experience at the time of becoming a CSAO, CSAOs rate these skills as being more important.

#### Differences by Field of Degree

The items of significance with respect to field of degree were all rated higher by the CSAOs with degrees outside of higher education, except for the item, speak with the media during crisis. The items maintain open line of communication, gather information on institutional processes, and having clearly stated goals, were all rated higher by CSAOs with degrees outside of higher education. These items seem consistent with the idea that CSAOs with degrees outside of higher education would place more emphasis on learning institutional processes, stating goals, and keeping lines of communication open as they learn more about the collegiate environment.

#### Differences by Reporting Category

With respect to reporting category, only three items were significant, and all were in the *Communication* section. Curiously, CSAOs who report to the provost do not rate the critical skills in the *Presidential Relationship* section significantly less than those who report directly to the president do. Again, this supports the work of Shay (1984, 1993) and Sandeen (2001) who emphasized the importance of the presidential relationship. The significance of the items speak with media on general issues, speak with media during times of crisis, and share research with staff are surprising and is not addressed in prior research. Given the limited research to date on the role of the CSAO, the examination of

the differences and similarities in the CSAO role based on reporting category is not widely reported.

#### Differences by Carnegie Classification

The statistical power for the findings of this hypothesis is very low and a very large effect size was used to determine significance. Type II error is increased given these facts and so the meaningful significance of these findings should be considered carefully.

For several items, share information with students and staff, facilitate policy development, assess student development outcomes, attend professional conferences, and hold office in professional associations were all significant where the CSAOs at Associate's Colleges rated these skills significantly higher than CSAOs at Doctorate-granting Institutions. One might assume that with the increased resources available at Doctorate-granting Institutions, these areas would be more important for those CSAOs. The results of this study do not support that statement. In fact, for any item that was significant except for present sessions at conferences, the CSAOs at the Doctorate-granting Institutions never rated any of those skills significantly higher than CSAOs at other Carnegie classified institutions did. Furthermore, CSAOs at Master's Colleges/Universities rated the skill maintain accessibility to students higher than the Doctorate-granting Institution CSAOs did.

#### Differences in Critical Skills by Guiding Philosophy

The CSAOs with a student services philosophy never rated any critical skill significantly higher than CSAOs with either of the other two philosophies. For items share institutional objectives with staff, understand the faculty governance process, and

develop individualistic leadership style CSAOs with a student development philosophy rated these items significantly higher than CSAOs with a student services philosophy did.

This study's look at the guiding philosophy of the CSAO and the importance of the critical skills for the CSAO role is unique to this study. Although each of these concepts has been researched individually, no prior research has connected these concepts in one study.

#### Differences in the Professional Development Section

With respect to the *Professional Development* section, the reliability or alpha coefficient was reported as .8298. Only the *Managing the Political Environment* scale had a higher rating. Responses to one item in this section made up of seven items were consistent with the responses to the other items. Even though the items in this section were rated the lowest of the critical skills by all the CSAOs, there were a variety of independent variables that yielded significant results. Hence, not all the CSAOs viewed the items in this section the same way.

#### Implications for Practice

There are several implications for current practice in student affairs. First, at the beginning of this project, it was noted that Analoui, Labbaf, and Noorbakhsh (2000) stated, "the contributions made towards further understanding of the perception and needs of the senior managers for their increased effectiveness will hopefully lead to practical results for the improved performance of the organization as the whole" (p. 220-221). Although this study was not designed to assess CSAO effectiveness, the first purpose of identifying critical skills of the CSAO position is the first step in that process.

Identification of critical skills for the CSAO position has not been undertaken in recent years and this process is valuable for both current CSAOs and those student affairs professionals aspiring to become CSAOs. Ultimately, it is hoped that the identification of these skills may eventually lead to benefits to the organization as a whole.

It is beneficial to begin this discussion with a glimpse of the demographic characteristics of the CSAOs in this sample. In 1978, Gross (as cited in Harder, 1981) reported that between 34% and 47% of CSPAs (CSAOs) at four year institutions had a doctorate. Paul & Hoover (1980) noted that 83% of CSPAs (CSAOs) at four year institutions held a doctorate. In this study, 68% of the participating CSAOs held a doctorate. (Note that this figure represents all the CSAOs in this sample, including those at all types of Carnegie institutions reported.) With respect to field of degree, Harder (1981) reported that only 24% of the sample had degrees in educational and/or higher education administration along with 33% in student personnel. In this study, 45.5% of the participating CSAOs held degrees in other areas. Since 1981, there has been an increase in the numbers of CSAOs holding degrees in fields other than higher education.

Further, significant changes in the numbers of women in the CSAO role are evident. In 1974, Brooks and Avila reported that 100% of the CSAOs at four year institutions were men. They also stated in the same study that 91% of vice president positions were held by men and 86% of dean of students positions were held by men. By 1980, Paul and Hoover noted that 89% of CSAOs were men, and 11% were women. In the Saunders and Cooper study (1999), 70% of the CSAOs were men while 30% were women. In this study, 60% of the CSAOs were men, and 40% were women. In a little more than twenty

years, the percentages of men and women in the CSAO position have nearly evened out. More and more women are assuming this role.

Another implication of this study emerges upon examination of the means of each critical skill (Table 5). The critical skills rated the most important by CSAOs seem to focus on people rated skills such as communication skills, networking and problem solving with staff, and advocating student concerns. Student affairs practitioners should focus on these skill areas in their professional development, particularly if becoming a CSAO is a personal goal. Analoui, Labbaf, and Noorbakhsh (2000) reported a similar finding in that the managers placed importance on people and analytical/self-related skill areas over task related skills. Saunders & Cooper (1999) reported that CSAOs rated personnel management, leadership, student contact, and communication skills as the most desirable in doctoral program graduates. Taylor (2001) developed a profile of the CSAO as a leader, and his main twelve characteristics are also people oriented qualities. These findings also support the results of this study where people related skills are stressed by CSAOs. Strong interpersonal skills seem to be very important to CSAOs. The position of the person is not as important as having the basic skills necessary to communicate effectively whether it be with faculty, the president, senior administrator, student affairs staff, or students.

Analoui, Labbaf, and Noorbakhsh (2000) found that communication skills and managing stress at work were clustered together. They suggest that importance in communication skills is tied to managing stress. In other words, one will benefit the

other. More study would be needed with respect to this issue and CSAOs, but this may also be an implication of these findings.

The guiding philosophies of the participating CSAOs have significant implications for student affairs. The concept of the three main guiding philosophies (student services, student learning and student development) was taken from a 1996 study by Ender, Newton, and Caple. At that time, 50% of CSAOs rated the student services philosophy as most important, 20% chose student development, and 16% chose student learning. Thirteen percent noted that a mixed model was most important. Ender, Newton, and Caple stated, "The allocation of resources as represented by the percentage of time and division effort devoted to the constructs of each model reinforces the importance of student services when guiding professional practice" (p. 9). In this study, CSAOs reported that the philosophy currently guiding their day-to-day work was first student learning (39%), student services (36%), and lastly student development (24%). This is different from the survey results in 1996. In addition, this study asked CSAOs about the philosophy that would be used in an ideal setting. Fifty-five percent responded that student learning should come first. Thirty-one percent indicated student development should be the most important and only 12% marked student services as the most important philosophy.

In just a few years, CSAOs seem to have begun changing their primary focus with particular emphasis in the student learning areas. With increases in the numbers of institutions intentionally placing student affairs and academic affairs staff side-by-side, asking these two divisions to collaborate on special programs, it should be no surprise



that student learning is a high priority for many CSAOs. CSAOs must use the communication skills they rated so highly and share this priority with faculty and administrators in academic affairs. Even though the *Student Learning Imperative* (ACPA, 1994) was published two years prior to the Ender, Newton, and Caple study (1996), the impact of our profession's renewed focus on student learning had not yet been fully realized. It will be interesting to see how this trend continues in the next five to ten years.

#### Need for Future Research

No research project is complete without implications and needs for additional research. The results of this study are no exception. First, these critical skills need to be evaluated again in light of newly published research. With the reliability coefficients ranging from .65 to .88, more study is needed on these identified scales. What can be done to strengthen the reliability coefficients? Each item should be studied carefully before using this instrument again.

Once the individual critical skills have been reviewed, the next step should be to connect these critical skills to performance evaluation for CSAOs. O'Brien (1977) started this process twenty-five years ago and more research is needed on the performance and effectiveness of CSAOs. In addition, there is not a working definition of what an effective CSAO is. Although some authors have identified skill areas that would impact effectiveness, more in depth empirical studies are needed in this area. As mentioned previously, Analoui, Labbaf, and Noorbakhsh (2000) were able to identify in their study

of managers in the steel industry a relationship between strong communication skills and the ability to manage stress at work.

In addition, this study focused on critical skills at the individual level, asking which personal skills are important in the CSAO role. Understanding these critical skills is only one piece of the puzzle. Analoui, Labbaf, and Noorbakhsh (2000) state that there is a “need for consideration of a multitude of individual, organizational and contextual factors for better understanding managerial effectiveness” (p. 230). Once the critical skills are reviewed, it is crucial to place these skills into a larger perspective of the organization and institution. All of these factors contribute to the success of a CSAO.

Further study can also be conducted concerning the differences in CSAO perspectives based on the Carnegie classification of their employing institution. The power of the statistical analysis for the hypothesis looking at differences in the importance of the critical skills and the Carnegie classification of the CSAO’s employing institution is very low. One should be cautious in inferring too much from these results. Since there are major differences in the types of institutions, a closer examination of the differences (or similarities) in the perspective of CSAOs at a variety of institutions is essential. Some critical skills might vary from one type of institution to another.

### Chapter Summary

CSAOs in NASPA Regions II and III were surveyed in July 2002 to understand their perceived importance of identified critical job skills. Survey results were examined with respect to gender, ethnicity, tenure in current position, years of professional experience upon attainment of the first CSAO position, Carnegie classification of the CSAO’s

employing institution, CSAO guiding philosophy, field of degree, and number of CSAO positions held.

Implications of this study in current student affairs practice include information to professionals seeking to become a CSAO, the demographic changes in the individuals holding CSAO positions over the last twenty-five years, the types of skills seen as most important by CSAOs (such as communication skills or people related skills), the guiding philosophies of CSAOs in relation to how student affairs functions within the overall institutional mission, and the renewed focus on student learning. These implications are evident in current student affairs practice today.

Finally, areas for future research include a more detailed examination of the necessary critical skills and the reliability coefficients of the scales, a study examining the relationship of these critical skills to CSAO performance and effectiveness, the organization and contextual aspects of CSAO effectiveness, and differences in CSAO perspectives based on Carnegie classification of their employing institution.

## REFERENCES

- American College Personnel Association (1994). *The student learning imperative: Implications for student affairs*. Washington, D. C.: American College Personnel Association.
- American Council on Education. (1937). *Student Personnel Point of View*. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education.
- Analoui, F. (1993). Skills of management. In J. W. Cusworth & T. R. Franks (Eds.), *Managing Projects in Developing Countries*, p. 68-84. Harlow: Longman Scientific & Technical.
- Analoui, F. (1995). Management skills and senior management effectiveness. *International Journal of Public Sector Management*, 8(3), 52-68.
- Analoui, F., Labbaf, H., & Noorbakhsh, F. (2000). Identification of clusters of managerial skills for increased effectiveness: The case of the steel industry in Iran. *International Journal of Training and Development*, 4(3), 217-234.
- Anderson, C. M. (1993). A case study of the career acquisition and professional experiences of female chief student affairs officers (Doctoral dissertation, Northern Arizona University, 1993). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 54, 4364.
- Anderson, J. E. (1998). A comparison of female and male senior student officers' job satisfaction, life satisfaction, and inter-role conflict (Doctoral dissertation, University of Northern Colorado, 1998). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 59, 2375.

- Anderson, G. L. (1979). The ad hoc committee model for administrator evaluation. In C. H. Farmer (Ed.), *Administrator Evaluation: Concepts, methods, cases in higher education*, (pp.67-87). Richmond, VA: Higher Education Leadership and Management Society, Inc.
- Appleton, J. R., Briggs, C. M., & Rhatigan, J. J. (1978). *Pieces of eight: The rites, roles and styles of the dean by eight who have been there*. Portland, OR: NASPA Institute of Research and Development.
- Armour, M. D. (1990). An analysis of relationships between the attitudes of chief student affairs officers concerning AIDS and the existence and longevity of AIDS education programs and policies (Doctoral dissertation, The University of Mississippi, 1990). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 51, 3336.
- Ayers, A. R., Tripp, P. A. & Russel, J. H. (1966). *Student services administration in higher education*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- Bandura, A. (1977). Self-efficacy: Toward a unifying theory of behavioural change. *Psychological Review*, 84, 191-215.
- Barr, M. J. (1988). Managing the enterprise. In M. L. Upcraft & M. J. Barr (Eds.), *Managing student affairs effectively. New Directions for Student Services, No. 41*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Bennis, W. G. (1976). *The unconscious conspiracy: Why leaders can't lead*. New York: AMACOM
- Bianco, V. (1984). In praise of performance. *Personnel Journal*, 63(6), 40-50.
- Birnbaum, R. (1988). *How colleges work*. San Francisco: Jossey Bass.

- Blackhurst, A. E., Brandt, J. E., & Kalinowski, J. (1998a). Effects of personal and work-related attributes on the organizational commitment and life satisfaction of women student affairs administrators. *NASPA Journal*, 35(2), 86-99.
- Blackhurst, A. E., Brandt, J. E., & Kalinowski, J. (1998b). Effects of career development on the organizational commitment and life satisfaction of women student affairs administrators. *NASPA Journal*, 36(1), 19-34.
- Blaine, E. D. (1997). An analysis of the chief student affairs officer in the California State University: Demographics, functions, roles and career paths (Doctoral dissertation, Pepperdine University, 1997). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 58, 4201.
- Boland, P.A. (1979). Student personnel training for the chief student affairs officer: Essential or unnecessary? *NASPA Journal*, 17(2), 57-62.
- Bollheimer, R. L. (1982). College presidents' perceptions of student affairs issues and attendant development needs of chief student affairs officers for the 1980s (Doctoral dissertation, University of Northern Colorado, 1982). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 43, 3162.
- Brodzinski, F. R. (1991). A time allocation study of chief student affairs officers (Doctoral dissertation, Columbia University Teachers College, 1991). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 52, 2334.
- Brooks, G.D., & Avila, J. F. (1974). The chief student personnel administrator and his staff: A profile. *NASPA Journal*, 11(4), 41-47.

- Carnegie Foundation. (2000). *The 2000 Carnegie Classification: Background and Description*. Retrieved March 31, 2002, from <http://www.carnegiefoundation/CIHE2000/defNotes/Definitions.htm>
- Carreathers, R. E. (1981). A study of the critical requirements of the chief student personnel officer in the public senior colleges of Texas (Doctoral dissertation, East Texas State University, 1981). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 42, 2383.
- Carroll, M. (1950). Overview of personnel workers in colleges and universities. *Journal of the National Association of Deans of Women*, 14, 3-33.
- Clemens, B. T., & Akers, S. J. (1973). The dean in transition: On making commitments and becoming a facilitator. *NASPA Journal*, 10(3), 218-224.
- Cohen, J. (1992). Quantitative methods in psychology: A power primer. *Psychological Bulletin*, 112(1), 155-159.
- Crookston, B. B. (1974). The nomenclative dilemma: Titles of principal student affairs officers at NASPA institutions. *NASPA Journal*, 11(3), 3-6.
- Daugherty, P. W., Randall, K. P., & Globetti, E. (1997). Psychological types among women senior student affairs officers on college and university campuses. *Journal of Psychological Type*, 41, 28-32.
- Deegan, W. L. (1981). *Managing student affairs programs: Methods, models, muddles*. Palm Springs, CA: ETC Publications.
- DeWitt, R. C. (1991). Managing a student affairs team: It's a new ball game. *NASPA Journal*, 28(2), 185-88.

- Dickson, D. A. (1987). Influence of chief student affairs officers in four year colleges and universities (Doctoral dissertation, Rutgers The State University of New Jersey-New Brunswick). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 48, 2202.
- Douglas, D. O. (1991). Fiscal management: Background and relevance for student affairs. In T. K. Miller & R. B. Winston, Jr., and Associates, (Eds.), *Administration and leadership in student affairs: Actualizing student development in higher education* (pp. 615-641). Muncie, IN: Accelerated Development.
- Eberle, A. W., & Muston, R. A. (1969). The role of the chief student personnel administrator and the residence hall: Locus of conflict. *NASPA Journal*, 7(2), 91-96.
- Ender, S. C., Newton, F. B., & Caple, R. B. (1996). Contributions to learning: Present realities. In S. C. Ender, F. B. Newton, & R. B. Caple (Eds.), *Contributing to learning: The role of student affairs, New Directions for Student Services, No. 75*. San Francisco: Jossey Bass.
- Evans, B. F. (1974). There will always be a deandom. *NASPA Journal*, 11(4), 2-5.
- Farmer, C. H. (1979). Why evaluate administrators? In C. H. Farmer (Ed.), *Administrator Evaluation: Concepts, methods, cases, in higher education* (pp.6-13). Richmond, VA: Higher Education Leadership and Management Society, Inc.
- Ferguson, K. (1984). *The feminist case against bureaucracy*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Finlay, C. S. (1986). Perceptions of chief administrative officers at Pennsylvania colleges and universities concerning the career advancement potential of women



- administrators within higher education (Doctoral dissertation, University of Pittsburgh, 1986). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 47, 4300.
- Foxley, C. H. (1980). Determinates of managerial effectiveness. In C. H. Foxley (Ed.) *Applying management techniques, New Directions for Student Services*, No. 9. San Francisco: Jossey Bass.
- Garland, P. H. (1985). *Serving more than students: A critical need for college student personnel services. ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report No. 7*. Washington, D. C.: Association for the Study of Higher Education.
- Gilligan, C. (1982). *In a different voice: Psychological theory and women's development*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Gold, J. A., Golden, D. C., & Quatroche, T. J. (1993). The challenge of chief student affairs officers: Planning for the future. In M. C. Terrell & J. A. Gold (Eds.), *New Roles for Educational Fundraising and Institutional Advancement, New Directions for Student Services*, No. 63. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Guido-DiBrito, F. (1990). Cases of interpersonal loyalty between chief student affairs officers and their superordinate and subordinates (Doctoral dissertation, Texas A&M University, 1990). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 52, 359.
- Guido-DiBrito, F., Chavez, A. F., Wallace, J. A., & DiBrito, W. F. (1997). Loyalty between senior student affairs officers and their supervisors and staff members. *Journal of College Student Development*, 38(3), 244-54.
- Hambrick, D., & Mason, P. (1984). Upper echelons: The organization as a reflection of its top managers. *Academy of Management Review*, 9(2), 193-206.

- Harder, M. (1981). The chief student personnel administrator in the Southeastern United States. *Southern College Personnel Association Journal*, 3(3), 35-42.
- Hays, J. D. (1996). An assessment of chief student affairs officers' knowledge of first amendment issues (Doctoral dissertation, Vanderbilt University, 1996). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 57, 1516.
- Hecklinger, F. (1972). Let's do away with the dean. *NASPA Journal*, 9(4), 317-20.
- Held, P. A. (1994). The role of the chief student affairs officer as perceived by chief executive officers and chief student affairs officers of bible colleges (Doctoral dissertation, The University of Alabama, 1994). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 55, 1434.
- Herdlein, R. J., III (1985). A history of the role of the chief student affairs officer at the University of Pittsburgh, 1919-1980 (Doctoral dissertation, University of Pittsburgh, 1985). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 46, 2582.
- Jones, J. L. (1928). *A personnel study of women deans in colleges and universities*, Contributions to Education, No. 319. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Katz, R. L. (1955). Skills of an effective administrator. *Harvard Business Review*, 33(1), 33-42.
- Kuh, G.D., Evans, N.J., & Duke, A. (1983). Career paths and responsibilities of chief student affairs officers. *NASPA Journal*, 21(1), 39-47.
- Langan-Fox, J., Bell, R., McDonald, L. & Morizzi, M. (1996). The dimensionality of ratings of performance appraisal systems. *Australian Psychologist*, 31(3), 194-203.
- Lavender, H. W. (1972). The dean of students - why? *NASPA Journal*, 9(4), 312-16.

- Lerner, B. E. (1995). Staffing patterns of women administrators in colleges and universities (Doctoral dissertation, The University of Connecticut, 1995). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 56, 3805.
- Letts, J. D. (1988). Factors perceived by selected chief student affairs officers that enhance advancement to this position (Doctoral dissertation, New Mexico State University, 1988). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 49, 2050.
- Lilley, G. W. (1974). Functions of chief student personnel officers in selected colleges. *NASPA Journal*, 11(3), 7-10.
- Lunsford, L.W. (1984). Chief student affairs officer: The ladder to the top. *NASPA Journal*, 22(1), 48-56.
- Luthans, F. (1988). Successful vs. real managers. *Academy of Management Top-Level Manager*, 2(2), 127-132.
- Mackey, B. R. (1979). The working relationship between the college president and the chief student affairs officer: A descriptive study (Doctoral dissertation, Columbia University Teachers College). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 40, 4917.
- MacPhail-Wilcox, B. & Forbes, R. (1990). *Administrator evaluation handbook: How to design a system of administrative evaluation*. Washington, D. C.: Phi Delta Kappa.
- Mamarchev, H. L. & Williamson, M. L. (1991). Women and African Americans: Stories told and lessons learned-a case study. In P. L. Moore (Ed.), *Managing the political dimension of student affairs, New Directions for Student Services No. 55*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Mathews, L.K. (1915). *The dean of women*. Cambridge, MA: The Riverside Press.

- McDade, S.A. (1989). Leadership development: A key to the new leadership role of student affairs professionals. *NASPA Journal*, 27(1), 33-41.
- Mintzberg, H. (1973). *The nature of managerial work*. New York: Harper.
- Moore, P. L. (1991). Ideas for the chief. In P. L. Moore (Ed.), *Managing the political dimension of student affairs, New Directions for Student Services No. 55*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- O'Brien, J. C. (1977). A study to determine the functions and competencies of the chief student personnel administrator in public two year colleges in New Jersey, New York, and Pennsylvania. (Doctoral dissertation, Rutgers University, 1977). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 38, 6451.
- Olivero, P. (1990). An analysis of planning by chief student affairs officers in small independent colleges (Doctoral dissertation, Ohio University, 1990). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 51, 2285.
- Ostroth, D. D., Efird, F. D., & Lerman, L. S. (1984). Career patterns of chief student affairs officers. *Journal of College Student Personnel*, 25(5), 443-447.
- Ottinger, D. C. (2000). Student development: Its place in the academy. In A. M. Hoffman & R. W. Summers (Eds.), *Managing colleges and universities: Issues for leadership* (pp. 139-159). Westport, CT: Bergin & Garvey.
- Paul, W. L., & Hoover, R. E. (1980). College student personnel administrators: A decade of change. *NASPA Journal*, 18(1), 33-39.

- Priest, D. M., Alphenaar, W.J., & Boer, W.J. (1980). Long-range planning: Implications and applications for the chief student personnel administrator. *NASPA Journal*, 18(1), 2-7.
- Pruitt, D. A., Sr. (1995). An analysis of the chief student affairs officer as a boundary spanner (Doctoral dissertation, University of South Carolina, 1995). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 56, 2069.
- Pruitt, D. A., Sr., & Schwartz, R. A. (1999). Student affairs work as boundary spanning: An exploratory study. *College Student Affairs Journal*, 19(1), 62-87.
- Redzich, M. (1989). Development of a formative evaluation process for university chief student affairs administrators (Doctoral dissertation, West Virginia University, 1989). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 50, 3126.
- Rickard, S. T. (1985). Titles of chief student affairs officers: Institutional autonomy or professional standardization? *NASPA Journal*, 23(2), 44-49.
- Rigg, K. T. (1978). The role of the chief student affairs officer as a function of his relationship with the president (Doctoral dissertation, Boston University School of Education, 1978). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 39, 2671.
- Roper, R. J. (1995). Actual and ideal functions of the chief student affairs officer in small private religious colleges as perceived by presidents and chief student affairs officers (Doctoral dissertation, Temple University, 1995). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 56, 2135.

- Rueckel, P. (1971). The student dean in the 70' s: Doctor, lawyer, or Indian chief. *Journal of the National Association of Women Deans and Counselors*, 34(3), 106-110.
- Rusbosin, R. H. (1989). Perceptions of chief student affairs officers regarding the amount of time spent and the importance of specific duties that they perform in three dimensions of professional practice (Doctoral dissertation, Indiana University of Pennsylvania, 1989). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 50, 1169.
- Ryan, R. E. (1983). The relationship of leadership behavior and demographic characteristics to performance in chief student affairs officers. (Doctoral Dissertation, University of Northern Colorado, 1998). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 44, 1697.
- Sandeen, A. (1991). *The chief student affairs officer: Leader, manager, mediator, educator*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Sandeen, A. (2001). *Making a difference: Profiles of successful student affairs leaders*. Washington, D. C.: National Association of Student Personnel Administrators.
- Saunders, S. A. & Cooper, D. L. (1999). The doctorate in student affairs: Essential skills and competencies for mismanagement. *Journal of College Student Development*, 40(2), 185-191.
- Scharre, E. W., Jr. (1996). Chief student affairs officers in the southeast: A profile (Doctoral dissertation, The University of Alabama, 1996). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 58, 684.
- Schwartz, R. A. (1997). How deans of women became men. *The Review of Higher Education*, 20(4), 419-436.

- Scott, N. A. (1992). Chief student affairs officers: Stressors and strategies. *Journal of College Student Development*, 33(2), 108-116.
- Shay, J. E., Jr. (1984). Point of View: The chief student affairs officer and the president: Revisiting an old issue. *NASPA Journal*, 22(2), 55-58.
- Shay, J. E., Jr. (1993). The president's perspective on student affairs and educational fundraising. In M. C. Terrell & J. A. Gold (Eds.), *New Roles for Educational Fundraising and Institutional Advancement, New Directions for Student Services*, No. 63. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Siera, S. G. (1984). Chief student affairs officers' performance as related to professional development (Doctoral dissertation, New Mexico State University, 1984). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 45, 1312.
- Silverman, R. J. (1980). The student personnel administrator as leading-edge leader. *NASPA Journal*, 18(2), 10-15.
- Smith, D. G. (1991). Small colleges and religious institutions: Special issues. In P. L. Moore (Ed.), *Managing the political dimension of student affairs, New Directions for Student Services No. 55*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Spigner-Littles, D. (1985). Perceptions of skills and competencies necessary to become an effective chief student affairs officer (Doctoral dissertation, The University of Oklahoma, 1985). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 47, 438.
- Stewart, R. (1970). *Managers and their jobs*. London: Pan.
- Sturtevant, S. M. & Hayes, H. (1930). *Deans at work*. New York: Harper and Brothers Publishers.

- Sturtevant, S. M. & Strang, R. (1928). *A personnel study of deans of women in teachers colleges and normal schools, Contributions to Education, No. 319*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Sturtevant, S. M., Strang, R., & McKim, M. (1940). *A personnel study of deans of women in colleges, universities, and normal schools, Contributions to Education, No. 787*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Taylor, J. D. (2001). Finding the right stuff in chief student affairs officers (Doctoral dissertation, University of Missouri-Columbia, 2001). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 62, 1753.
- Trueheart, F. (1977). Things they never told me about being a vice president. *NASPA Journal*, 16(2), 8-10.
- Van Der Velde, M. E. G., Jansen, P. G. W., & Vinkenburg, C. J. (1999). Managerial activities among top and middle managers: Self versus other perceptions. *Journal of Applied Management Studies*, 8(2), 161-174.
- Whetten, D. A. & Cameron, K. S. (1984). *Developing managerial skills*. New York: Scott, Foresman, and Company.
- White, M. M. (2000). Comparison of self-reported transformational leadership behaviors and outcomes of women senior student affairs officers with immediate staff member perceptions (Doctoral dissertation, The University of Akron, 2000). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 61, 3924.
- Whitney, M. E. (1971). Women student personnel administrators: The past and future. *Journal of College Student Personnel*, 12(1), 7-10.



Winston, R. B., Jr. & Creamer, D.C. (1997). *Improving staffing practices in student affairs*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Woodard, D. B., Jr. (1993). Budgeting and fiscal management. In M. J. Barr (Ed.), *The handbook of student affairs administration*, (pp. 242-259). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

## APPENDIX A

## CHIEF STUDENT AFFAIRS OFFICER CRITICAL SKILLS INVENTORY

## COVER LETTER

115 Fox Hunt Place  
Athens, GA 30606  
July 8, 2002

<CSAO name>  
<institution>  
<title>  
<address>  
<city>, <state> <zip code>

Dear <CSAO name>:

I am a doctoral candidate in the Student Affairs Administration program at the University of Georgia. Under the direction of Dr. Diane Cooper, Counseling and Human Development Services Department, I am conducting my dissertation research on the critical skills of chief student affairs officers (CSAO). This research is titled, *“Perceptions of Critical Skills of the Chief Student Affairs Officer.”* The purposes of my research are to gather information concerning the importance of critical skills of the CSAO as identified in the literature and assess the guiding philosophy of the CSAO.

I am seeking your assistance in this study. Your participation is voluntary and you may withdraw your participation at any time without penalty. Here is some additional information regarding this research:

- Please complete the attached survey, *CSAO Critical Skills Inventory*, which should take only 15-20 minutes of your time. The deadline to complete the survey is August 16, 2002.
- Should you prefer, this survey is also available on-line at: <http://sls.vpsa.uga.edu/surveys/csao/consent.asp>. The survey password is: csaoskills (enter in all lower case letters). There is a limit to the confidentiality that can be guaranteed due to the technology itself.
- For the paper survey, please use blue or black pen.
- The results of your participation will remain confidential. No personally identifiable information will be released without your written consent or unless required by law.
- Results from this research will be secured in the researcher's home upon collection and will be destroyed in December 2005.

- If you wish to withdraw your participation or not participate at all, you do not need to mail the survey.

Thank you very much for your participation. I will send a reminder postcard to you in three weeks. Feel free to contact me at (706) 542-6533 or at [jsdavis@arches.uga.edu](mailto:jsdavis@arches.uga.edu) if you have questions or need additional assistance. You may also contact Dr. Diane Cooper, 402 Aderhold Hall, Counseling and Human Development Services Department, University of Georgia, Athens, GA 30602-7142 at (706) 542-1812 or [dlcooper@coe.uga.edu](mailto:dlcooper@coe.uga.edu) should you have additional questions.

Sincerely,

J. Shay Davis  
Doctoral Candidate  
Student Affairs Administration  
The University of Georgia

For questions or problems about your rights please call or write: Chris A. Joseph, Ph.D., Human Subjects Office, University of Georgia, 606A Boyd Graduate Studies Research Center, Athens, Georgia 30602-7411; Telephone (706) 542-6514; E-Mail Address [IRB@uga.edu](mailto:IRB@uga.edu).

## APPENDIX B

## UNIVERSITY OF GEORGIA CSAO LETTER OF SUPPORT

July 8, 2002

Dear Fellow Chief Student Affairs Officer:

I am writing to you to encourage your participation in the research study entitled, *Perceptions of Critical Skills of Chief Student Affairs Officers (CSAOs)*. The purpose of this study is to assess our perceptions of the importance of the essential skills identified in the professional literature for CSAOs. This research may have important implications for current student affairs practice.

The attached survey should only take approximately 15-20 minutes to complete. I know that the issues of the day require your immediate attention, but I urge you to consider taking a few minutes of your time to respond to the attached questionnaire.

Sincerely,

Richard H. Mullendore  
Vice President for Student Affairs  
and Associate Provost

## APPENDIX C

## CHIEF STUDENT AFFAIRS OFFICER (CSAO) CRITICAL SKILLS INVENTORY

by  
J. Shay Davis

Directions: Please complete the following questionnaire in blue or black ink. The questionnaire has three sections: critical skills, guiding philosophy, and demographic questions. On average, it should take you 15-20 minutes to complete the survey. No attempt will be made to link responses to any one specific individual. Thank you for your participation. This survey is also available on-line at:  
<http://sls.vpsa.uga.edu/surveys/csao/consent.asp>

**Part I: Critical Skills**

This section is designed to assess the importance you place on the following critical skills of the CSAO which have been identified in the professional literature. Please mark one response for each item using the following scale:

- 1 = Unimportant skill for CSAO  
2 = Somewhat unimportant skill for CSAO  
3 = Neither unimportant nor important for CSAO  
4 = Important skill for CSAO  
5 = Extremely important skill for CSAO  
NA = Skill is not applicable for CSAO

Communication

- |  |   |   |   |   |   |    |
|--|---|---|---|---|---|----|
| 1. Maintain an open line of communication.   | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | NA |
| 2. Expect staff to keep you (CSAO) informed of concerns and issues.  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | NA |
| 3. Share information with student leaders and staff.   | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | NA |
| 4. Speak with the media in times of crisis.  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | NA |
| 5. Speak with the media concerning general campus issues.  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | NA |
| 6. Share current research with student affairs staff.  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | NA |
| 7. Interpret pertinent federal and state legislation to staff.   | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | NA |
| 8. Share institutional objectives and opportunities with staff.  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | NA |
| 9. Brief the president (or supervisor) of significant incidents and decisions which may effect student affairs and/or the institution. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | NA |
| 10. Interpret policies.  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | NA |
| 11. Present effectively the purposes of student affairs to faculty and the administration.   | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | NA |
| 12. Facilitate policy development.   | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | NA |

Presidential Relationship

- |  |   |   |   |   |   |    |
|--|---|---|---|---|---|----|
| 13. Meet regularly with president.   | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | NA |
| 14. Assist president in handling crisis issues.                              | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | NA |
| 15. Assist president in setting goals for the future.                        | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | NA |
| 16. Assist president in developing relationships with external stakeholders. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | NA |
| 17. Assist president with fund raising activities.                           | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | NA |

1 = Unimportant skill for CSAO  
 2 = Somewhat unimportant skill for CSAO  
 3 = Neither unimportant nor important for CSAO  
 4 = Important skill for CSAO  
 5 = Extremely important skill for CSAO  
 NA = Skill is not applicable for CSAO

18. Share student opinions with the president.	1	2	3	4	5	NA
19. Support the president in public.	1	2	3	4	5	NA
20. Assist the president with issues in the surrounding community.	1	2	3	4	5	NA
21. Advise the president concerning student issues and concerns.	1	2	3	4	5	NA

#### Student Education and Growth

22. Value student education and growth.	1	2	3	4	5	NA
23. Incorporate student affairs into the academic experience.	1	2	3	4	5	NA
24. Serve as an expert on students.	1	2	3	4	5	NA
25. Advocate for student concerns.	1	2	3	4	5	NA
26. Encourage student involvement on committees.	1	2	3	4	5	NA
27. Assess student development outcomes.	1	2	3	4	5	NA
28. Maintain accessibility to students.	1	2	3	4	5	NA
29. Seek student opinions on important issues.	1	2	3	4	5	NA

#### Managing the Political Environment

30. Understand role of the CSAO as politician.	1	2	3	4	5	NA
31. Network with other administrators regularly.	1	2	3	4	5	NA
32. Be able to problem solve with other senior staff.	1	2	3	4	5	NA
33. Demonstrate respect for others.	1	2	3	4	5	NA
34. Demonstrate respect for institutional process and structures.	1	2	3	4	5	NA
35. Gather information concerning institutional processes and structures.	1	2	3	4	5	NA
36. Gather information concerning other senior staff interests.	1	2	3	4	5	NA
37. Observe behavior patterns of others.	1	2	3	4	5	NA
38. Know formal dimensions of the institution's culture.	1	2	3	4	5	NA
39. Know informal dimensions of the institution's culture.	1	2	3	4	5	NA
40. Know institutional issues.	1	2	3	4	5	NA
41. Know the institution's history and lore.	1	2	3	4	5	NA
42. Develop credibility with faculty.	1	2	3	4	5	NA
43. Understanding the faculty governance process.	1	2	3	4	5	NA

#### Personal Qualities

44. Develop a "public presence".	1	2	3	4	5	NA
45. Be visible at key institutional events.	1	2	3	4	5	NA
46. Choose which institutional events to attend.	1	2	3	4	5	NA
47. Maintain integrity in decision making.	1	2	3	4	5	NA
48. Manage stress effectively.	1	2	3	4	5	NA
49. Make connections with students one-on-one.	1	2	3	4	5	NA

#### Planning and Goal Setting

50. Have a clearly stated goals and objectives statement.	1	2	3	4	5	NA
51. Plan for facilities improvements.	1	2	3	4	5	NA
52. Have a plan for implementing student affairs short term goals.	1	2	3	4	5	NA
53. Use a model or plan for a systematic planning process.	1	2	3	4	5	NA
54. Tie a planning model to the budgeting process.	1	2	3	4	5	NA

- 1 = Unimportant skill for CSAO  
 2 = Somewhat unimportant skill for CSAO  
 3 = Neither unimportant nor important for CSAO  
 4 = Important skill for CSAO  
 5 = Extremely important skill for CSAO  
 NA = Skill is not applicable for CSAO

#### Leadership and Supervision

55. Develop a personal, individualistic style of leadership.	1	2	3	4	5	NA
56. Effectively manage the budget process.	1	2	3	4	5	NA
57. Develop efficiency in administrative tasks.	1	2	3	4	5	NA
58. Develop a process for recruitment and selection of staff.	1	2	3	4	5	NA
59. Delegate tasks to direct reports.	1	2	3	4	5	NA
60. Delegate management of student affairs units to directors.	1	2	3	4	5	NA
61. Meet regularly with direct reports.	1	2	3	4	5	NA
62. Utilize effective time management strategies.	1	2	3	4	5	NA

#### Professional Development

63. Attend professional conferences.	1	2	3	4	5	NA
64. Present sessions at professional conferences.	1	2	3	4	5	NA
65. Hold office in professional associations.	1	2	3	4	5	NA
66. Attend seminars and workshops on special topics.	1	2	3	4	5	NA
67. Serve as an adjunct faculty member in your field of study.	1	2	3	4	5	NA
68. Submit articles, book chapters, etc. for publication.	1	2	3	4	5	NA
69. Consult with colleagues at other institutions on difficult issues.	1	2	3	4	5	NA

### **Part II: Guiding Philosophy**

This section is designed to assess the philosophy which guides your work in student affairs. Ender, Newton, and Caple (1996) identified the following three guiding philosophies of student affairs:

Student Services Model: The purpose of our work is to provide support for the academic mission of the academy by providing numerous adjunctive services (e.g., admissions, housing, counseling, student activities, recreation, financial aid, etc.).

Student Learning Model: The purpose of our work is an emphasis on shared efforts with other educators to achieve a more integrated or "seamless" learning environment. Outcomes of this model are primarily related to intentional learning, academic assistance, and an enhanced academic climate.

Student Development Model: The purpose of our work is a focus on the human maturation process from birth to death. Professionals focus on developmental tasks that students experience. The theoretical perspectives (e.g., psychosocial, person-environment, cognitive, typological, etc.) form the criteria for decision making concerning programming on campus.

70. Based on these definitions, rank the models that you **predominately** use in your day-to-day work:

Student Services Model \_\_\_\_\_  
 Student Learning Model \_\_\_\_\_  
 Student Development Model \_\_\_\_\_

*Please rank these models using 1, 2, and 3. Do not use a rank twice. A rank of 1 is "most used" where a rank of 3 is "least used".*

71. Based on these definitions, rank the models that you **believe** (in an ideal setting) student affairs professionals **should be** predominately using in their day-to-day work:

Student Services Model	_____	<i>Please rank these models using 1, 2, and 3. Do not use a rank twice. A rank of 1 is 'most used' where a rank of 3 is 'least used'.</i>
Student Learning Model	_____	
Student Development Model	_____	

### Part III: Demographics

Please note the most appropriate response for each item.

72. What is your gender? Circle one.      Female      Male

73. What is your ethnicity? Mark the one that best describes you.

_____ African American/Black	_____ Caucasian/White
_____ Native American	_____ Hispanic/Latino
_____ Asian/Pacific Islander	_____ Multiracial
_____ Other (please specify:_____)	

74. How many years have you held your **current** CSAO position? \_\_\_\_\_ years

75. How many CSAO positions have you held in your career? (including current position): \_\_\_\_\_

76. How many total years of experience do you have as a CSAO? (include all CSAO positions): \_\_\_\_\_

77. How many years of professional experience in higher education did you have upon attainment of your first CSAO position? \_\_\_\_\_ years

78. What is your highest degree earned? Please mark the one that best describes you.

_____ Bachelor's	_____ Master's	_____ Doctorate	_____ Professional (e.g. J. D., etc.)
_____ Other (please specify:_____)			

79. What is the field of study of your highest degree earned? \_\_\_\_\_

80. What is the title of the position to which you report? \_\_\_\_\_  
(e.g. President, Provost, etc.)

81. What is the Carnegie Classification of your current institution? Mark the one with an "X" that best describes your institution.

_____	Doctorate-granting Institution
_____	Master's College/University
_____	Baccalaureate Colleges ( liberal arts, general)
_____	Associate's Colleges
_____	Specialized Institutions
_____	Tribal Colleges and Universities

82. What is your title? \_\_\_\_\_

**Thank you for completing this survey!** Please return it to the researcher in the self-addressed, stamped envelope provided for you. The results will be submitted as a program for the 2003 NASPA Conference in St. Louis.



## APPENDIX D

## REMINDER POSTCARD

Chief Student Affairs Officer:

Recently, you were mailed a survey, *'Chief Student Affairs Officer Critical Skills Inventory.'* If you have not completed and returned this survey to the researcher, you are encouraged to participate in this study. You may also locate the survey on line at <http://sls.vpsa.uga.edu/surveys/csao/consent.asp>. The password is **csaoskills** (enter in all lower case letters). The main purpose of this study is to examine the critical skills of the CSAO position and the guiding philosophy of the CSAO. Deadline to complete the survey is August 16, 2002.

If you have already completed this study, your participation is appreciated! If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact the researcher at [jsdavis@arches.uga.edu](mailto:jsdavis@arches.uga.edu) or at 706-542-6533. Again, thank you for your participation in this research project.

Sincerely,

J. Shay Davis  
Doctoral Candidate  
The University of Georgia

Chief Student Affairs Officer:

Recently, you were mailed a survey, *'Chief Student Affairs Officer Critical Skills Inventory.'* If you have not already completed and returned this survey to the researcher, you are encouraged to participate in this study. You may also locate the survey on line at <http://sls.vpsa.uga.edu/surveys/csao/consent.asp>. The password is **csaoskills** (enter in all lower case letters). The main purpose of this study is to examine the critical skills of the CSAO position and the guiding philosophy of the CSAO. Deadline to complete the survey is August 16, 2002.

If you have already completed this study, your participation is appreciated! If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact the researcher at [jsdavis@arches.uga.edu](mailto:jsdavis@arches.uga.edu) or at 706-542-6533. Again, thank you for your participation in this research project.

Sincerely,

J. Shay Davis  
Doctoral Candidate  
The University of Georgia