

James Madison University

JMU Scholarly Commons

Dissertations, 2020-current

The Graduate School

12-19-2020

Predicting attrition of new Student Affairs professionals through perceptions of work-related quality of life, synergistic supervision, and executive servant leadership

Wendy Lushbaugh
James Madison University

Follow this and additional works at: <https://commons.lib.jmu.edu/diss202029>



Part of the [Educational Leadership Commons](#), [Higher Education Commons](#), and the [Higher Education Administration Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Lushbaugh, Wendy, "Predicting attrition of new Student Affairs professionals through perceptions of work-related quality of life, synergistic supervision, and executive servant leadership" (2020). *Dissertations, 2020-current*. 2.

<https://commons.lib.jmu.edu/diss202029/2>

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by the The Graduate School at JMU Scholarly Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Dissertations, 2020-current by an authorized administrator of JMU Scholarly Commons. For more information, please contact dc_admin@jmu.edu.

Predicting Attrition of New Student Affairs Professionals through Perceptions of Work-Related
Quality of Life, Synergistic Supervision, and Executive Servant Leadership

Wendy Lushbaugh

A dissertation submitted to the Graduate Faculty of

JAMES MADISON UNIVERSITY

In

Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements

for the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

School of Strategic Leadership Studies

August 2020

FACULTY COMMITTEE:

Committee Chair:

Dr. Ben Selznick

Committee Members/ Readers:

Dr. Karen Ford

Dr. Jeanne Horst

Acknowledgements

This dissertation would not have been possible without the endless support, patience, and encouragement of my chair, Dr. Ben Selznick. His patience and insight through every step of the process were instrumental in the journey. Thank you for your dedication to me and all Ph.D. students.

Thank you to my committee member, Dr. Karen Ford, for her encouragement and patience with my journey. Your smiles, calling me Dr. Lushbaugh to let me know what it would feel like to get there, and your dedication to my journey were inspiring.

Thank you to my committee member, Dr. Jeanne Horst, for her patience, amazing and detailed feedback, and encouragement of the importance of my research; it kept me going.

Thank you to my staff in the Office of Student Accountability and Restorative Practices at James Madison University throughout the years of this journey. Their support, encouragement, and willingness to ensure time for my writing and coursework throughout my Ph.D. journey pushed me to make it happen.

Thank you to my supervisors in Student Affairs who encouraged me to persist and always saw the importance of my learning in the work done in my roles at the university.

Thank you to my parents, Mr. Bruce Young and Mrs. Roxane Young for always supporting me in my educational dreams and encouraging me to never stop learning. Their support of my learning from an early age provided the foundation for my educational journey.

Thank you to all of my family and friends, who have encouraged me and understood the times when my schoolwork needed to be a priority.

Thank you to Edwin Lushbaugh, my partner, best friend, and number one fan. Your incredible patience, support, and love throughout this process were the daily encouragement needed to make it happen. There are not enough words to fully express my gratitude for your role in this journey.

Table of Contents

Acknowledgements	i
Table of Contents	ii
List of Tables	v
Abstract.....	vi
Chapter 1: Introduction	1
Rationale for the Current Study	4
Purpose of Current Study and Research Question	5
Chapter 2: Literature Review	8
History of the Student Affairs Profession	8
Attrition and Turnover in Employment	12
Attrition of Higher Education Employees	14
Student Affairs Attrition	15
Job Competition Concerns.....	16
Perception of Devalued Work.....	18
Role Stress, Job Stress, Burnout, and Work-Life Balance Concerns	18
Culture and Leadership Concerns in Student Affairs Divisions	20
New Professional Characteristics and Needs: Impact on Intention to Leave	21
New Professionals' Direct Supervisors' Characteristics: Impact on Intention to Leave	23
Supervision and the Retention of New Professionals	23
Contextual Aspects of Supervision.....	24
Synergistic Supervisory Model with New Professionals	26
New Professionals' Perceptions of SA Divisional Leadership: Impact on Intention to Leave	27
Theoretical Framework.....	30
Erikson, Chickering, and Psychosocial Identity Development.....	30
Leader-Member Exchange Theory in the Supervisory Dyad	32
Servant Leadership in the Student Affairs Division	33
Current Study	35
Chapter 3: Methods	36
Sampling Procedure.....	36
Sample	38

Variables	40
Instrumentation	41
Work-Related Quality of Life (WRQoL)	41
Synergistic Supervision Scale (SSS)	43
Executive Servant Leadership Scale (ESLS)	44
Data Analysis.....	45
Limitations	49
Chapter 4: Findings	51
Analysis Incorporating WRQoL	59
Chapter 5: Discussion, Conclusions, and Recommendations.....	63
Summary of Findings.....	63
Work-Related Quality of Life	63
Potential Predictive Value of the Number of Hours Worked Each Week	69
Non-Significance of New Professionals' Perceptions of ESLS and SSS	69
Implications for Student Affairs	70
Implications for Practice: Graduate Programs	70
Addressing Issues of Job and Career Satisfaction	70
Addressing Issues of General Well-Being	72
Addressing Issues of Control at Work	72
Implications for Practice: Divisional Leaders and Direct Supervisors	73
Addressing Issues of Job and Career Satisfaction	73
Addressing Issues of General Well-Being	78
Addressing Issues of Control at Work	80
Implications for Practice: National Organizations in Student Affairs	82
Addressing Issues of Job and Career Satisfaction	82
Addressing Issues of General Well-Being	83
Addressing Issues of Control at Work	83
Implications for Further Research	84
Summary	85
Appendices.....	87
Appendix A.....	87

Appendix B.....	8
Appendix C.....	89
Appendix D.....	104
Appendix E.....	106
Appendix F.....	108
Appendix G.....	110
References.....	112

List of Tables

Table 1	38
Table 2	51
Table 3	52
Table 4	53
Table 5	55
Table 6	56
Table 7	58
Table 8	59
Table 9	60
Table 10	61
Table 11	68
Appendix D	104

Abstract

New professional attrition in Student Affairs has been established as a concern for the field (Bender, 1980; Lorden, 1998; Renn & Hodges, 2007; Marshall, Gardner, Hughes, & Lowery, 2016). The debilitating impacts on university finances, productivity, organizational stability, team disruption, and innovation as a result of this problem creates urgency for the field to understand its predictors. The current study reviewed the impact of new professionals' work-related quality of life, their perception of the use of synergistic supervision by their direct supervisors, and their perception of the use of executive servant leadership by divisional leaders as potential predictors of attrition. Using logistic regression, several models were examined to determine the isolated influence of each of these study variables and the cumulative impact. Counter to hypotheses, the perceptions of style in both the supervisor and divisional leaders were not statistically significant. As hypothesized, the predictive value of work-related quality of life for new professionals proved to be significant, demonstrating that as new professionals increase in their level of work-related quality of life, the odds of them intending to leave the field decrease. The factors of work-related quality of life were further explored for their predictive value. New professionals' job and career satisfaction and their general well-being were important predictors with both demonstrating that as they increased, the odds of new professionals intending to leave the field decreased. Control at work was a significant predictor as well with increases in the perceived level of control leading to increases in the odds of new professionals intending to leave Student Affairs. These findings provide insight on new professional attrition for Student Affairs supervisors, divisional leaders, and national organizations. Recommendations for Student Affairs leadership and suggestions for further research are discussed.

Chapter One: Introduction

Career change is common among Americans who are estimated to change jobs seven times during their careers (Jo, 2008; Lorden, 1998). Unavoidable reasons for involuntary turnover include promotion, family obligations, or relocation. In addition to these understandable reasons for attrition, other employees voluntarily turnover due to issues with job dissatisfaction, work-life balance, lack of opportunities for advancement, and lack of congruence between personal and professional needs (Allen, Bryant, and Vardaman, 2010). While these realities exist, and are understood by organizational leaders, attrition has a real impact on all organizations, including higher education (Frank, 2013). While various research studies (Frank, 2013; Johnsrud & Rosser, 2002; Watanabe & Falci, 2016; Zhou & Volkwein, 2004) demonstrate that faculty attrition is a concern, Rosser and Javinar (2003) cited several studies that demonstrated “position change and turnover in the student affairs profession continues to be much higher relative to other work units in higher education” (p.825).

Student Affairs, as a profession, has struggled with attrition for decades. In an early study, Bender (1980), surveyed members of the National Association of Student Personnel Administrators (NASPA) and found that despite over half being satisfied with their jobs, 25% of all the professionals in the study and 31% of the younger professionals (aged 23-36) did not intend to stay in the field. Lorden (1998) cited a range from a few studies demonstrating that 32-60% of new professionals in the field leave within their first five or six years. Renn and Hodges (2007), in their review of all the literature on attrition and job satisfaction in Student Affairs, stated that 50-60% of new professionals will be gone before completing five years in the field. Marshall, et al. (2016) more recently found that 41.7% of professionals left with less than five years in the field and 60% left after less than 10 years. Even though the research conducted in this area represented several small, selective samples, the trend of high rates of employee turnover that is seen over time in this data should not be ignored as the impacts are real and prevent progress in the field. This trend is problematic in several ways, including the debilitating

impacts on university finances, productivity, organizational stability, team disruption, and innovation.

At the university, divisional, and departmental levels, the financial impacts of these trends are felt. Marshall et al. (2016) and Renn and Hodges (2007) pointed out that the costs for recruitment, hiring and training are significant during turnover transitions. According to Bryant and Allen (2013), financially, the continual loss of employees “often exceed[s] 100% of the annual compensation for a position” (p.171). Direct financial costs include the separation and replacement of the employee. Separation of the employee is seen through pay-outs for accrued sick and vacation time as well as hiring a part-time person to continue some of the needed tasks of the prior employee. The replacement costs include financial resources involved with advertising, interviewing, and hiring a new employee (Allen et al., 2010).

Productivity also suffers during transition due to attrition. Managers shift their focus from progress being made on needed and desired advancement of the work of their unit to running search processes. In addition, time is spent by remaining employees on keeping up with vital tasks of the vacated position. While this shift of focus occurs, the necessary work for the managers and remaining staff does not stop. For instance, a student in crisis cannot wait for an employee to be hired to work with them. Their needs must and should be addressed. However, this need to do more work with less time leads to burnout of current staff. Burnout has been shown to lead to attrition in Student Affairs (Marshall et al., 2016), thereby creating a vicious cycle. Further, burnout can lead to mistakes, which hurts the reputation and morale of the department and division. In addition, fixing the mistakes takes more time away from being productive in other tasks.

Attrition impacts the work environment through the losses of organizational memory and seasoned mentors. Whenever employees leave positions in the organization, they take with them the relationships, efficiencies, and understanding of the work they did. While many managers require employees who leave to create transition binders to be reviewed by future staff in the

position, there are some quirks of positions that cannot be translated in this manner. In addition, the development of needed relationships across departments allows for a seamless experience for students; when employees leave, these relationships must be rebuilt. Some new employees may not even know they need to establish these working relationships and must learn it through trial and error. In addition, the employee who is vacating takes with them memories of approaches to their work that were tried and not effective; without this knowledge new employees may spin their wheels, which again hurts productivity. If the vacating employee has been in the field for more than three years, their ability to mentor new staff and acclimate them to the culture of the department and division is also lost (Allen et al., 2010).

Work environments are also impacted through team disruptions and contagion effect (Allen et al., 2010). In addition to requiring team members to do more work, as previously discussed, other team disruptions such as group dynamics, equity of pay, and supervisory capacity may occur. Whenever employees leave an organization and new members join, the manager must spend time creating a cohesive unit again so that work can be as productive as possible. Teambuilding takes time to be effective, which continues to derail efforts towards accomplishing unit goals. In addition, equity of pay can sometimes become a concern for a team as new hires may be paid at the market value, which may increase them to equal to or above team members in the same position level, causing tension for the staff. Lastly, because supervisors within the department are being required to do more during transitions, they have less time to devote to supervisees that remain. These concerns can create a contagion effect on the staff where other employees look to follow the lead of those who have already left the department or division.

For the field of Student Affairs, high rates of attrition have implications for the loss of creativity, innovation, connection to current student populations, and the advancement of a new generation to continue the important work of supporting students in their growth and development outside of the classroom. Tull, Hirt, and Saunders (2009) discussed the indirect

losses felt from attrition, especially when new professionals leave, in terms of the hours of training, supervision, and guidance provided by graduate programs and supervisors. Specifically, Tull et al. (2009) stated that “we lose not only the resources we have invested in them, but the ideas and innovations they might have contributed” (p. x). Many departmental and divisional leaders rely on new professionals to bring energy, an innovative approach, a knowledge of the needs of today’s student, and an understanding of new technology to the work of Student Affairs. Without maintaining this new generation of professionals, the field’s ability to meet the needs of the university’s mission of serving and helping students grow and develop could become stagnant. Without Student Affairs professionals doing this important work in ways that are most effective for students, other methods that lack personal touch and professional understanding may be implemented.

Rationale for the Current Study

Since it has been established that attrition in the field of Student Affairs exists and has both financial and environmental costs to higher education, it is important for strategic leaders, such as division heads, campus leaders, and professional associations in the field to investigate the problem to uncover ways it can be addressed to limit these impacts. Specifically, understanding new professionals’ intent to leave, defined on NASPA’s website as those with less than five years in the field, is vital. Strategic leaders in Student Affairs must understand individual factors that may impact new professionals’ intent to leave the field. Several studies have indicated that new professionals experience an emotional toll, stress, or burnout in their roles (Chessman, 2015; Marshall et al., 2016; Silver & Jakeman, 2014) while others found that feeling valued, having work-life balance, and understanding the organizational expectations and culture were important to their commitment to the field (Cilente, Henning, Jackson, Kennedy, & Sloane, 2006; Frank, 2013; Renn & Jessup-Anger, 2008). Cilente et al. (2006) further found that “institutional type impacts job expectations” (p.11). Specifically, their new professional focus groups revealed that smaller-sized institutions provided more interaction with colleagues and

students but also encouraged professionals to be available and in attendance at all events (Cilente et al., 2006). Many of these personal indicators given by new professionals as important in their decisions regarding attrition are components of the Work-Related Quality of Life measure.

In addition, to this point in time, sparse research exists on the relationship between leadership and attrition in the Student Affairs workforce. To make an impact on the problem of new professional attrition in Student Affairs, we must understand the expectations new professionals have of the field and the leaders within it. To examine this effectively, there are two leadership levels that need to be explored: the role of the direct supervisor and the role of the Student Affairs divisional leadership.

While research studies thus far identified that new professionals leave the field due to poor supervision (Marshall et al., 2016; Renn & Hodges, 2007; Tull, 2006) and lack of stable and positive organizational culture (Bender, 1980; Frank, 2013; Silver & Jakeman, 2014), very little has been done to fully understand how these two levels of leadership are not meeting their expectations. To implement strategies to address the attrition problem, leaders must understand what style and characteristics of supervisors and divisional leaders new professionals expect. Generally, leadership with elements of transformational (Astin & Astin, 2000; Eckel & Kezar, 2003; Robinson, 2017), servant (Burch, Swails, & Mills, 2015; Schuh, 2002) and synergistic supervisory (Shupp & Arminio, 2012; Winston & Creamer, 1998) styles have been encouraged in the field. What has not yet been addressed, or at least not addressed thoroughly, are how new professionals' expectations of organizational leaders' styles and direct supervisors' approaches impact new professionals' intent to remain in or leave the field.

Purpose of Current Study and Research Question

While supervision in Student Affairs and how it relates to attrition has received some attention, there is a gap in the research for examining the perceived quality of life of new professionals and the approach to supervision and leadership of these new professionals in the field. This study will continue to explore the qualities of work life (Chessman, 2015; Su, Tay, &

Diener, 2014) of new professionals and whether new professionals intend to leave the field. It is hypothesized that new professionals with lower perception of quality of work life will intend to leave Student Affairs. In addition, this study seeks to further explore the relationship between a perceived synergistic supervisory approach to the intention of new professionals to leave the field. It is hypothesized that supervisors with approaches that represent a synergistic supervisory approach will meet the expectations of new professionals who will not report an intention to leave the Student Affairs field.

Lastly, there is a large gap in the research on the impact of new professionals' perception of the organizational leadership on retention of Student Affairs professionals. This study will begin exploration of new professionals' perception of the leadership style of organizational leaders on their intention to remain in or leave the field. It is hypothesized that new professionals who perceive their organizational leaders as servant leaders will not report an intention to leave the field.

Therefore, this study will explore new professionals in Student Affairs' intent to stay in or leave the field by examining this intention as informed by three dimensions: new professionals themselves, perceptions of the supervisor, and perceptions of the organizational leadership. Understanding the problem of attrition requires examining these various levels that can impact it. The study will also examine relationships between remaining in the field and higher perceived levels of work-related quality of life, synergistic supervision, and executive servant leadership. These levels and relationships will be explored by answering the following research question:

What relationships do new Student Affairs professionals' perceptions of work-related quality of life, synergistic supervision by their direct supervisor, and executive servant leadership by divisional leaders have with their intention to remain in or leave the field?

A purposive sample of new professionals, defined as having five years or less of experience in the Student Affairs field, from two national organizations, NASPA and American College Personnel Association (ACPA), will be the focus of this study. Chapter two provides a

historical look at the Student Affairs profession and relevant literature regarding this research.

Chapter three discusses the methods implemented in this study. Chapter four discusses the findings in the current study. Chapter five provides insight and recommendations to Student Affairs leadership regarding the impact of work-related quality of life factors on new professional attrition.

Chapter Two: Literature Review

The importance of retaining new professionals in the field of Student Affairs is vital to the impact the division provides to students' experiences in higher education. In this literature review, Student Affairs' attrition is examined from three levels: new professionals themselves, direct supervisors of new professionals, and organizational leaders of the Student Affairs divisions of the new professionals. By understanding what we know about the impacts that each of these levels has on attrition in the field, we illuminate the gaps in the literature that will be explored in this study.

To accomplish this goal, I first examine the context of the Student Affairs field including its history. Second, the general reasons for attrition in the field, including those specific to new professionals, will be explored. Third, the literature related to the reasons for attrition that are directly connected to new professionals' characteristics and needs will be reviewed. Fourth, studies on how the direct supervisors of new professionals are connected to intentions of their supervisees to leave the field will be examined. Lastly, any insights from the literature on the influence of organizational leadership within a Student Affairs division on new professionals' decisions to stay in or leave the field will be cited.

History of the Student Affairs Profession

Within the context of higher education history, Student Affairs is young. Prior to the 1800's, faculty held the multidimensional role of teacher, disciplinarian, and counselor during a period in higher education referred to as the "era of paternalism" (Schwartz & Stewart, 2017, p.20). The mid-1800's saw the expansion of higher education to include a more diverse student population with the inclusion of women and African Americans (Altbach, Gumport, & Berdahl, 2011). Expansion continued with the passing of the Morrill Acts of 1862 and 1890, which provided states with land grants to build higher education institutions. After WWI, this expansion was seen in the stratification of colleges for various purposes; for example, the emergence for teachers' colleges, technical schools, and normal schools created variety in types of students within higher education

(Thelin & Gamson, 2017). With the increase in college attendance, faculty were unable to maintain all the aspects of their previous roles. This tension led to the development of the first administrative positions on campuses, titled Deans of Men and Deans of Women. These administrative roles oversaw the needs of students through campus life and student behavior. Alice Freeman Palmer became the first Dean of Women at the University of Chicago in 1892; she would later establish the National Association of Deans of Women in 1916 (Schwartz & Stewart, 2017). Thomas Arkle Clark became the first Deans of Men at the University of Illinois in 1901 by position and by title in 1909 (Gerda, 2006). By 1918 the Deans of Men at that time were meeting about similar concerns in their work; a year later they had formally established the National Association of the Deans of Men (Schwartz & Stewart, 2017).

The onset of a framework of the Student Affairs profession came through the work of Walter Dill Scott at Northwestern University in 1920. Scott was a student of personnel psychology, which he believed would apply well in a higher education setting. Therefore, he replaced the Deans of Men and Women with a Personnel Office. This newly established office would provide student services regarding enrollment, student needs, and job placement. When other schools adopted this approach, it became known as the “student personnel movement” (Schwartz & Stewart, 2017).

The student personnel work in the 1920’s primarily focused on the world of work through occupational guidance and placement. Those working in these roles were influenced by developments in the areas of psychology, education, and industry; they came to understand that their work with students was multidimensional. In 1925, student personnel workers met to discuss the concerns present in their work with students, which led to data collection for a decade to help inform the work (Evans, Forney, Guido, Patton, & Renn, 2010). These efforts led to what many view as the “official birth of the formal profession of Student Affairs” (Buchanan, 2012, p.18) that occurred with the publication by a sub-committee of the American Council on Education (ACE) of the *1937 Student Personnel Point of View (SPPV)* document. This landmark document demonstrated the recognition by student personnel professionals that student success required focus

on the “whole student,” including the personal and professional growth of students outside of the classroom (Evans et al., 2010).

The end of WWII and the Serviceman’s Readjustment Act of 1944 (better known as the GI Bill) led to rapid increases in higher education enrollment; for instance, “in 1947, 1.1 million ex-GIs were enrolled, compared with 1.5 million total students before the war” (Altbach et al., 2011). This rapid growth impacted the ever-changing landscape of student personnel work. Thelin and Gasman (2017) referred to this quantitative growth in higher education in the United States as the impetus for the qualitative changes that would occur in its approach to working with students. In response, about a decade after the original *SPPV*’s publication, ACE brought together a current group of professionals working in student personnel to update the document (Schwartz & Stewart, 2017). By 1949, the profession had become more established and the revised *SPPV* that year further delineated the roles of student personnel workers in developing students with focus on students’ individual differences, while also calling for more attention to social responsibility of graduates and scholarship in the field (Buchanan, 2012; Evans et al., 2010).

The 1950s and 1960s saw continued opening of doors to higher education. The 1954 *Brown v. Board of Education* and the 1964 *Civil Rights Act* allowed for desegregation and increased rights to higher education (Altbach et al., 2011). The 1947 Truman Commission Report entitled *Higher Education for American Democracy* led to expanded access in the 1950s through the development of the community college system. The Vocational Education Act of 1963 increased federal funds for low to middle income families for higher education (Buchanan, 2012). All of this expansion led to reimagined roles for those working in student personnel to meet the needs of all students.

The 1960s redefined the relationship between colleges and students through the courts denouncing the *in loco parentis* concept and defining a person over the age of 18 as a legal adult in the *Dixon v. Alabama State Board of Education* decision in 1961. The 1960s and 1970s saw a rise in student activism and a focus on student development theory as a basis for personnel providing

student services on campus (Evans et al., 2010; Long, 2012). Specifically, the introduction of Chickering's identity development, Perry's intellectual development, and Kohlberg's moral reasoning became the underpinnings for the profession on how to think about student personnel work (Evans et al., 2010). In 1972 the American College Personnel Association (ACPA) produced a report entitled *Student Development in Tomorrow's Higher Education: A Return to the Academy*, which encouraged partnership between faculty and those working in Student Affairs to truly understand the curricular and co-curricular learning taking place for students.

The 1980s and 1990s, with the solid foundation of student development theories to date, expanded its learning about students that did not fit the typical undergraduate population with which these foundational theories had been developed. For example, Title IX in 1972 had provided greater access to women and others typically more underrepresented in higher education and by 1990, Section 504 of the Vocational Rehabilitation Act increased access to students with disabilities (Thelin & Gasmon, 2017). During these decades, more research on identities of minority populations in college was conducted to inform the work of the Student Affairs profession (Evans et al., 2010; Long, 2012).

The 1990s and 2000s demonstrated a shift in the profession from a central focus on student development to the concept of student learning. In 1996, ACPA published *The Student Learning Imperative: Implications for Student Affairs*, which continued to promote collaboration with faculty but also put student learning as the focus of the profession by stating that both faculty and Student Affairs professionals had a shared responsibility for this learning (Long, 2012). Further developing this philosophy were a number of documents that shared this message of the importance of student learning; the documents included the following: *Powerful Partnerships: A Shared Responsibility for Learning* (American Association for Higher Education, ACPA & NASPA, 1998), *Learning Reconsidered: A Campus-Wide Focus on the Student Experience* (ACPA & NASPA, 2004), and *Learning Reconsidered 2: A Practical Guide to Implementing a Campus-Wide Focus on the Student Experience* (ACPA, ACUHO-I, ACUI, NACA, NACADA, NASPA & NIRSA, 2006). In addition

to learning as a focus, the past two decades in the Student Affairs profession have included the need for expansion into the globalization of higher education (Long, 2012). Evidence of this commitment can be seen in the global expansion of regions within the National Association of Student Personnel Administrators (NASPA) as viewed on their website (<https://www.naspa.org/constituent-groups/regions>). The expansion of students to include adult learners, the influence of new technologies, and the shift to a majority of student enrollment being women have also been important elements of more recent Student Affairs work (Thelin & Gasman, 2017).

As can be seen throughout the history of higher education in the United States, people working within a Student Affairs unit have had to be adaptable, flexible, and attuned to the ever-changing demands. Much of this ability to meet the needs of changing students has relied on new ways of thinking about the work. To keep creativity and change flowing into this Student Affairs environment, it requires new professionals to continue to add value in this way to the field. As previously discussed, Student Affairs, in the last few decades, has been struggling with attrition. We will next explore what the research demonstrates as some of the reasons for attrition in general and specifically in the field of Student Affairs.

Attrition and Turnover in Employment

Job turnover is a common theme for American employers (Jo, 2008; Lorden, 1998). While many believe attrition in an organization to be a negative outcome, Allen et al. (2010) argued that it has both positive and negative aspects. They further explained that two types of employee turnover exist--involuntary and voluntary. Involuntary turnover, which is controlled by the employer, occurs when it is decided that the loss of an employee is in the best interests of the organization due to restructuring needs or poor job performance. Voluntary turnover occurs when the employee chooses to leave the organization. Since the employer is in control of involuntary turnover, the benefits of the loss of the employee are greater than the potential negative outcomes. However, voluntary turnover, at times, can also provide financial and

environmental benefits. Financially, management may decide to save money by not replacing the person or restructuring to more efficiently utilize personnel funds. Environmentally, new hires can bring new energy and points of view, which may inspire new goals. Lastly, current employees may have the opportunity for upward mobility (Allen et al., 2010; Frank, 2013).

Voluntary turnover, however, is more commonly an area of concern for organizations as it may create the loss of skilled, valuable employees. There are two types of voluntary turnover: 1) *functional*, meaning that the loss may be disruptive but may not be harmful in the long-term; and 2) *dysfunctional*, meaning the loss is of a high performing employee with difficult skills to replace. Further, dysfunctional turnover, of most concern to leadership, may be unavoidable, due to health (i.e. of oneself, family member, child) or dual career issues (i.e. moving with a partner). Dysfunctional turnover, from a financial perspective, can be debilitating. The reasons for this are the multiple layers of direct costs to the organization for both the separation and the replacement of the employee. Direct costs related to the separation of the employee are accrued paid time for sickness and vacation as well as overtime pay, if the company does this, for temporary workers. Replacement costs include staff time and resources involved with advertising, interviewing, and hiring a new employee (Allen et al., 2010).

In addition, there are environmental losses associated with voluntary turnover. Jo (2008) pointed out there are “hidden costs such as lost productivity, skill drain, and poor morale among the remaining employees” (p. 565). More specifically, this is felt in the time spent by remaining employees on keeping up with tasks of the vacated person while the manager is recruiting, interviewing, and hiring a new employee. This scenario does not allow remaining employees to progress on their own projects, with the net result of no movement forward for the organization. Allen et al. (2010) expanded these intangible costs to include the loss of workforce diversity, organizational memory, seasoned mentors, and quality of work while the job is unfilled. In addition, they point out that voluntary turnover can create team disruptions and contagion effect where other employees may decide to follow suit by leaving the organization as well. Lastly,

Allen et al. (2010) pointed to research evidence linking turnover rates to performance indicators at the organizational level.

Organizational leadership must focus on understanding and lowering rates of avoidable turnover to reduce the impact of these financial and environmental costs. While some turnover is unavoidable, Allen et al. (2010) highlighted that leadership can impact reasons for avoidable turnover, including “low job satisfaction, poor supervision, or higher pay elsewhere” (p.51). Emphasizing this point, Allen et al. (2010) stated that “from a strategic perspective, organizations need a clear shared understanding of the costs and benefits associated with turnover to develop an effective retention management plan” (p.51).

Researchers have studied, created models for, and added to models for turnover to understand what drives employees to leave an organization (Bluedorn, 1982; Lee & Mowday, 1987). According to Lee and Mowday (1987) factors that have been studied and found to have some merit on being a driver of turnover include the intention to leave, job satisfaction, organizational commitment, person-job congruence, and job involvement. Relying on meta-analyses on this topic, researchers (Allen et al., 2010; Bedeian, Kemery, and Pizzolatto, 1991; Bluedorn, 1982; Bryant & Allen, 2013) pointed out that the strongest predictor of actual turnover is the intent to turnover. The drivers of this intent, according to Allen et al. (2010) include organizational commitment, job satisfaction, relationships with immediate supervisors, and role clarity. Allen et al. (2010) summarized that “organizations that foster a supportive and cohesive culture may realize improved retention” (p.54).

Attrition of Higher Education Employees

Like other industries in which employee turnover has been studied, Frank (2013) stated that higher education is also not immune to the effects of attrition. Further, a review of the research on attrition for faculty in higher education revealed that factors for attrition include level of position (tenured, non-tenured, instructional), perceptions of higher external rewards (salary, benefits, advancement), morale level, job security, and job satisfaction (Frank, 2013; Johnsrud &

Rosser, 2002; Zhou & Volkwein, 2004). Zhou and Volkwein (2004) found that the strongest external factor that impacted faculty members' intent to leave was extrinsic rewards (i.e. salary, benefits, advancement). Johnsrud and Rosser (2002) determined that these extrinsic rewards and other professional benefits created higher morale for faculty, which led to a reduction in their intention to leave their position. Further, they found that perceptions of work life have a positive impact and morale has a negative direct impact on a faculty members' intent to leave. This focus on extrinsic reward, defined as compensation level, was highlighted as leading to increased retention of faculty in a study conducted through the American Association of University Professors (Ehrenberg, Kasper, & Rees, 1991). More recently, Watanabe and Falci (2016) added work-related demands and resources to the list of predictors of turnover for faculty members. Lindfelt, Ip, Gomez, and Barnett (2018), in a study of American pharmacy faculty, found that a higher perception of work-life balance and lower stress levels were significant in faculty members' intention to remain in their roles. In a review of 36 studies of faculty burnout, Zaynab, Hall, and Saroyan (2018) concluded that faculty well-being is moderately to largely, positively correlated with intent to leave.

Student Affairs Attrition

While higher education leaders certainly need to understand and strategize to keep skilled faculty, they also need to examine the concerns for attrition within the Student Affairs division. For decades, the profession of Student Affairs struggled with attrition at a higher rate than other work units in higher education (Rosser & Javinar, 2003). Renn and Hodges (2007), in their review of all the literature on attrition and job satisfaction in Student Affairs, stated that 50-60% of new professionals will be gone before completing five years in the field. More recently, Marshall et al. (2016) found that 41.7% of Student Affairs professionals left with less than five years in the field and 60% left after less than 10 years.

Expected career changes, to move into higher positions in the field, are understood and adapted to within Student Affairs. However, the impact on graduate level faculty in the field,

supervisors, remaining employees, a department, a division of Student Affairs, and the Student Affairs field when reasons for attrition do not follow these normal patterns, is concerning.

Marshall et al. (2016) pointed out that the costs for recruitment, hiring and training are significant during turnover transitions so any knowledge obtained regarding attrition is helpful to the Student Affairs field. Further, Renn and Hodges (2007) stated that “once individuals and institutions have invested substantial resources into...job searches, to lose someone because of a poor institutional or vocational fit, dissatisfaction with a job, or some other reason may be seen as a loss for all” (p.370). In addition to the direct costs that Allen et al. (2010) referenced regarding separation and replacement costs, Tull et al. (2009), discussed the indirect losses when new professionals leave, in terms of the hours of training, supervision, and guidance provided by graduate programs and supervisors. Further, they focus on the loss of creative approaches and new ideas when new professionals leave the field.

To date, research illuminates various reasons for Student Affairs attrition. The overarching themes, with reasons that will be explored next, are job competition; perception of devalued work; role stress, job stress, burnout, and work-life balance; and the culture and leadership of the Student Affairs divisions.

Job competition concerns in Student Affairs.

Job competition is a concern for the field. Marshall et al. (2016), in examining Lorden’s (1998) suspicions about attrition, found that the attractiveness of careers outside of the field drew about 43% of their survey participants away from Student Affairs. This job competition, according to the literature had various causes. Those who left the field reported the lack of challenge or professional development as a primary factor (Evans, 1988; Marshall et al., 2016). More specifically, Buchanan (2012) qualitatively found that lack of funds available for the pursuit of professional development was a problem in the field. Bender (1980) demonstrated that 53% of her stratified sample of Student Affairs employees were disappointed in the staff development they were receiving and indicated not growing from it. Further, Marshall et al. (2016) found that “a

noteworthy theme...emerged...that some participants, though challenged by the profession as a whole, did not feel challenged in their specific position. This lack of challenge eventually led them to seek out more meaningful and rigorous work” (p.156).

Secondly, job competition as a reason for attrition is due to the perception of non-competitive salaries compared to other fields. Lorden (1998) speculated about low salary as a reason for the attrition concern, which was later confirmed by various researchers. Bender (1980) found a dissatisfaction with how institutions determined salary increases, while Buchanan (2012) found salary to be a primary reason for departing the field. In interviewing graduate students who intended to leave the field, Silver and Jakeman (2014) revealed that finances were a theme that “manifested itself in concerns about limited earning potential, lacking the resources to support a family, and being unable to repay student loans” (p.178). Rosser and Javinar (2003) found low salaries to be one of the main two reasons for practitioners in the field to make the decision to leave. Lastly, Marshall et al. (2016) stated that most of those who left the field discussed low salaries as a concern; specifically, “many commented on how despite their advanced degrees, their salaries were not congruent with their educational levels” (p.153).

The third factor that leads to job competition as a reason for attrition is the lack of opportunity in the field. This concern with opportunities when relocating was highlighted as an important factor on Student Affairs attrition (Evans, 1988). More recently, Marshall et al. (2016) revealed the lack of opportunity to be a function of both advancement and geographic concerns for new professionals. One of the most common reasons for departing the field was the limited opportunities for advancing to higher level positions, with only 40% seeing any potential for advancement within their institution. More specifically, Bender (1980) found that “50% of the younger [employees] were dissatisfied with the opportunity for advancement within their organization” (p.560). Coupled with this was the inability to find these opportunities outside of their current institution without relocating to a new geographic area. Rosser and Javinar (2003) found that a lack of job mobility was the most frequently mentioned reason for leaving the

profession. Further, when moving to a new geographic region with a partner, securing new employment in the field in the new area was limited (Frank, 2013; Marshall et al., 2016).

Perception of devalued work in Student Affairs.

Several studies suggest that the value placed on Student Affairs work by the administration becomes a factor in decisions of practitioners to leave the field. Interestingly, Rosser and Javinar (2003) found that in addition to low salaries, the number of years at an institution was a factor in mid-level practitioners' choice to leave. Further, these mid-level practitioners revealed that as more time was spent working at the institution, they began to feel less valued by the institution for their work, which made them less committed to the work. Rosser (2004) demonstrated that the "more positive midlevel leaders perceive they have been recognized and respected for their contributions to the institution, the more satisfied they become and are less likely to leave" (p.331). Understanding this perspective on value of work at the mid-level is important in understanding how it may impact the practitioners being supervised by them, the new professionals in the field. Tull et al. (2009), in a review of Rosser and Javinar's (2003) work, suggested that new professionals would likely respond in the same way as mid-level professionals to their work being valued and appreciated. Silver and Jakeman (2014) found that this idea of value was prevalent even at the graduate student level. The researchers, in interviews with Student Affairs masters' students who intended to leave, found that they described the field "as a devalued profession, lacking institutional support and legitimacy. When they experienced failures in securing institutional resources for their offices or programs, students interpreted this as a reflection of Student Affairs having less value" (p.176).

Role stress, job stress, burnout, and work-life concerns in Student Affairs.

Role stress, work overload, and burnout were found by several researchers to be contributing reasons for Student Affairs attrition. Lorden (1998) and later Cilente et al. (2006) cited unclear job expectations and a disconnect between the values of the field and the reality of the work as reasons for attrition. Ward (1995) investigated the impact of role stress, defined by levels of role

ambiguity and role conflict, on attrition in the field. He found that role ambiguity, or “when information needed to guide one’s behavior is incomplete, insufficient, unclear, or absent” (p.36), was found to be the stronger predictor of new professionals having a propensity to leave the field rather than other factors, such as role conflict or career mobility.

In addition to the stress caused by not understanding one’s role, other researchers have found concerns in the field related to job stress. Berwick (1992) examined multiple variables’ ability to predict work stress of Student Affairs professionals. Among other findings, she found that liking your job, being in the field longer, having a hardy personality, and being committed to the organization were all factors in experiencing less work-related stress. Volkwein and Zhou (2003), in their study on an administrative model for job satisfaction found that “compared with other divisions, managers in student services report the highest level of job stress and pressure” (p.160). Silver and Jakeman (2014) found this stress and pressure voiced as emotional burdens by master’s students in Student Affairs who were planning to depart. Their summary of these student interviews stated that graduate students were unable to find ways to manage the emotional toll of the work in healthy ways but rather reported shutting down the emotions the work evoked.

Mullen, Malone, Denney, and Dietz (2018) found an association between higher levels of job stress and burnout with increased turnover intentions for Student Affairs professionals. In an earlier study, Buchanon (2012), in her interviews of new professionals who left the field, found that burnout due to long work hours, identified as 50-90 hours per week, was a primary reason for vacating the field. New professionals, in a study by Marshall et al. (2016), also “reported extreme work obligations, which lead to burnout, fatigue, and eventual departure from the field” (p.152).

Other research has determined that balance between work and personal life is a reason for departing the field. Frank (2013), in her interviews with those who departed the field as new professionals, found work-life balance to be a factor for departure for half the interviewees in her study. She summarized this finding from participants by stating that “Student Affairs work tends to require long hours and emotional commitment to students, which can be taxing on one’s psyche

when these boundaries are blurred and balance is uneven” (p.96). Silver and Jakeman (2014) found work-life balance to be a concern for Student Affairs master’s students who cited it as a reason to depart the field. Marshall et al. (2016) also found work-life conflict to be a reason for attrition of new professionals. In summarizing their findings, they stated that most of their participants had concerns with work-life balance due to a culture that “dictates long hours... [in which] professionals are expected to sacrifice personal time to put students’ needs first. This unhealthy expectation can result in burnout, work-life conflicts, and eventual departure from the field” (p. 154).

Culture and leadership concerns in Student Affairs divisions.

In addition, a few studies (Bender, 1980; Frank, 2013; Silver & Jakeman, 2014) focused on the culture and leadership of the student affairs division and attrition. Specifically, Bender (1980) found that 75% of those surveyed in her study were satisfied with the competence of their supervisor and were satisfied with their jobs, but only 56% respected their Chief Student Affairs Officer. Further, she stated that “a gap seem[ed] to exist between the entry-level staff and the person in charge of student affairs” (p.563). Frank (2013), in a qualitative study of professionals leaving the field, identified that departure occurs when expectations are not met. These unfulfilled expectations include lack of the following: a personal connection to the institution and job, a stable organizational environment, value and support by management, work/life balance, and a fair salary with advancement opportunities. Student Affairs master’s students described the devaluation of the field as a reason for departure as well (Silver & Jakeman, 2014). Davis and Cooper (2017) identified, through interviews with new professionals’ supervisors, how vital the recruitment and hiring processes are to an organization for communicating these expectations to prospective employees to ensure retention. Further, these supervisors highlighted that organizational factors such as “physical distance between supervisor and supervisee...and institutional initiatives and culture were important as well and should not be trivialized” (p.64). Buchanan (2012) identified the politics of higher education as a reason for those who departed the field. Interviewees

specifically talked about the difficulty in working with supervisors and leadership who did not support students or staff.

These reasons for professionals deciding to leave the Student Affairs field are ones that have been found for the whole field. Next, we will examine how these findings relate specifically to the intent of new professionals to remain in or leave the field. The reasons for intention to leave will be separated into characteristics of the new professionals themselves, the role of the direct supervisor of the new professionals, and the perceptions by the new professionals of organizational leadership. In the following sections, we will explore each of these three areas in more depth as reasons for new professional attrition.

New Professional Characteristics and Needs: Impact on Intention to Leave

In a 2006 study, new Student Affairs professionals represented 15-20% of the total workforce in the field (Underwood & Austin, 2016). NASPA, according to its website, defines new professionals as those working in the field for less than five years. Taub and McEwen (2006) examined the demographics of those in Student Affairs graduate preparation programs. Of those who responded to their national survey, 89% were white, 76.3% were enrolled in graduate school full-time, 68.8% were 26 or younger in age, and just over 14% were enrolled in courses while also occupying a full-time position in the field. Underwood and Austin (2016), answering the call for current data on Student Affairs master's programs, engaged in a study to determine characteristics and trends. The students' demographics illuminated two trends, an increase in the number of students overall, but particularly women, in master's and doctoral programs. Other aspects of their demographics were not discussed.

While only a small amount of research exists specifically on the characteristics and needs of new professionals in the field, we can extrapolate the needs of new professionals from these studies. Cilente et al. (2006) found that first professional positions do not match the experience of graduate school, which is frustrating for new professionals. In addition, they found that new professionals need more direction on topics such as politics and campus culture. Renn and Jessup-

Anger (2008) identified four themes of needs of new professionals through asking them what they believed graduate programs should focus on to prepare new professionals. “The themes cluster around major challenges faced by new professionals and are: creating a professional identity, navigating a cultural adjustment, maintaining a learning orientation, and seeking sage advice” (p.324). Frank (2013) found multiple needs of new professionals in her interviews with those who left the field prior to completing five years. New professionals had needs for work-life balance, to feel valued, opportunities for work in areas that met their family’s needs (geography, dual career) or to advance in the field, better communication of expectations, and an understanding of organizational politics.

Collins (2009) saw themes of relationships being unsettled for new professionals, who typically are in their middle to late 20’s; changing relationships with family and friends accompany the major life changes of jobs, marriage, home ownership, and children. Collins (2009) emphasized that “as the routines of the work environment are better established, routine can also return to personal relationships” (p.16). After identifying these needs of new professionals in the field, Tull et al. (2009) suggested that supervisors and organizations focus on the socialization of this group to reduce attrition. According to Collins (2009), the informal stage of socialization, where new professionals are taught “unwritten rules” of their position that pertain to organizational culture, role clarity, and relationships with colleagues, is important. They emphasize socialization to assist new professionals in their transition into work life. Rosser and Javinar (2009) extend these suggestions for new professional socialization by suggesting six dimensions of work-life that organizations should focus on during new professionals’ transition. These dimensions include career support, recognition for competence, intradepartmental relations, building external relationships with those not in Student Affairs, work environmental conditions, and perceptions of discrimination. Focusing on these dimensions makes sense when other researchers have found that feeling valued, supported, and understanding the organizational expectations and culture were important to new professionals’ commitment to the field (Cilente et al., 2006; Frank, 2013).

Student Affairs new professionals left the field due to the long hours and stressful roles in Student Affairs leading to burnout (Marshall et al., 2016). Graduate students who were planning to leave the field prior to becoming a new professional also focused on the emotional burdens that were a part of Student Affairs work as a concern (Silver & Jakeman, 2014). To explore these types of concerns further, Chessman (2015) conducted the first known study on well-being of Student Affairs professionals. Chessman (2015) found a strong relationship between work quality of life and well-being. Position level in the Student Affairs field mattered, with CSAO's having a four-point higher well-being score than entry-level professionals. Surprisingly, years in the field was not significant to well-being until someone had worked for 12 years or more.

New Professionals' Direct Supervisors' Characteristics: Impact on Intention to Leave

In addition to the characteristics of the new professionals themselves that have been discussed, the literature also provides evidence of the impact of the direct supervisor on the intention of new professionals to leave the field.

Supervision and the retention of new professionals.

Rosen, Taube, and Wadsworth (1980) set the stage for qualitatively understanding the needs of new professionals by identifying their order of tasks in the first year as understanding their position, then working on socialization within the institution, and finally becoming a professional. The expectations new professionals had for supervisors were guidance, feedback, and support in accomplishing these important tasks. Renn and Hodges (2007) found that new professionals in their first year of work "were frustrated that their supervisors were not acting as mentors" (p.376). Marshall et al. (2016) had many participants who stated that ineffective supervision was a reason for leaving the field, with 42% of their new professional interviewees reporting no appreciation for their supervisors due to supervisors undervaluing or not supporting them. Most recently, Davis and Cooper (2017), in narrative interviews of supervisors of new professionals, found positive themes of new professionals desiring feedback, learning, and taking initiative while practicing good judgement. On the flip side, supervisors of new professionals

found challenge in this role when their supervisees were unwilling to listen, lacked discipline and communication, and were unable to make decisions. These findings demonstrate a spectrum of outcomes in new professional supervision, which begs the question of how these outcomes relate to attrition.

Researchers have suggested the lack of an appropriate supervisory model and professional training on this model for mid-level supervisors (Saunders, Cooper, Winston, & Chernow, 2000; Shupp & Arminio, 2012; Winston & Creamer, 1998) as a main reason for the attrition of new professionals. In response, Stock-Ward and Javorek (2003) explored the application of clinical supervision theory as a developmental approach for supervision in Student Affairs. Winston and Creamer (1998) and Shupp and Arminio (2012) argued for a synergistic model of supervision to meet this growing need in the profession. The importance of supervision style, measured through the Synergistic Supervision Scale (SSS), also predicted professional identity development of new professionals (Pittman & Foubert, 2016). Tull (2006) found a negative correlation between intent to leave and a new professional's perceived level of synergistic supervision meaning that the "lack of a synergistic supervisory relationship could lead to greater intentions to turnover among new professionals" (p.474). While developed and tested utilizing an instrument, this model of synergistic supervision has not been studied fully in the literature.

Contextual aspects of supervision.

Other contextual aspects of supervision have been examined. Supervisory attention to orienting, supporting, and socializing new professionals inadequately were purported as reasons for attrition (Harned & Murphy, 1998; Tull, 2006; Winston, Torres, Carpenter, McIntire, & Peterson, 2001). Without proper orientation, new professionals are not provided the opportunity to understand the culture of the Student Affairs organization (Harned & Murphy, 1998).

Most studies on supervisor and supervisee similarities and differences regarding gender and ethnicity have been conducted outside the area of Student Affairs but we can gain insight into

these dimensions of the supervisory relationship. Many of these studies have demonstrated that similarities within the supervisory dyad is related to job satisfaction (Bakar & McCann, 2014; Mueller, Finley, Iverson, & Price, 1999; Tsui, Egan, & O'Reilly, 1992; Vecchio & Bullis, 2001), intention to turnover (Tsui et al., 1992), and organizational attachment (Harrison, Price, & Bell, 1998; Mueller et al., 1999). In general, researchers support gender (Gardinar & Tiggeman, 1999; Jeanquart-Barone, 1993; Liden, 1985) and race (Jeanquart-Barone, 1993) as important characteristics within the supervisory dyad.

Interestingly, previous research findings disagree over whether congruent race and gender supervisory dyads are necessary for positive subordinate outcomes. Jeanquart-Barone (1993) found that trust differences among similar or different supervisory dyads were mixed. Trust was higher for black subordinates reporting to black supervisors and white subordinates reporting to white supervisors. However, with gender the pattern did not always follow similarities within the dyad; for example, the highest level of trust was found in females reporting to male supervisors. Similarly, Varma and Stroh (2001) found that supervisors rated the performance of employees of the opposite gender more positively than those of their own gender. More recently, looking at this dynamic within Student Affairs, Tull (2004; 2006) did not find the expected patterns related to gender or race within the supervisory dyad when correlating the perception of synergistic supervision with job satisfaction and with turnover.

Another contextual issue within the supervisory relationship that has been minimally explored in the research is the well-being of the Student Affairs supervisor. Chessman (2015), in a national study of all Student Affairs staff, found that for all levels, including supervisors, what is most important to well-being is the "ability to have autonomy in their work, support from their supervisors, the opportunity to use their skills and advance, professional development and training, feedback from supervisors, and satisfaction with their overall workload" (p. 96). Marshall et al. (2016) established burnout as a reason for attrition for all Student Affairs staff. According to Stoves (2014), burnout in Student Affairs professionals manifests itself as

compassion fatigue, which is when a supervisor may be so impacted by the trauma she experiences that it becomes a part of her own worldview.

Synergistic supervisory model with new professionals.

Winston and Creamer (1998) reviewed the characteristics of what they labeled synergistic supervision as being “dual focus; joint effort; two-way communication; focus on competence; goals; systematic, ongoing process, and growth orientation” (p.30). The joint effort of supervisor and employee using the synergistic supervision approach assists the dyads in maximizing goal attainment for the university and for the employee’s personal development (Shupp & Arminio, 2012). Saunders et al. (2000) determined new Student Affairs professionals’ poor supervision to be based on the lack of professional development on supervisory techniques and the absence of an appropriate model of supervision in the Student Affairs field. The researchers explain that mid-level professionals, who are often responsible for the supervision of new professionals, need to be competent in personnel management and leadership so they can assist supervisees in personal and institutional goal setting. In response, they developed the Synergistic Supervision Scale (SSS), in accordance with the tenets of synergistic supervision theory, to measure “staff member perceptions of the following supervisor behaviors: concern about staff members’ personal and career development, equitable staff treatment, management that encourages productivity, cooperative problem solving with staff, systematic goal setting, and two-way communication and mutual feedback” (p.183).

New professionals identified support from their supervisor as necessary for success; in addition, the lack of support from the immediate supervisor was connected to burnout and high attrition (Cilente et al., 2006). Tull (2004; 2006) examined the relationship between the perceived level of synergistic supervision and intention to turnover for new professionals and found when the perception of synergistic supervision is higher, the intent to turnover is lower. Shupp and Arminio (2012) utilized research on synergistic supervision as a frame in conducting their qualitative, in-depth interviews with five new professionals. The themes of needs from

supervision that emerged were tied to synergistic supervision. The emergent themes of needs were “supervisor accessibility, meaningful interaction with supervisor, the proper utilization of formal evaluations, providing unique supervision, and the priority of professional development in the supervisory relationship” (Shupp & Arminio, 2012, p.164). Shupp and Arminio (2012) not only suggested the use of synergistic supervision as an appropriate approach for direct supervisors but broadened the approach to include having senior members of the Student Affairs division be supportive of the approach and evaluate supervisors on the implementation of its tenets. Jubert (2016) provided additional support for the use of synergistic supervision through the finding that “supervisors using the synergistic approach tend to manage new professionals who experience job satisfaction, professional development, and are likely to persist in the field” (p.84).

New Professionals’ Perceptions of Student Affairs Divisional Leadership: Impact on Intention to Leave

Various researchers have relayed the importance of an organizational approach to higher education, and therefore to Student Affairs (Buller, 2015; Eckel & Kezar, 2003; Manning, 2018). While the organizational level of analysis for understanding the attrition of new professionals has less research within the field, there is some research and theory that provides insight into organizational influences on the problem. To look at characteristics at this higher level of leadership, Tull (2004; 2006) used the size of the institution as an exploratory variable in her examination of the relationship of synergistic supervision with both job turnover and satisfaction. While the size of the institution was not found to be a factor in Tull’s study, other research demonstrated the importance of institutional factors such as public or private, size, and secular or non-secular when looking at the needs of new professionals (Cilente et al., 2006). Further, Cilente et al. (2006) identified institutional factors, navigating politics, and balancing professional and personal lives as sub-themes for new professional needs. Renn and Hodges (2007) also saw concerns for new professionals’ navigation of positional power struggles during their first year of

work; they called for graduate programs to emphasize how influence works in higher education organizations. Bender (1980) found that new professionals were dissatisfied with their level of involvement in divisional decision-making, which she reflected can impact general dissatisfaction. Senior Student Affairs officers highlighted that understanding the organizational culture of an institution is essential for new professionals but that they need guidance from the division on the culture (Cilente et al., 2006).

While Student Affairs organizational culture and leadership are provided as reasons for new professional attrition (Bender, 1980; Frank, 2013; Silver & Jakeman, 2014) and some Senior Student Affairs officers seem to value the importance of understanding organizational culture (Cilente et al., 2006), to date there is not considerable research at the organizational level to understand the issue of new professional attrition. Studying the individual level of the problem is important to making changes, but the changes will be futile without support and understanding of leadership in the division. To fully understand and impact the problem of attrition, we must examine the organizational culture and leadership of Student Affairs divisions, as they set the tone for understanding the culture of an institution and division as well as can have impact on attrition concerns.

Studies of the intention to turnover in organizations in general is prevalent in the literature and can provide insights into Student Affairs turnover. Bluedorn (1982) cites three well-studied models for turnover, which demonstrate through many research efforts that organizational commitment and intention to leave are related to actual turnover. Further, in his own model development for turnover, Bluedorn (1982) also found that intention to leave is an important factor in actually leaving. Somers (1995), in his study of hospital personnel, found that affective commitment, which is “an emotional attachment to an organization characterized by acceptance of organizational values and by willingness to remain with the organization” (p. 49) was the sole predictor of turnover. Continuance commitment, the perception of sunk costs a person has in the organization, and normative commitment, the perception of duty to support the

organization, were not significant variables in explaining turnover. Shih-Tse Wang (2014) found that affective and normative commitment had negative relationships with employee emotional exhaustion and turnover intention. Further, emotional exhaustion was found to be “a vital indicator of turnover intention” (Shih-Tse Wang, 2014, p. 326).

Several recent studies, outside of Student Affairs and higher education, have reviewed the impact of leadership style on turnover. Specifically, two research studies examined leader-member exchange theory (LMX) and turnover. Since the current study examines the perceived supervisory style as a potential influence on attrition, it is important to understand how LMX relational leadership theory leads to turnover. LMX theory examines the relationship of a leader with her followers and the quality of the exchanges that take place between them (Maslyn & Uhl-Bien, 2001). Gerstner and Day (1997), in a meta-analysis of LMX theory, found a significant, negative relationship between LMX quality and turnover intentions. LMX quality also was associated with decreasing turnover intentions of college seniors entering their first employment (Zheng et al., 2016). Examination of frontline bank employees demonstrated that the organization having servant leaders and customer orientation reduced burnout and turnover intentions (Babakus, Yavas, & Ashill, 2011). Yavas, Jha, and Babakus (2015) found servant leadership and service technology in the banking industry led to satisfaction and ultimately led to lower turnover intention. In a study of salespeople, Jaramillo, Grisaffe, Chonko, and Roberts (2009) demonstrated that servant leadership through a model involving mediating and moderating effects of ethical level, organizational commitment, and person-organizational fit led to lower turnover intentions. Tse, Huang, and Lam (2013) discovered that for employees of a telecommunications company affective commitment “mediated the link between transformational leadership and turnover intention” (p.763).

While leadership style as an organizational element is not well studied in higher education or Student Affairs, Samad, Reaburn, Davis, and Ahmed (2015), called for more research in how leadership style, well-being of employees, and organizational outcomes such as

turnover intention interact in a higher education setting. With the ties that the research has demonstrated between organizational leadership and turnover, it is key to explore this concept further as it relates to the concern of Student Affairs' attrition.

Theoretical Framework

In the same way that the current study has research questions on three levels: individual, direct supervisor, and organization, the theoretical framework also follows these three levels. The examination of new professionals' attitudes impact on attrition is built from Erikson's and Chickering's psychosocial identity development. The understanding of the new-professional-supervisory dyad and its impact on attrition is framed through the lens of the LMX theory. And the understanding of the organizational level in the problem of new professional attrition is seen through the servant leadership lens. Each of these levels and their theoretical frame will be explored next.

Erikson, Chickering, and psychosocial identity development.

As can be seen in the demographics of new professionals in the field, most are in young adulthood, majority in their 20's, many of whom went straight into a master's program after completing their undergraduate degrees (Renn & Jessup-Anger, 2008). Erik Erikson, in his study of the human lifespan, labeled this first stage of adulthood, known as the "intimacy versus isolation," a psychosocial "turning point". In this stage, an adult is working on resolving the development of relationships with others, which include intimate, friendship, and community relationships (Evans et al., 2010).

In thinking about the psychosocial identity of college students, Arthur Chickering utilized seven vectors to describe this growth. The vectors include developing competence, managing emotions, moving through autonomy toward interdependence, developing mature interpersonal relationships, establishing identity, developing purpose, and developing integrity. The first, third, and sixth vectors inform the current study. Developing competence, the first vector, focuses on gaining knowledge and skills related to subjects (intellectual competence), related to the body and

wellness (physical competence), and communication, working with others, and leading (interpersonal competence). The third vector, moving through autonomy toward interdependence, has three phases, including emotional independence (not needing others' reassurance), instrumental independence (self-direction, problem-solving), and interdependence (connection to others). Developing purpose, the sixth vector, occurs when one has clear vocational, personal, and interpersonal commitments. (Evans et al., 2010).

The vectors are not meant to be linear, as Chickering states that a person may pass through a vector and then re-visit the same vector, in a different area of life at a later time. Specifically, Chickering (as cited in Evans et al., 2010) noted that

students move through these vectors at different rates, that students may deal with issues from more than one vector at the same time, that vectors can interact with each other, and that students often find themselves reexamining issues associated with vectors they had previously worked through. (Evans et al., 2010, p. 66)

While Chickering examined development during the college years, his recognition that people can revisit these vectors provides the open door that this developmental framework could apply to young adulthood as well, particularly young adults in their 20's who are returning to college as a new professional.

As the research on new professionals has demonstrated, the importance of relationships, especially with supervisors, is a key part of their experience in the field of Student Affairs (Marshall et al., 2016; Renn & Hodges, 2007; Tull, 2006; Tull et al., 2009). In fact, as previously highlighted, Collins (2009), in emphasizing the need for socialization of new professionals in the field, pointed out that during this time in life, all relationships are developing personally and professionally; if the new professional is helped with developing relationships at work, then all the rest will become easier. While the importance of relationship is evident in Erikson's stage of development for early adulthood, it can also be found in several of Chickering's vectors in this new context as a new professional in the field. For example, Chickering's first vector could be

applied to a new professional developing interpersonal competence with supervisors, leaders, and colleagues. The third vector may have new professionals working on emotional and instrumental independence to allow them to have more confidence in their problem-solving abilities without reassurance from others. New professionals would then be free to re-conquer Chickering's sixth vector of developing purpose, allowing them to develop clearly their vocation in the field of Student Affairs.

Leader-member exchange theory in the supervisory dyad.

Continuing the focus on relationships with the new professional in Student Affairs, it is important to explore the supervisory dyad, which can be viewed through the lens of LMX theory. The relational school became a new focus in leadership research beginning in the 1970's with the Vertical Dyad Linkage (VDL) theory that further developed into the LMX theory (Day & Antonakis, 2012). Based out of social exchange, reciprocity, and role theory (Jha & Jha, 2013), the focus of LMX is the development and continued maintenance of the relationship of the leader with her followers.

The new interest in the relationship between leader and follower took the research away from a leader-centric perspective to an investigation of other levels in the leadership process. Specifically, Graen and Uhl-Bien (1995) describe the domains of leadership as being on three levels including the leader, the follower, and the relationship between them. Within the relationship domain, the researchers describe leadership as an entity creating "trust, respect, and mutual obligation that generates influence between parties" (Graen & Uhl-Bien, 1995, p.224). The dyadic relationship of the leader and follower changes over time (Jha & Jha, 2013) based on the quality of the exchanges that take place between them (Maslyn & Uhl-Bien, 2001). Further research by Liden and Maslyn (1998) provided three dimensions for LMX relationships, which included contribution, affect, and loyalty.

In a meta-analysis, Dulebohn, Bommer, Liden, Brouer, and Ferris (2012), found that interpersonal relationship characteristics such as perceived similarity, affect, ingratiation, and

leader trust of the follower are all significantly related to LMX quality. Specifically, high-quality relationships have respect, loyalty, and trust as predictors while low-quality relationships are predicted by higher formality, contractual natures, and a distance between leader and follower. High LMX quality is referred to as the “in-group” relationship and low LMX is considered an “out-group” relationship (Jha & Jha, 2013). In summary of the research on LMX Uhl-Bien, Maslyn, and Ospina (2012) conclude that “effective leadership is that in which leaders and followers have strong, partnership relationships” (p.304).

LMX has been a framework used to study supervision for many years. It has been used to understand abusive supervisory relationships (Haggard & Park, 2018; Xu, Huang, Lam, & Miao, 2012), performance evaluations (Varma & Stroh, 2001), leader humor (Pundt & Hermann, 2015), personality (Harris, Harris, & Eplion, 2007), and burnout (Thomas & Lankau, 2009). Most notable for the current study, Gerstner and Day (1997), in a meta-analysis of LMX theory, found a significant, negative relationship between LMX quality and turnover intentions.

Synergistic supervision is the model that has been suggested for use with new Student Affairs professionals. Winston and Creamer (1998) described this as a supervisory relationship that contains “dual focus; joint effort; two-way communication; focus on competence; goals; systematic, ongoing process, and growth orientation” (p.30). These characteristics describe the “strong, partnership relationships” (Uhl-Bien, Maslyn, & Ospina, 2012, p.304) that should be found in a supervisory relationship with high LMX quality. Further, Lane (2010), in his study of mid-level professionals in Student Affairs, found a significant, positive relationship between the social exchange factors of LMX and synergistic supervision. Therefore, thinking about the current study’s supervision of new professionals in Student Affairs through this lens is appropriate.

Servant leadership in the Student Affairs division.

In addition to relationships, research has demonstrated that feeling valued and supported by the leadership in the Student Affairs division is important for retention (Buchanan, 2012;

Frank, 2013; Rosser, 2004; Tull et al., 2009). Many of the characteristics of servant leadership, as developed by Spears (2004) after a full review of Greenleaf's work, connect to the needs of Student Affairs' new professionals to feel valued and supported by leaders. In fact, according to Letizia (2018), Greenleaf, in his creation of servant leadership, "did believe that higher education institutions had great potential to help foster the ideas of servant leadership" (p.10). "At its core, servant-leadership is a long-term, transformational approach to life and work—in essence, a way of being—that has the potential for creating positive change..." (Spears, 2004, p.8). According to Harris, Hinds, Manansingh, Rubino, and Morote (2016), Greenleaf believed the connection between employee job satisfaction and organizational success was important for leaders to understand. The specific characteristics found in servant leaders include listening, empathy, healing, awareness, persuasion, conceptualization, foresight, stewardship, commitment to the growth of people, and building community (Spears, 2004). According to Ragaisis (2018),

servant leadership is based on the principle of bringing out the best in followers... [After gaining an understanding of followers,] a servant leader can use power and inspire trust to assist in the development...of followers, building confidence, feedback, and resources for growth. (p.41)

Servant leadership has been studied in a higher education setting. Qualitatively, Schuh (2002) found, in interviews with Chief Student Affairs Officers with 30 or more years of experience in the field, the qualities of servant leadership were present. A moderate, positive correlation was found between servant leadership and faculty job satisfaction (Ragaisis, 2018). Burch et al. (2015), examining a Christian university where servant leadership is a focus, found that there was agreement between the perception of followers and leaders on their leaders' servant attributes but less on their servant leaders' practices. Intention to stay in their jobs at faith-based higher education institutions served as a moderator between job satisfaction and servant leadership (Harris et al., 2016). Specifically, "intention to stay predicted 33% of the variance of

job satisfaction; 54% of the variance of intention to stay is predicted by dimensions of servant leadership practices” (Harris et al., 2016, p.27).

The needs of new professionals at an organizational level match the servant leadership approach. This match, coupled with some preliminary connections between job satisfaction, intention to stay in a job, and servant leadership practices, provides a solid foundation for viewing the problem of Student Affairs attrition at the organizational level.

Current Study

This section has discussed the review of the literature and the theoretical underpinnings of the individual, supervisory, and organizational levels to understanding new professional attrition in Student Affairs. Next, the methods that were implemented to examine the current research question related to this attrition are discussed.

Chapter Three: Methods

As previously demonstrated, the reasons for new professional attrition in Student Affairs remains an area for exploration. The impact of new professional attrition provides the need to delve deeper into this concern from the individual, supervisory, and divisional leadership levels of the field. The purpose of this study was to explore new Student Affairs professionals' intent to stay in the field considering perceptions of work-related quality of life, synergistic supervision by their direct supervisor, and servant leadership by those overseeing their division. The current study examined whether these constructs can significantly predict the intention of the new professional to stay in or leave the field. This chapter focuses on the research design and analysis methods employed for this study. The specific research question guiding the study is:

RQ: What relationships do new Student Affairs professionals' perceptions of work-related quality of life, synergistic supervision by their direct supervisor, and executive servant leadership by divisional leaders have with their intention to remain in or leave the field?

Sampling Procedure

A purposive sample of new professionals, defined as having five years or less of experience in the Student Affairs field, from two national organizations, NASPA and ACPA, is the focus of this study. Both national organizations provide guidance, professional development, and connections for those working in the field of Student Affairs. These organizations classify their membership in categories based upon number of years in the field; one of their categories is new professional (also called entry-level), defined as having five or fewer years in the field of Student Affairs. The researcher worked with both national organizations to send electronic surveys via email to members of the organizations defined as a new professional.

Before deploying any surveys, the researcher obtained approval from James Madison University's Institutional Review Board (IRB) to conduct this study. After obtaining approval from IRB and both national organizations, the electronic surveys created in Qualtrics software

were sent via email to new professionals in each national organization along with an explanation of the study, their anonymous involvement, and the instruments. ACPA ran a query of their current membership for those defined as new professionals (entry-level) in the Student Affairs field ($N=1786$) as of January 20, 2020 who were sent the survey directly by the organization. The researcher provided the recruitment email (see Appendix A), informed consent letter, and link to the survey to ACPA, who sent two emails to their membership who met the criteria of being a new professional in Student Affairs. The emails sent to the new professionals were an original email request to participate and then one reminder to those who had not yet participated about two weeks later.

For NASPA, the recipients were members of the New Professionals and Graduate Students Knowledge Community as of January 20, 2020 who were sent the survey directly by a Co-Chair of the committee as an open link on the membership-only Listserv ($N = 1329$). The researcher provided the recruitment email (see Appendix B), informed consent letter, and link to the survey to the Co-Chair of the committee, who sent two emails to their membership. The emails sent to the New Professionals and Graduate Students Knowledge Community were an original email request to participate and then one reminder to those who had not yet participated about two weeks later.

Within the emailed survey, each participant received an informed consent form at the beginning, which notified them of the very low-level risks involved in this survey and allowed them to accept those risks prior to answering any questions. Participants were able to stop participation in the survey at any time. To prevent duplicate surveys, two strategies were implemented. First, the researcher made potential participants aware that they may receive the survey twice if they are a member of both NASPA and ACPA and requested that they complete the survey only once. Secondly, at the end of the survey, the researcher included a question that asked participants to indicate if they have taken the survey previously. Two participants

answered this question saying they had previously taken the survey; those two surveys were removed from the dataset prior to analysis.

The survey was deployed in mid-January 2020 to new professionals in both NASPA and ACPA. The survey yielded a 12% response rate with 49% usable surveys for all analyses performed. This response rate was considered acceptable based on research done by Fossnacht, Sarraf, Howe, and Peck (2017), which demonstrated that lower response rates can provide unbiased population estimates. Specifically, Fossnacht et al. (2017), using simulated lower response rates to the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) survey, found that the correlation between the means of the simulated lower response estimate (10%) and the full sample estimate were .80 or higher. The full survey used for the current study, as deployed, is in Appendix C.

Sample

The purposive sample consisted of 185 individuals whose surveys were usable in all analyses. The participant sample demonstrated diversity in individual and institutional characteristics. Table 1 presents the individual and institutional characteristics of these participants in the format in which they were operationalized for the analyses performed, which will be described later. For a more comprehensive view of the participant characteristics, please see Appendix D.

Table 1. *Participant Sample's Characteristics by New Professionals' Intent to Stay or Leave the Field of Student Affairs*

New Professional Characteristic	Total %	Intention	
		Stay in Field	Leave Field
Gender:			
Female	66.5	102	21
Male	26.5	41	8
Other	7.0	11	2
Sexual Orientation:			

Heterosexual	60.5	91	21
LGBTQ+	39.5	63	10
<i>Race/Ethnicity:</i>			
White/Caucasian	65.4	105	16
Non-White	34.6	49	15
<i>Age:</i>			
25 or younger	41.1	67	9
26-29	43.2	64	16
30-37	13.5	19	6
38 or older	2.2	4	0
<i>Education Level:</i>			
Master's/Doctorate	75.1	116	23
AA/Bachelors	24.9	38	8
<i>Institution's Geography:</i>			
Northeast	29.7	43	12
South, West, Midwest, Alaska/Hawaii	70.3	111	19
<i>Size of Institution:</i>			
0-3000	13.5	20	5
3001-8000	15.7	24	5
8001-15000	15.7	26	3
15001-25000	23.2	31	12
25001 or more	31.9	53	6
<i>Type of Institution:</i>			
Private (including religious affiliated)	31.4	44	14
Public (including community college)	68.6	110	17
<i>Functional Area:</i>			
Residence Life	26.5	43	6

Career/Academic Services	20.0	34	3
Student Activities or Services	53.5	77	22
<i>Reported Hours Worked Per Week:</i>			
Work more than 40 hours per week	42.2	60	18
Work 40 or less hours per week	57.8	94	13

N=185

Variables

The deployed Qualtrics survey contained demographic questions related to the participants themselves and the institution in which they are a new professional in Student Affairs, some of which can be seen in Table 1 and Appendix D. The individual level demographics included questions about gender (Female, Male, Transgender, Prefer not to answer; Other, please specify), age (25 or younger; 26-29; 30-37; 38 or older), race/ethnicity (American Indian or Alaskan Native; Asian or Pacific Islander; Black or African American; Hispanic or Latino/Latina; White/Caucasian; Prefer not to answer; Other, please specify), sexual orientation (Bisexual; Gay; Heterosexual; Lesbian; Queer; Prefer not to answer; Another sexual orientation, please specify), highest level of education attained (High School diploma or equivalent; AA; Bachelor's; Master's; Doctorate), what functional area in Student Affairs they currently work within (Residence Life; Career Development; Academic Advising; Student Health; Disability Services; Student Conduct; Student Programming; Fraternity & Sorority Life; Orientation; Multicultural Center; Other, please specify), amount of hours worked per week, and number of years in Student Affairs. The institutional level demographics included its geographic region (Northeast; Midwest; South; West; Alaska/Hawaii; I work outside of the United States), size of the institution (0—3000; 3001-8000; 8001-15000; 15001-25000; 25001 or more), and type of institution (Public, 4-year, no affiliation; Private, 4-year, no affiliation; Religious Affiliated; For Profit; Community College; Other). These demographic variables served as controls in the study.

Participants were also asked to self-report whether or not they have worked in another career field other than Student Affairs (yes; no), how long they have worked in their current Student Affairs position (< 1 year; 1 year; 2 years; 3 years; 4 years; 5 years; > 5 years), and their current employment and/or education status [full-time graduate student (with or without a graduate employment position); full-time Student Affairs employee; full-time Student Affairs employee and part-time graduate student; part-time Student Affairs employee and part-time graduate student; other, please specify].

The dependent variable in this study is whether a new professional intends to persist in the field of Student Affairs. It was asked in the following way: “At this time, do you intend to stay in or leave the field of Student Affairs?” Participants were able to answer, “Intend to stay in the field” (coded as “0”) or “Intend to leave the field” (coded as “1”). The current study had 154 participants who stated they intend to stay in the field while 31 stated they intend to leave. The independent variables are new professionals’ perceptions of work-related quality of life, synergistic supervision by their direct supervisor, and executive servant leadership by divisional leaders as measured by the instruments that follow.

Instrumentation

Participants in this study took three quantitative measures including the Work-Related Quality of Life (WRQoL), Synergistic Supervision Scale (SSS), and Executive Servant Leadership Scale (ESLS) in addition to responding to the demographic variables.

Work-related quality of life (WRQoL).

The Work-Related Quality of Life scale, constructed by Van Laar, Edwards, and Easton (2007), is a 24-item instrument designed in the United Kingdom to meet the need of reliably measuring the quality of working life of healthcare workers. Their development of the tool using this population demonstrated an overall Alpha coefficient of .91 and solid reliability coefficients for each of the six sub-scales ranging from .76 to .91 (Van Laar et al., 2007). The current study found an overall Alpha coefficient of .924 for WRQoL. Twenty-three of the items make up the

sub-scales that include Job and Career Satisfaction (JCS), General Well-Being (GWB), Home-Work Interface (HWI), Stress at Work (SAW), Control at Work (CAW), and Working Conditions (WCS).

The JCS sub-scale uses six items to measure the level to which a respondent feels “the workplace provides...sense of achievement, high self-esteem and fulfillment of potential” (Easton & Van Laar, 2012, p.15). The GWB sub-scale uses six items to measure “the extent to which an individual feels good or content with their life as a whole” (Easton & Van Laar, 2012, p.13). The HWI sub-scale uses three items and measures “that the organization understands and tries to help...with pressures outside of work” (Easton & Van Laar, 2012, p.14). The SAW sub-scale uses two items to measure “the extent to which an individual perceives they have excessive pressures and/or feel stressed at work” (Easton & Van Laar, 2012, p.19). The CAW sub-scale uses three items to measure “the level at which an employee feels they can exercise what they consider to be an appropriate level of control within their work environment” (Easton & Van Laar, 2012, p.16). Lastly, the WCS sub-scale uses three items to measure “the extent to which the employee is satisfied with the fundamental resources, working conditions and security necessary to do their job effectively” (Easton & Van Laar, 2012, p.17). The overall quality of work-life is measured using the 24th item of the survey (Chessman, 2015). Responses to the items are on a five-point Likert scale ranging from Strongly Disagree to Strongly Agree. Three of the questions are scored in reverse.

While the scale was created for and within the United Kingdom’s healthcare environment, the researchers felt the scale could be applied to other settings. Edwards, Van Laar, Easton, and Kinsman (2009) validated the use of the instrument in the higher education context of the United Kingdom. In this population, they found an overall Cronbach’s alpha, excluding the overall quality of life question, to be .94. The sub-scales produced reliability coefficients ranging from .72 to .90. Chessman (2015), in an American higher education study, found sub-scale

reliabilities ranging from .77 to .88. The current study produced solid Cronbach's alphas for the sub-scales: JCS = .756; HWI = .773; SAW = .783; CAW = .766; WCS = .754; GWB = .856.

The WRQoL was deployed in the current study. The 24-item version of the WRQoL survey to be used in the present study, along with information regarding its analysis and factors, is in Appendix E.

Synergistic supervision scale (SSS).

The Synergistic Supervision Scale (SSS) was constructed by Saunders et al. (2000) to measure what had been hailed as an appropriate supervisory approach for professionals in Student Affairs (Winston & Creamer, 1997). According to Saunders et al. (2000), the scale "measures the extent to which staff perceive that their supervisor focuses on the twin areas of advancement of the institutional mission and goals and the personal and professional advancement of individual staff members" (p.181). A 22-item scale was constructed specifically to measure perceptions of synergistic supervision in the following six supervisor behaviors: concern about staff members' personal and career development; equitable staff treatment; management that encourages productivity; cooperative problem solving with staff; systematic goal setting; and two-way communication and mutual feedback. The SSS utilizes a 5-point Likert scale (1 = "never or almost never" to 5 = "always or almost always"), with the sum of the items reflecting the overall level of perceived synergistic supervision by the supervisee (Saunders et al., 2000).

In development, Saunders et al. (2000) provided evidence of internal consistency using a Cronbach alpha coefficient. The alpha coefficient of .94 for the total scale demonstrated this internal consistency and item correlations ranged from .44 to .75. The authors further tested the instrument for concurrent validity by correlating the scores on the survey to the scores on the Index of Organizational Reaction (IOR) scale and the Organizational Commitment Questionnaire (OCQ) scale. As expected, a positive correlation was found between the SSS and the IOR (.91) and between the SSS and the OCQ (.64).

The SSS has been examined in further studies by researchers in Student Affairs. Within these studies, researchers have continued to indicate internal consistency of the SSS with similar Cronbach alpha coefficients of .936 (Morgan, 2015) and .94 (Pittman & Foubert, 2016). The current study found an overall Alpha coefficient of .910 for SSS. Lane (2010) also has examined four subscales of the SSS including four items for Decision-making Inclusiveness, six items for Exhibiting Interest in Personal/Professional Development, six items for Fair and Equitable Treatment of Others, and five items for Exhibiting Support for Divisional Work Unit. Scores from all four subscales were also shown to be reliable with Cronbach alpha coefficients ranging from .813 to .843.

The full SSS used in the present study, along with information regarding its analysis, is in Appendix F.

Executive servant leadership scale (ESLS).

The Executive Servant Leadership Scale (ESLS) was developed by Reed, Vidaver-Cohen, and Colwell (2011) as the first scale to measure servant leadership beyond the direct supervision level. The ESLS was developed using scores from participants who were asked to think about their top executives of their companies, which were not specified in one field of work. The researchers' CFA revealed that executive servant leadership had five factors, including interpersonal support, building community, altruism, egalitarianism, and moral integrity, whose Cronbach's alphas ranged from .90 to .95. The final items chosen for the unidimensional measure of executive servant leadership had standardized item loadings ranging from .735 to .912.

The current study explored executive servant leadership specifically in Student Affairs, expanding the work done on this instrument. The current study found an overall Alpha coefficient of .966 for ESLS. The 25-item, four-point response scale survey along with information regarding its analysis is in Appendix G. The prompt was slightly adjusted for use with the Student Affairs new professional population.

Data Analysis

Prior to working with the data, it was screened in three ways. First, as previously mentioned, two participants were removed from the study because they stated they had taken the survey more than once. Secondly, since the study criteria required new professionals to be defined as having five years or less in the field of Student Affairs, those participants who stated they had over five years of experience in the field were eliminated from the study; there were thirty participants removed from the study for this reason. Other participants were removed from the study using listwise deletion; therefore, if the participant did not answer all study questions, they were not included in the analyses. After screening the data, there were 185 participants included in the full study.

Before conducting analyses, descriptive statistics and correlations were examined for the three instruments representing the study variables of interest (WRQoL, SSS, ESLS). Preliminary analyses were conducted to see how the two groups (intention to remain in or leave the field of Student Affairs) responded to the study variables of interest. First, an independent *t*-test was conducted to compare the means the two groups on their work-related quality of life. Second, an independent *t*-test compared the means of the two groups on their perceived synergistic supervision by their direct supervisor. Lastly, an independent *t*-test compared the means of the two groups on their perception of executive servant leadership by Student Affairs divisional leaders. In each of the independent *t*-test analyses, the assumptions of normality of the dependent variable and homogeneity of variance were examined and satisfied prior to running the independent *t*-test.

The main research question for the study was analyzed using logistic regression with five models. In order to create parsimonious models, the control variables were coded in the following ways: gender (female = reference group; male; other = transgender/prefer not to answer/other); sexual orientation (heterosexual = reference group; LGBTQ); race/ethnicity (white = reference group; non-white = Black or African American; Hispanic or Latino/Latina; Asian or

Pacific Islander; prefer not to answer; biracial; biracial, Asian/White; Black and Asian; Black/Latinx; Haitian American; Latinx/Hispanic; Middle Eastern; Arab/Swana/Mena; mixed race; multiracial; multi, Asian/Black/White; multiracial, Black/White); highest education level (master's/doctorate = reference group; AA/bachelor's); geography of institution (Northeast = reference group; other = Midwest; South; West; Alaska/Hawaii); institution type (public/community college = reference group; private/religious affiliated); functional area [residence life = reference group; career/academic services (including registrar); student activities or services = student programming/student health/disability services/student conduct/fraternity & sorority life; orientation; multicultural/diversity programming; multicultural center; Dean of Students office/advancement/administration/assessment/continuing education/international education/leadership education/student success/university recreation/Title IX]; hours worked per week (forty hours or less per week = reference group; more than forty hours per week).

Typically, the reference group was chosen based on it having the highest number of participants (e.g. gender, race/ethnicity, sexual orientation). Age was entered as ordinal categorical data based on the response options (1 = 25<, 2 = 26-29, 3 = 30-37, 4 = 38+) as was institutional size as a function of total student population (1 = 0-3000, 2 = 3001-8000, 3 = 8001-15000, 4 = 15001-25000, 5 = 25001+). For age and institutional size, a one unit increase indicates a movement from one category to the next, interpreted using these categorical definitions. Most control variables were divided into two levels for the greatest parsimony. Since many Student Affairs positions require or prefer at least a master's degree, those with master's or doctorates were combined to serve as the reference group; new professionals with an AA or bachelor's as their highest degree earned comprised the group entered in the models. The geographical location of the institution variable had close to equal-sized groups but needed to be re-coded for parsimony; therefore, the Northeast, since it did have the highest number and since it has less rural environments than the other regions, was chosen as the reference group; all other regions were combined into one group and entered in the models. Institutional type was divided into public and private. Since

religiously affiliated schools are by design private, they were included in the private institution group. Since community colleges are by design public, they were included in the public institution group. Public institutions were the larger group, and therefore were treated as the reference group; the private institution group was entered in the models. Lastly, the functional area variable was divided into three main components of Student Affairs work: residence life; career/academic services; and student activities or services. Residence life was chosen as the reference group since it was the largest group in the original data before the researcher combined the remaining responses into the other two groups. Career/academic services and student activities or services were entered in the models.

Prior to conducting the logistic regression analyses, the data was examined for sparseness concerns. To do this, crosstabulations were examined to see the distribution of the continuous predictors (years in Student Affairs, work-related quality of life, synergistic supervision, executive servant leadership) across the two levels of remaining in or leaving the field. In addition, to examine the concern for multicollinearity, each of the continuous predictors was examined to determine the strength of their relationship with the other continuous predictors. In addition, several linear regressions were run rotating the continuous predictors in as the dependent variable to examine VIF and tolerance scores.

After all assumptions for logistic regression were met, the five models were conducted. Model 1 examined the relationship of the control variables with new professionals' intention to remain in or leave the field of Student Affairs. The following were entered in Model 1 as control variables: years in Student Affairs; institution size; age; report of working more than 40 hours per week; male gender; other gender; LGBTQ; non-white race/ethnicity; education level less than a master's degree; United States geographical location of institution other than Northeast; private institution; functional area of career/academic services; and functional area of student activities or services.

Model 2 isolated the relationship of new professionals' perceptions of work-related quality of life with attrition after controlling for individual characteristics (gender, age, race/ethnicity, sexual orientation, level of education attained, number of years in Student Affairs, hours worked per week, functional area) and institutional characteristics (size, geographic region, and type) in predicting whether a new professional intends to stay in or leave the field.

Model 3 isolated the relationship of new professionals' perceptions of synergistic supervision by their direct supervisor with attrition after controlling for individual characteristics (gender, age, race/ethnicity, sexual orientation, level of education attained, number of years in Student Affairs, hours worked per week, functional area) and institutional characteristics (size, geographic region, and type) in predicting whether a new professional intends to stay in or leave the field.

Model 4 isolated the relationship of new professionals' perceptions of executive servant leadership by Student Affairs divisional leaders with attrition after controlling for individual characteristics (gender, age, race/ethnicity, sexual orientation, level of education attained, number of years in Student Affairs, hours worked per week, functional area) and institutional characteristics (size, geographic region, and type) in predicting whether a new professional intends to stay in or leave the field.

Model 5 was conducted comparing the intercept only model to a model with all the control variables and the three predictors of interest in the study (new professionals' perceptions of work-related quality of life, synergistic supervision by direct supervisors, and executive servant leadership by Student Affairs divisional leaders) in it. It was hypothesized that all the predictors of interest in the study, in models two, three, four, and five, after controlling for individual and institutional characteristics, would be statistically significant in predicting the intentions of new professionals to remain in or leave the field.

On the advice of committee, sub-scale analyses were conducted for any multi-factor construct which achieved significance to more closely estimate the specific factors predicting

attrition of new professionals. Based on the results of the first five models, the six factor scores were obtained for the work-related quality of life measure. Prior to conducting the logistic regression analysis, the data for these factors and the control variables were examined for sparseness concerns. To do this, crosstabulations were examined to see the distribution of the continuous predictors (years in Student Affairs, JCS, HWI, SAW, CAW, WCS, GWB) across the two levels of remaining in or leaving the field. In addition, to examine the concern for multicollinearity, each of the continuous predictors was examined to determine the strength of their relationship with the other continuous predictors. In addition, several linear regressions were run rotating the continuous predictors in as the dependent variable to examine VIF and tolerance scores. After all assumptions for logistic regression were met, Model 6 was conducted comparing the intercept only model to a model with all the control variables and the six factors of WRQoL as predictors of interest (JCS, HWI, SAW, CAW, WCS, GWB).

Limitations

The results of this study should be interpreted with caution due to the limitations present. The generalizability of the study is low. While the researcher attempted to provide a national sample by utilizing new professionals who were members of national organizations in the field (ACPA; NASPA), this may have reduced the representativeness of the sample. First, those who are members of national organizations have the financial means to join, which may make the sample qualitatively different than the true population of new professionals. Secondly, while there were new professionals in the sample who do intend to leave the field, this number may have been lower than reality. Of the 185 participants examined in the study, only 31 of them (or 16.76%) stated they were intending to leave the field; previous studies (Marshall et al., 2016; Renn & Hodges, 2007) found that 42-60% of new professionals will leave the field within less than five years. Third, if a new professional intends to leave the field, they may not join a national organization, which may indicate this sample is not representative of the true population.

Additionally, motivation for participants to take the survey may have been a concern. For instance, new professionals who do intend to leave the field may have self-selected out of taking the study since they are no longer motivated to give back to field. They may not believe that their perspective will create change and therefore were not motivated to provide it in the survey. Participants may also have been motivated by fear into not participating in the survey. Even though the survey told participants their responses would be anonymous, some may still have feared that their responses to perceptions of their direct supervisors and divisional leaders may at some point be tied to them.

In addition, this study is the beginning of examining these study variables as predictors of retention of new professionals in the field and therefore requires replication. The study also demonstrates that while some of these predictors were found to be significant, there may be other variables not examined in this study that may add to our understanding of new professionals' intentions for remaining in or leaving the field. Further, due to the participant sample collected in the current study, several identity categories (e.g. race/ethnicity) needed to be collapsed for statistical power and modeling; future studies may be able to examine identity experiences with regards to new professional attrition in a more robust manner. Overall, there is clearly more work to be done in our efforts to fully understand the attrition of new professionals in Student Affairs.

Chapter Four: Findings

Before conducting analyses, descriptive statistics, reliability, and correlations were examined for the study variables of interest [Work-Related Quality of Life (WRQoL); Synergistic Supervision Scale (SSS); Executive Servant Leadership (ESLS)]. As can be seen in Table 2, each of the study variables reliably measured their construct, showed variance in participants' scores, and were significantly related to each other. While the three variables were significantly correlated, they were found not to be multicollinear, as will be described later.

Table 2. *Descriptive Statistics and Correlations among Study Variables*

	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>Range</i>	<i>Minimum</i>	<i>Maximum</i>	1	2
1. WRQoL ($\alpha = .924$)	84.15	14.66	70	46	116		
2. SSS ($\alpha = .910$)	72.18	16.83	77	23	100	.729*	
3. ESLS ($\alpha = .966$)	64.46	15.42	73	27	100	.581*	.423*

Notes: $N = 185$, $*p < .05$.

Preliminary analyses were conducted by employing independent t -tests with each of the study variables of interest (WRQoL, SSS, ESLS) as the dependent variable and intent to leave the field of Student Affairs as the grouping variable (see Table 3). All three variables demonstrated the required assumptions of normality and homogeneity of variance.

The first independent t -test showed that participants who intend to stay in the field reported, on average, statistically significantly higher perceived work-related quality of life than those who intend to leave the field, $t = 3.867$ (183), $p < .001$, $r^2 = .076$. The second independent t -test showed that participants who intend to stay in the field are not significantly different in their perceived synergistic supervision by their direct supervisor from those who intend to leave the field, $t = 1.675$ (183), $p = .096$, $r^2 = .015$. The third independent t -test showed that participants who intend to stay in the field are not significantly different in their perceived executive servant leadership of their divisional leaders than those who intend to leave the field, $t = 1.791$ (183), $p = .075$, $r^2 = .017$.

Table 3. Means, Standard Deviations, and Independent T-Tests for Three Study Variables by New Professionals' Intent to Stay or Leave the Field

Measure	Stay in Field		Leave Field		<i>t</i>	<i>r</i> ²
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>		
Work-Related Quality of Life (WRQoL)	85.95	14.63	75.19	11.27	3.867***	.076
Synergistic Supervision (SSS)	73.10	17.29	67.58	13.64	1.675	.015
Executive Servant Leadership (ESLS)	65.37	15.74	59.97	13.01	1.791	.017

*** $p < .001$; N (Intend to Stay) = 154; N (intend to leave) = 31

Logistic regression was employed to examine several prediction models. Prior to running the models, the control variables (individual characteristics: gender, age, race/ethnicity, sexual orientation, level of education attained, number of years in Student Affairs, hours worked per week, functional area; institutional characteristics: size, geographic region, type) and the three study variables (WRQoL, SSS, ESLS) were examined for issues of sparseness; given adequate coverage across the range of scores for both groups, there were no concerns found for this assumption of logistic regression. In addition, the continuous variables were examined for multicollinearity issues through examining the correlations (see Table 2), VIF, and Tolerance scores and no concerns were discovered. Having met these required assumptions, the logistic regression models were conducted.

For Model 1, all the control variables were entered in and compared with the null model. As expected, the control variable only model does not improve the ability to predict new professionals' intention to leave the field, $\chi^2 = 20.387$ ($p = .086$). The proportion of deviance accounted for by this model is low (see Table 8).

For Model 2, new professionals' perceptions of their work-related quality of life (WRQoL) was entered into the equation. As hypothesized, adding the variable of WRQoL into the equation significantly improves the ability to predict new professionals' intention to leave the field, $\chi^2 = 31.701$ ($p = .004$) as compared to the null model. The proportion of deviance accounted for by Model 2 is higher than Model 1 (see Table 8). The test of model deviance demonstrates

that Model 2 adequately predicts new professionals' intent to leave the field. WRQoL is shown to be a significant predictor after controlling for all the control variables, $Wald(1) = 10.213, p = .001$ (see Table 4). Further, for each one unit increase in WRQoL, the log odds of a new professional leaving the field decrease by .051, after controlling for the other variables in the model. For each one unit increase in WRQoL, the odds of a new professional leaving the field decreases by a factor of .950, after controlling for the other predictors. Therefore, holding all other predictors constant, the odds of a new professional leaving the field are, on average, 5% lower for each unit increase in WRQoL.

There were three other predictors in Model 2 that were closer to being statistically significant but were not under the $p < .05$ criterion (Working in Student Activities/Services; More than forty hours of work per week; Race/Ethnicity Non-White). Since Wald is known for being underpowered, these two predictors were regressed individually in a nested logistic regression with all the other predictors in the model. A new professional working in a Student Activities/Services as compared to working in Residence Life, when added to the other variables in Model 2 was not found to explain a significant amount of deviance in the model, $\chi^2 = 3.724$ ($p = .054$). A new professional working more than forty hours per week as compared with those working forty or less hours per week was not found to explain a significant amount of deviance in the model, $\chi^2 = 3.035$ ($p = .081$). A new professional whose race/ethnicity is non-white as compared with those who identify as white was not found to explain a significant amount of deviance in the model, $\chi^2 = 3.288$ ($p = .070$).

Table 4. *Logistic Regression Coefficients for Model 2*

	B (SE)	Wald	Exp(B)	95% CI Lower Exp(B)	95% CI Upper Exp(B)
Number Years in SA	-0.048 (.193)	.062	.953	.653	1.391
Institution Size	.058 (.185)	.097	1.059	.738	1.521
Age	.145 (.344)	.178	1.156	.589	2.271
Work > 40 Hrs./Week	.915 (.534)	2.932	2.497	.876	7.119
Gender: Male	.100 (.572)	.030	1.105	.360	3.388

Gender: Other	-.837 (.986)	.721	.433	.063	2.990
Sexual Orientation: LGBTQ	-.592 (.521)	1.290	.553	.199	1.537
Race/Ethnicity: Non-White	.814 (.466)	3.054	2.256	.906	5.620
Education Level (AA/Bachelors)	.457 (.592)	.596	1.579	.495	5.035
Institution Geography (not NE)	-.422 (.498)	.719	.656	.247	1.740
Private Institution	.865 (.544)	2.523	2.374	.817	6.900
Functional Area: Career/Acad.	-.237 (.883)	.072	.789	.140	4.450
Functional Area: Student Activities or Services	1.038 (.567)	3.352	2.823	.929	8.577
WRQoL	-.051 (.016)	10.213*	.950	.921	.980
Constant	.919 (1.715)	.287	2.506		

Notes: $N = 185$; $*p < .05$

For Model 3, new professionals' perceptions of synergistic supervision (SSS) being used by their direct supervisors was entered in the equation. Against what was hypothesized, adding the variable of SSS into the equation does not significantly improve the ability to predict new professionals' intention to leave the field, $\chi^2 = 22.516$ ($p = .069$) as compared to the null model. The proportion of deviance accounted for by this model can be seen in Table 8. Further, when examining the sole addition of SSS as a predictor to Model 1 (see Table 5), it is not significant in predicting new professionals' intent to leave the field, $Wald(1) = 2.146$ ($p = .143$). Therefore, the study variable SSS, while hypothesized to be a significant predictor in retention of new professionals, did not demonstrate that in the study. Interestingly, this model showed that a new professional working more than forty hours per week as compared with those working forty or less hours per week was found to be significant in predicting new professionals' intent to leave the field, $Wald(1) = 5.222$ ($p = .022$).

There were two other predictors in Model 3 that were closer to being statistically significant but were not under the $p < .05$ criterion (Working in Student Activities/Services; Race/Ethnicity Non-White). Since Wald is known for being underpowered, these two predictors were regressed individually in a nested logistic regression with all the other predictors in the

model. A new professional working in a Student Activities/Services as compared to working in Residence Life, when added to the other variables in Model 3, was not found to explain a significant amount of deviance in the model, $\chi^2 = 3.314$ ($p = .069$). A new professional whose race/ethnicity is non-white as compared with those who identify as white, when added to the other variables in Model 3, was not found to explain a significant amount of deviance in the model, $\chi^2 = 3.132$ ($p = .077$).

Table 5. *Logistic Regression Coefficients for Model 3*

	B (SE)	Wald	Exp(B)	95% CI Lower Exp(B)	95% CI Upper Exp(B)
Number Years in SA	-0.075 (.185)	.166	.927	.645	1.334
Institution Size	.041 (.179)	.052	1.042	.733	1.481
Age	.144 (.326)	.196	1.155	.610	2.188
Work > 40 Hrs./Week	1.168 (.511)	5.222*	3.217	1.181	8.763
Gender: Male	.283 (.542)	.272	1.327	.459	3.839
Gender: Other	-.370 (.919)	.163	.690	.114	4.178
Sexual Orientation: LGBTQ	-.599 (.513)	1.362	.549	.201	1.502
Race/Ethnicity: Non-White	.801 (.452)	3.140	2.227	.919	5.401
Education Level (AA/Bachelors)	.573 (.573)	1.001	1.773	.577	5.448
Institution Geography (not NE)	-.562 (.484)	1.346	.570	.221	1.473
Private Institution	.766 (.521)	2.163	2.152	.775	5.973
Functional Area: Career/Acad.	-.280 (.849)	.109	.756	.143	3.990
Functional Area: Student Activities or Services	.931 (.543)	2.942	2.537	.876	7.352
SSS	-.018 (.012)	2.146	.982	.958	1.006
Constant	-1.783 (1.54)	1.348	.168		

Notes: $N = 185$; * $p < .05$

For Model 4, new professionals' perceptions of executive servant leadership by the leaders in their division (ESLS) was entered in the equation. As hypothesized, adding the variable of ESLS into the equation significantly improves the ability to predict new professionals' intention to leave the field, $\chi^2 = 23.767$ ($p = .049$) as compared to the null model. The proportion of deviance accounted for by this model can be seen in Table 8. The test of model deviance

demonstrates that Model 4 adequately predicts new professionals' intent to leave the field. However, when examining the sole addition of ESLS as a predictor to Model 1, it is not significant in predicting new professionals' intent to leave the field, $\chi^2 = 3.310$ ($p = .069$). Since Wald is known for being underpowered, and ESLS was close to meeting the significance level, ESLS was regressed individually in a nested logistic regression with all the other predictors in the model. ESLS was still found not to be significant in predicting new professionals' intent to leave the field, $Wald (1) = 3.310$ ($p = .066$) after controlling for the other variables in the model. Therefore, the study variable ESLS, while hypothesized to be a significant predictor in the attrition of new professionals, did not demonstrate that in the study. Interestingly, this model (see Table 6) showed that a new professional working more than forty hours per week as compared with those working forty or less hours per week was found to be significant in predicting new professionals' intent to leave the field, $Wald (1) = 5.569$ ($p = .018$) after controlling for the other variables in the model.

There were two other predictors in Model 4 that were closer to being statistically significant but were not under the $p < .05$ criterion (Working in Student Activities/Services; Race/Ethnicity Non-White). Since Wald is known for being underpowered, these two predictors were regressed individually in a nested logistic regression with all the other predictors in the model. A new professional working in a Student Activities/Services as compared to working in Residence Life, when added to the other variables in Model 4, was not found to explain a significant amount of deviance in the model, $\chi^2 = 3.544$ ($p = .060$). A new professional whose race/ethnicity is non-white as compared with those who identify as white, when added to the other variables in the model, was not found to explain a significant amount of deviance in the model, $\chi^2 = 3.553$ ($p = .059$).

Table 6. *Logistic Regression Coefficients for Model 4*

B (SE)	Wald	Exp(B)	95% CI	95% CI
			Lower	Upper

				Exp(B)	Exp(B)
Number Years in SA	-0.150 (.187)	.649	.860	.597	1.241
Institution Size	-.003 (.183)	.000	.997	.697	1.428
Age	.119 (.321)	.137	1.126	.601	2.110
Work > 40 Hrs./Week	1.215 (.515)	5.569*	3.370	1.229	9.243
Gender: Male	.219 (.545)	.161	1.245	.428	3.622
Gender: Other	-.285 (.927)	.095	.752	.122	4.622
Sexual Orientation: LGBTQ	-.754 (.524)	2.075	.470	.169	1.313
Race/Ethnicity: Non- White	.847 (.450)	3.551	2.334	.967	5.634
Education Level (AA/Bachelors)	.543 (.574)	.895	1.721	.559	5.303
Institution Geography (not NE)	-.592 (.484)	1.498	.553	.214	1.427
Private Institution	.627 (.530)	1.398	1.871	.662	5.287
Functional Area: Career/Acad.	-.290 (.853)	.116	.748	.141	3.977
Functional Area: Student Activities or Services	.979 (.554)	3.129	2.663	.900	7.883
ESLS	-.027 (.015)	3.310	.973	.945	1.002
Constant	-.889 (1.735)	.262	.411		

Notes: $N = 185$; $*p < .05$

For Model 5, all three study variables (WRQoL, SSS, ESLS) were entered in the equation along with the control variables. As hypothesized, adding the study variables of WRQoL, SSS, and ESLS into the equation significantly improves the ability to predict new professionals' intention to leave the field, $\chi^2 = 34.786$ ($p = .004$) as compared to the null model. The proportion of deviance accounted for by this model can be seen in Table 8. The test of model deviance demonstrates that Model 5 adequately predicts new professionals' intent to leave the field.

WRQoL, as hypothesized, is shown to be a significant predictor after controlling for all the other variables in the model, $Wald(1) = 9.559$, $p = .002$ (see Table 7). Further, for each one unit increase in WRQoL, the log odds of a new professional leaving the field decrease by .087, after controlling for the other variables. For each one unit increase in WRQoL, the odds of a new professional leaving the field decreases by a factor of .917, after controlling for the other variables in the model. Therefore, holding all other predictors constant, the odds of a new professional leaving the field are, on average, 8.3% lower for each unit increase in WRQoL.

Further, two of the study variables, SSS and ESLS, while hypothesized to be significant predictors in retention of new professionals, did not demonstrate that in this model.

There were three other predictors in Model 5 that were closer to being statistically significant but were not under the $p < .05$ criterion (Working in Student Activities/Services; Race/Ethnicity Non-White; private institution). Since Wald is known for being underpowered, these three predictors were regressed individually in a nested logistic regression with all the other predictors in the model. Under the higher-powered test, a new professional working in a Student Activities/Services as compared to working in Residence Life, when added to the other variables in Model 5, was found to be a significant predictor in the model, $\chi^2 = 3.999$ ($p = .046$). A new professional working in a private institution as compared to a public institution, when added to the other variables in the model, was not found to explain a significant amount of deviance in the model, $\chi^2 = 3.172$ ($p = .075$). A new professional whose race/ethnicity is non-white as compared with those who identify as white, when added to the other variables in the model, was not found to explain a significant amount of deviance in the model, $\chi^2 = 3.407$ ($p = .065$).

Table 7. *Logistic Regression Coefficients for Model 5*

	B (SE)	Wald	Exp(B)	95% CI Lower Exp(B)	95% CI Upper Exp(B)
Number Years in SA	-0.047 (.200)	.055	.954	.645	1.413
Institution Size	.126 (.195)	.414	1.134	.773	1.663
Age	.189 (.348)	.295	1.208	.611	2.391
Work > 40 Hrs./Week	.830 (.546)	2.309	2.294	.786	6.695
Gender: Male	-.009 (.591)	.000	.991	.311	3.158
Gender: Other	-1.025 (1.05)	.944	.359	.045	2.835
Sexual Orientation: LGBTQ	-.587 (.542)	1.173	.556	.192	1.609
Race/Ethnicity: Non- White	.871 (.473)	3.397	2.390	.946	6.036
Education Level (AA/Bachelors)	.447 (.591)	.572	1.564	.491	4.983
Institution Geography (not NE)	-.335 (.507)	.436	.716	.265	1.932
Private Institution	1.007 (.569)	3.130	2.737	.897	8.348
Functional Area: Career/Acad.	-.128 (.881)	.021	.880	.157	4.947

Functional Area: Student Activities or Services	1.134 (.591)	3.685	3.107	.976	9.885
ESLS	.006 (.020)	.089	1.006	.967	1.047
WRQoL	-.087 (.028)	9.559*	.917	.867	.969
SSS	.035 (.021)	2.802	1.035	.994	1.079
Constant	.543 (1.938)	.079	1.721		

Notes: $N = 185$; $*p < .05$; Functional Area: Student Activities/Services (as compared to Residence Life), when regressed individually using a nested LR was a significant predictor, $\chi^2 = 3.999$ ($p = .046$).

In order to compare all five models, the AIC values were calculated for each model (see Table 8). The model with the lowest AIC is Model 2 meaning it is the best model found in this study for predicting new professionals' intention to leave the field.

Table 8. *Model Comparisons and Effect Sizes for Models 1-6*

Model	-2LL (Deviance)	k	Cox & Snell R^2	Nagelkerke R^2	R_L^2	% Correct Classification	AIC
1 – Control Variables Only	146.856	13	.104	.175	.110	83.2	.9452
2 – Control Variables & WRQoL	135.542	14	.157	.265	.190	83.8	.8948
3 – Control Variables & SSS	144.727	14	.115	.193	.135	84.9	.9445
4 – Control Variables & ESLS	143.476	14	.121	.203	.142	84.9	.9377
5 – Control Variables, WRQoL, SSS, & ESLS	132.457	16	.171	.288	.208	82.7	.8998
6 – Control Variables, 6 WRQoL Sub-Scales	125.650	19	.201	.338	.249	83.8	.8954

Note: $N = 185$

Analysis Incorporating WRQoL Subscales

Given that Model 2, where only WRQoL was added to the controls in the model was found to be the optimal of the five models, a disaggregated analysis was conducted to examine the sub-scales of this construct. The factor scores for the sub-scales were computed using the regression approach (DiStefano, Zhu, & Mindrila, 2009). Satisfactory Cronbach's alphas were obtained for the six sub-scales [JCS ($\alpha = .769$); HWI ($\alpha = .746$); SAW ($\alpha = .776$); CAW ($\alpha = .754$); WCS ($\alpha = .736$); GWB ($\alpha = .856$)]. Prior to running Model 6, the control variables (individual characteristics: gender, age, race/ethnicity, sexual orientation, level of education attained, number of years in Student Affairs, hours worked per week, functional area; institutional characteristics: size, geographic region, type) and six WRQoL factors (JCS, HWI, SAW, CAW, WCS; GWB) were examined for issues of sparseness; there were no concerns found for this assumption of logistic regression. In addition, the continuous variables were examined for multicollinearity issues through examining the correlations (see Table 9), VIF, and Tolerance scores and no concerns were discovered. Having met these required assumptions, the logistic regression for Model 6 was conducted.

Table 9. *Correlations for Model 6 Continuous Variables*

	1	2	3	4	5	6
1. Years in Student Affairs						
2. Job and Career Satisfaction (JCS)	.024					
3. Home-Work Interface (HWI)	.004	.415*				
4. Stress at Work (SAW)	-.059	.271*	.343*			
5. Control at Work (CAW)	.083	.673*	.374*	.214*		
6. Working Conditions (WCS)	-.097	.666*	.552*	.384*	.553*	
7. General Well-being (GWB)	.052	.576*	.479*	.422*	.453*	.584*

Notes: $N = 185$, * $p < .05$.

Model 6 significantly improves the ability to predict new professionals' intention to leave the field, $\chi^2 = 41.593$ ($p = .002$) as compared to the null model. The proportion of deviance accounted for by this model can be seen in Table 8. The test of model deviance demonstrates that Model 6 adequately predicts new professionals' intent to leave the field.

Three of the six factors, Job and Career Satisfaction ($Wald(1) = 4.888, p = .027$), Control at Work ($Wald(1) = 3.983, p = .046$) and General Well-being ($Wald(1) = 5.259, p = .022$) were found to be significant predictors after controlling for the other predictors in Model 6 (see Table 10). Therefore, for each one unit increase in Job and Career Satisfaction (JCS), the log odds of a new professional leaving the field decrease by .855, after controlling for the other variables. For each one unit increase in JCS, the odds of a new professional leaving the field decreases by a factor of .425, after controlling for the other variables in the model. Therefore, holding all other predictors constant, the odds of a new professional leaving the field are, on average, 57.5% lower for each unit increase in JCS. In addition, for each one unit increase in Control at Work (CAW), the log odds of a new professional leaving the field increase by .727, after controlling for the other variables. For each one unit increase in CAW, the odds of a new professional leaving the field increases by a factor of 2.068, after controlling for the other variables in the model. Lastly, for each one unit increase in General Well-being (GWB), the log odds of a new professional leaving the field decrease by .859, after controlling for the other variables. For each one unit increase in GWB, the odds of a new professional leaving the field decrease by a factor of .423, after controlling for the other variables in the model. Therefore, holding all other predictors constant, the odds of a new professional leaving the field are, on average, 57.7% lower for each unit increase in GWB.

Table 10. *Logistic Regression Coefficients for Model 6*

	B (SE)	Wald	Exp(B)	95% CI Lower Exp(B)	95% CI Upper Exp(B)
Number Years in SA	-0.070 (.213)	.109	.932	.614	1.415
Institution Size	.060 (.196)	.093	1.062	.722	1.560
Age	.032 (.347)	.009	1.033	.523	2.041
Work > 40 Hrs./Week	1.017 (.591)	2.963	2.766	.869	8.808
Gender: Male	-.264 (.627)	.177	.768	.225	2.624
Gender: Other	-1.445 (1.153)	1.571	.236	.025	2.258
Sexual Orientation: LGBTQ	-.476 (.559)	.723	.621	.208	1.860

Race/Ethnicity: Non-White	.988 (.525)	3.549	2.687	.961	7.513
Education Level (AA/Bachelors)	.247 (.655)	.142	1.280	.354	4.626
Institution Geography (not NE)	-.470 (.524)	.803	.625	.224	1.747
Private Institution	.840 (.572)	2.160	2.316	.756	7.100
Functional Area: Career/Acad.	-.382 (.904)	.179	.682	.116	4.010
Functional Area: Student Activities or Services	1.053 (.602)	3.056	2.867	.880	9.337
JCS	-.855 (.387)	4.888*	.425	.199	.908
HWI	-.178 (.294)	.370	.837	.471	1.487
SAW	.051 (.287)	.032	1.053	.600	1.848
CAW	.727 (.364)	3.983*	2.068	1.013	4.223
WCS	.190 (.360)	.279	1.210	.597	2.452
GWB	-.859 (.375)	5.259*	.423	.203	.883
Constant	-3.229 (1.266)	6.511	.040		

Notes: $N = 185$; $*p < .05$; JCS = Job and Career Satisfaction; CAW = Control at Work; GWB = General Well-being

In order to compare all six models, the AIC values were calculated for each model (see Table 8). The model with the lowest AIC remains Model 2 meaning it is, statistically, the best model found in this study for predicting new professionals' intention to leave the field. While Model 6 provides a marginal decrease in statistical fit, its explanatory power is important to providing practical guidance for Student Affairs leaders on how to impact the problem of new professional attrition.

Chapter Five: Discussion, Conclusions, and Recommendations

The current study contributes to our understanding of new professional attrition in Student Affairs in hypothesized ways and in a way that was not the intent of the study. It is important to revisit the three dimensions studied for their potential influence on attrition: new professionals themselves, perceptions of the direct supervisor, and perceptions of the organizational leadership. The individual perceptions of the field of Student Affairs are reflected in the findings related to work-related quality of life. New professionals' perceptions of their direct supervisor and their divisional leaders provide the other two dimensions that were studied for their impact on whether they intend to leave or remain in the field. The current study did not show statistical findings that support the impact of the direct supervisor style or divisional leader style on attrition. Of the three study variables, only new professionals' perceptions of work-related quality of life demonstrated significance in the current study; however, leadership at the supervisory and divisional levels may be a contributing factor through the environmental influence they have on work-related quality of life.

The current findings demonstrate the value of understanding a new professional's work-related quality of life overall. Further, results demonstrate the importance for the field of focusing on three specific dimensions of new professionals' work-related quality of life, including job and career satisfaction, general well-being, and control at work, and their influence on attrition. Again, the role of Student Affairs leaders in creating the necessary environments to support new professionals' job and career satisfaction, general well-being, and control at work, is vital to addressing attrition. A summary of these important findings, along with the implications for graduate programs, divisional leaders and supervisors of new professionals, and national organizations in the field follow.

Summary of Findings

Work-related quality of life.

The new professionals themselves, and their perception of the field, demonstrated importance. When comparing new professionals who intend to leave versus those intending to remain in Student Affairs, those who intend to remain are significantly higher in their work-related quality of life. In both Model 2 (isolating WRQoL) and in Model 5 (controlling for ESLS, SSS, and control variables), work-related quality of life was a significant predictor of new professionals' intent to leave the field after controlling for other variables in the model. Specifically, new professionals higher in their perceptions of work-related quality of life have lower odds of intending to leave Student Affairs.

This finding was hypothesized and is not surprising when reviewing what is already studied regarding reasons for new professional attrition. Work-related quality of life (WRQoL) is comprised of the following factors: Job and Career Satisfaction (JCS), General Well-Being (GWB), Home-Work Interface (HWI), Stress at Work (SAW), Control at Work (CAW), and Working Conditions (WCS). Past research (Buchanan, 2012; Evans, 1988; Marshall et al., 2016) illuminated the following as reasons for new professional attrition in Student Affairs: lack of challenge and professional development; inadequate salaries; perception of devalued work; role stress, job stress, burnout, and work-life balance; and not understanding the culture and leadership of the Student Affairs divisions. These reasons coincide with many of the factors in work-related quality of life. Role stress, burnout, and job stress may link to SAW and GWB. Perception of devalued work, lack of challenge and professional development, and not understanding the culture and leadership of the division may link to CAW, WCS, and JCS. Work-life balance may link to HWI.

Since their perception of overall work-related quality of life was a significant predictor for new professional attrition, the specific factors were examined to understand which ones influenced this outcome. The findings demonstrated that job and career satisfaction, general well-being, and control at work were the three dimensions of work-related quality of life that were significant in predicting new professional intention to leave the field. Overall, the JCS

factor represents the level to which a respondent feels “the workplace provides...sense of achievement, high self-esteem and fulfillment of potential” (Easton & Van Laar, 2012, p.15).

The GWB factor demonstrates “the extent to which an individual feels good or content with their life as a whole” (Easton & Van Laar, 2012, p.13). The CAW factor shows “the level at which an employee feels they can exercise what they consider to be an appropriate level of control within their work environment” (Easton & Van Laar, 2012, p.16).

For JCS and GWB, with all the other factors and controls held constant, the odds of a new professional leaving Student Affairs are lower (57.5% and 57.7%, respectively) for each unit increase in the factor. Therefore, as you increase job and career satisfaction or general well-being of new professionals, their odds of leaving the field reduce. Interestingly, for CAW, with all the other factors and controls held constant, the odds of leaving the field increases by a factor of 2.068. Therefore, as control at work increases, the odds of new professionals leaving the field increases as well.

Understanding the factors by examining the specific items responded to by participants sheds further light on these findings (see Table 11). The items associated with JCS align with previous research on the concerns from new professionals about the field. Several researchers (Bender, 1980; Buchanan, 2012; Chessman, 2015; Evans, 1988; Marshall et al., 2016; Shupp & Arminio, 2012) demonstrated that the absence of challenge or professional development opportunities led Student Affairs professionals to leave the field. Frank (2013) found that new professionals who left the field did not have needs met in the following areas: feeling valued; opportunities to advance in the field; good communication of expectations. These unmet needs align with almost all the items in the JCS factor (see Table 11) providing evidence for the significance of this factor to attrition. When Student Affairs professionals do have their needs met, they feel valued, which leads to more job satisfaction and a lower likelihood of leaving the field (Rosser, 2004; Tull, 2009).

The significance of the items and concept of GWB align with previous research on new professional attrition as well. A strong relationship exists between work quality of life and well-being for Student Affairs professionals (Chessman, 2015). Further, there was a four point difference found between Chief Student Affairs Officers (CSAO's) and entry-level professionals on well-being; however, "when other positions [including new professionals] have high job-career satisfaction, higher control at work and higher overall job satisfaction, their well-being levels are near the same as a CSAO" (Chessman, 2015, p. 93).

The construct of GWB, or a new professional feeling "good or content with their life as a whole" (Easton & Van Laar, 2012, p.13), connects to Chickering's sixth vector of developing purpose. In order to work through the sixth vector, the new professional needs to establish clear commitments in the personal, interpersonal, and vocational areas of their lives (Evans et al., 2010). When the work environment allows for new professionals to make the connections needed in the vocational area, it in turn allows other connections personally and interpersonally to happen with more ease (Collins, 2009). New professionals' work on developing purpose, which includes vocational connections, may provide a reason for the strong relationship Chessman (2015) found between work-related quality of life and well-being.

While the literature suggests providing a stronger voice and level of involvement to new professionals in the field (Cilente et al., 2006; Frank, 2013), the current study found that as control at work increases, the odds of new professionals leaving the field increases. In reviewing the three items in this factor (see Table 11), there is an emphasis on having a voice or influence in a new professional's area of work as well as being involved in decisions impacting themselves and others in their area of work. This finding provides insight into what level of control, and how it translates to a voice beyond their work unit, a new professional may desire.

This finding requires the field to ask whether providing new professionals with too much control, autonomy, or influence in their area of work overwhelms them and does not meet their needs in their quality of life. Many new professionals are working through Chickering's first and

third vectors of developing competence and moving through autonomy towards interdependence. If the new professional is provided with the challenge of learning competence and how to be independent in their problem-solving without enough support to assist them in this learning, the frustration or anxiety that may occur could provide a reason for attrition in the field. The current findings may suggest that providing new professionals with too much control or influence in their area of work may lead to their desire to vacate the field for one of four potential reasons: empowerment to seek other employment; lack of compensation to match the level of influence; lack of support paired with the level of control; or lack of action associated with influence.

First, the more influence or involvement in decisions a new professional has, perhaps the higher their confidence level becomes, which may empower them to seek higher job titles within a year or two into the field. When they go to seek higher job titles within the field, they may find difficulty with the lack of job opportunities, which researchers (Frank, 2013; Marshall et al., 2016; Rosser & Javinar, 2003) highlighted as a concern for attrition in the field.

Secondly, if a new professional is put in a position of making difficult decisions in their area of work, then they may not feel they are being compensated appropriately for that level of influence. This may encourage them to seek employment that does not require this level of influence or that compensates at a higher level for those involved in higher level decisions. Previous research did demonstrate that fair compensation (Buchanan, 2012; Marshall et al., 2016; Rosser & Javinar, 2003; Silver & Jakeman, 2014) is a concern related to attrition of new professionals.

Thirdly, entry-level professionals are on the front lines in working directly with students. An obvious example of this front-line role occurs with residence life staff who live in the halls with students. Scheuermann and Ellett (2007), in their discussion of retention concerns for these entry-level professionals, highlighted a study by the Association of College and University Housing—International (ACUHO-I), that listed quality of life as a reason for leaving housing jobs. Quality of life concerns included lack of privacy, feelings of isolation, and burnout. Other

research on new professional attrition demonstrated role stress, job stress, burnout, and work-life balance as concerns as well (Buchanon, 2012; Frank, 2013; Marshall et al., 2016; Mullen et al., 2018; Silver & Jakeman, 2014; Ward, 1995). These other stressors for new professionals occur when they are asked to take on projects that they feel they do not have the experience to accomplish successfully. While some may see this as challenging a new professional, providing too much challenge can lead to them feeling overwhelmed. Allowing new professionals to have a stressful role with difficult decision-making and not providing them the appropriate level of support to balance that level of stress may be a reason for new professionals leaving.

Lastly, if new professionals are provided more control and autonomy in their areas of work where they are making difficult decisions in direct aid of students, then it becomes difficult for them to understand why their voices may not always be perceived as having that same level of influence within the organization. Providing a mechanism for new professionals to share their perspective at the department and/or divisional level but not supporting them in understanding how that perspective will be used, or further, not demonstrating any action on the perspectives that are shared, could lead to attrition. Mentoring new professionals in understanding all the dynamics that go into a final, divisional or departmental decision and how change takes place in the field is vital to them feeling their voices matter. Interestingly, one of the areas that much of the previous research focused on as a concern for new professionals surrounded the importance of mentoring (Renn & Hodges, 2007; Shupp & Arminio, 2012) and understanding the organizational culture (Cilente et al., 2006; Frank, 2013; Renn & Hodges, 2007). Merely asking for their voice to be heard but not helping new professionals understand how that voice gets translated into action, or sometimes inaction, could be key to attrition concerns.

Table 11. *Specific items for Significant WRQoL Factors*

Factor	Items in Survey
Job & Career Satisfaction (JCS)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. I have a clear set of goals and aims to enable me to do my job. 3. I have the opportunity to use my abilities at work.

	<p>8. When I have done a good job it is acknowledged by my line manager.</p> <p>11. I am encouraged to develop new skills.</p> <p>18. I am satisfied with the career opportunities available for me here.</p> <p>20. I am satisfied with the training I receive in order to perform my present job.</p>
General Well-Being (GWB)	<p>4. I feel well at the moment.</p> <p>9. Recently, I have been feeling unhappy and depressed. (<i>reverse score</i>)</p> <p>10. I am satisfied with my life.</p> <p>15. In most ways my life is close to ideal.</p> <p>17. Generally things work out well for me.</p> <p>21. Recently, I have been feeling reasonably happy all things considered.</p>
Control at Work (CAW)	<p>2. I feel able to voice opinions and influence changes in my area of work.</p> <p>12. I am involved in decisions that affect <u>me</u> in my own area of work.</p> <p>23. I am involved in decisions that affect members of the public in my own area of work.</p>

Potential predictive value of the number of hours worked each week.

In both Model 3 and Model 4, new professionals working more than forty hours per week when compared to their colleagues working forty hours or less in a week was a significant predictor. This predictor was not significant in Model 2 and Model 5, which contained work-related quality of life as a significant predictor. Therefore, working more than forty hours per week in Model 3 and Model 4 may have served as a proxy for elements of work-related quality of life since WRQoL was not included in those two models. However, since working more than forty hours per week did show significance in two models, it is worth further study.

Non-significance of new professionals' perceptions of ESLS and SSS.

While hypothesized to be significant predictors of new professionals leaving the field, the use of an executive servant leadership style by divisional leaders and the use of a synergistic supervisory style by direct supervisors were not important in understanding new professional attrition. More specifically, "the extent to which [new professionals] perceive that their supervisor focuses on the twin areas of advancement of the institutional mission and goals and the personal and professional advancement of individual staff members" (Saunders et al., 2000,

p.181) was not significant in predicting the intent to leave the field. Further, the findings demonstrated that divisional leaders implementing a servant leadership style, including focusing on interpersonal support, building community, altruism, egalitarianism, and moral integrity did not matter to new professional attrition. The use of executive servant leadership was closer to reaching statistical significance, however, and therefore should be reanalyzed with other samples, given the limitations in the current study.

Implications for Student Affairs

The current findings suggest that styles of supervisors and leaders are not as important as the organizational impacts they can make for new professionals. The ability of these two levels of leadership to produce work environments that allow new professionals to possess general well-being, to have appropriate levels of influence and involvement in decisions about their work, and to experience job and career satisfaction is vital to the retention of those new professionals. The finding that work-related quality of life, and specifically job and career satisfaction, general well-being, and control at work, are important in retaining new professionals in the field provides a framework for graduate programs, direct supervisors, divisional leaders, and professional organizations to tackle this concern, which will be discussed next.

Implications for Practice: Graduate Programs

Cilente et al. (2006) demonstrated there is a discrepancy between what graduate programs teach and provide as experience for their students and the realities of a position for a new professional, which leads to attrition concerns. Therefore, it is important that we look at the impact of graduate programs in working with work-related quality of life issues for new professionals. The following are suggestions for how graduate programs in the field can impact the problem of new professional attrition as it relates to work-related quality of life findings.

Addressing issues of job and career satisfaction.

The following are suggestions for how graduate programs can address the topic of job and career satisfaction when preparing students to become new professionals.

Emphasize the importance of understanding goals and expectations.

The importance of new professionals understanding their job expectations is a significant factor in their intention to leave the field (Cilente et al., 2006; Ward, 1995). Chessman (2015) emphasized the need for all employees to understand the goals of their unit, department, and division; this gives employees a sense of purpose and the ability to be more effective in their job responsibilities. The outcome of the current study supports that quality of life would increase, and therefore lead to retention of new professionals, by increasing this component of job and career satisfaction. Therefore, graduate students having a solid foundation in how to engage with supervisors and colleagues about goals and expectations within their role and how they fit into the larger picture of the department and division would be valuable.

Provide career planning courses with units on personal career development.

Renn and Jessup-Anger (2008) encouraged graduate programs to focus on the themes of professional identity and seeking sage advice in their preparation of new professionals. Many graduate programs have career planning as a required course. Typically, these courses focus on understanding how undergraduate students can be advised on career development using theory and practical applications. While this can translate into a graduate student using the practical applications for their own career in Student Affairs, it is not as often a focus of the course. Since we know from research (Marshall et al., 2016; Silver & Jakeman, 2014) that lack of professional development and mentoring are concerns for new professional attrition, having a unit in their career planning course where graduate students apply strategic planning for their professional development and for how to find and utilize job and career mentors is vital.

Model and teach the importance of feedback.

Researchers established the need for feedback to retain employees in Student Affairs. Specifically, Rosser (2004) and Rosser and Javinar (2009) discussed the importance of recognition for contributions and competence to increase job satisfaction. Further, Rosen et al. (1980) established that new professionals desire guidance and feedback from supervisors. For

these reasons, it is of utmost importance for graduate program advisors and instructors to model providing positive and constructive feedback and to teach students the reason why feedback is necessary to professional growth.

Addressing issues of general well-being.

The following are suggestions for how graduate programs can address the topic of general well-being when preparing students to become new professionals.

Provide a realistic picture of entry-level positions.

Entry-level positions in the field are difficult and often respond to stressful situations with students (e.g. suicide, sexual assault, mental health crises). Since previous research (Buchanon, 2012; Frank, 2013; Marshall et al., 2016; Mullen et al., 2018; Silver & Jakeman, 2014; Ward, 1995) focused on the impact of job stress on attrition, it is important for graduate students to have a good understanding of not only that these stressful situations can occur with students but how to respond and process it when they do. While some assistantships in graduate school (e.g. Hall Director positions) do provide some insight into this, not all assistantships do so the graduate program has to find other ways to teach about the realities of job stress' impact.

Teach wellness and strategies for stress management.

As previously stated, knowing the impact job stress has on retention of new professionals provides strong support for graduate programs to add professional development or a unit in a course for future employees in the field on maintaining wellness and implementing stress management techniques. Having this knowledge would be helpful to them during their graduate program but would also provide a solid baseline for them as entry-level professionals in the field.

Addressing issues of level of control at work.

The following are suggestions for how graduate programs can address the topic of control at work when preparing students to become new professionals.

Add a course on organizational culture and change to the curriculum.

Several studies (Cilente et al., 2006; Frank, 2013; Renn & Hodges, 2007) pointed out the concerns of graduate students and new professionals in their lack of understanding in how to navigate organizational culture. Ensuring that graduate students learn about the larger issues facing higher education, the types of organizational cultures, and how change occurs within a university, would provide them a foundation for navigating organizational politics as entry-level professionals. Buller (2015) provides a good overview of how change occurs in a higher education setting; implementing this text in a course, or at least portions of this text, along with other resources on organizational theory would create a space for conversation with graduate students about Student Affairs as a unit within the contexts of the university and higher education. New professionals would benefit from this context as they think about their own and others' influence on change in their department, division, and university.

Implications for Practice: Divisional Leaders and Direct Supervisors

The following are suggestions for how direct supervisors and divisional leadership at the university level can impact the problem of new professional attrition as it relates to work-related quality of life findings.

Addressing issues of job and career satisfaction.

Previous research gave voice to elements of career and job satisfaction as reasons for new professional attrition. The lack of orientation to job responsibilities and university culture, good communication about goals and expectations, challenge in one's work, opportunities to develop professionally, and positive and constructive feedback are all reasons for new professional attrition that relate to job and career satisfaction (Bender, 1980; Buchanan, 2012; Chessman, 2015; Evans, 1988; Frank, 2013; Marshall et al., 2016; Shupp & Arminio, 2012).

Collins (2009) and Tull et al. (2009) discussed the need to transition new professionals into the field using a socialization process. The process has formal, informal, and personal stages. The formal stage allows the new professional to become a part of the organization through structured orientation and training programs that help them understand their position and the

environment (Collins, 2009). The informal stage “occurs when new professionals observe the variations in implementing formal rules and expectations and develop their own individual styles for inhabiting the role” (Collins, 2009, p.4). The personal stage allows the new professional to integrate their personal and work identities (Collins, 2009).

These stages provide guidance for many of the suggestions that follow for direct supervisors and divisional leaders in addressing the job and career satisfaction factor that is significant to new professional attrition. The suggestions for orientation of new professionals are ways to implement the formal stage of the socialization process. The suggestions for mentoring and supervision of new professionals provide examples for the informal and personal stages of the socialization process.

Orientation for new professionals.

According to Saunders and Cooper (2009), “a well-constructed, intentionally planned orientation is one way...to improve job performance, foster confidence, build organizational commitment, and reduce attrition in the [Student Affairs] field” (p. 109). The orientation of new professionals begins at the acceptance of the position and lasts for the first one to two months of being in the position (Collins, 2009). Therefore, it is important for supervisors and divisional leaders to implement orientation strategies during this time.

Provide information prior to the first day of work.

Once a job offer for an entry-level position has been accepted, the direct supervisor not only should provide the new professional with administrative help on completing contracts and documents that are needed by human resources, but they should also provide them with information to review regarding their new position. This information should include divisional, departmental, and unit information. Having this information prior to the first day of work gives the new professional an opportunity to develop an understanding of their role within a larger context and prepare questions about that role for their supervisor and colleagues when they do begin work.

Divisional leaders need to teach about culture and change.

Since navigating organizational politics and culture is an area of concern for new professionals (Bender, 1980; Cilente et al., 2006; Frank, 2013; Harned & Murphy, 1998; Silver & Jakeman, 2014), divisional leaders should address this topic during an orientation for them within the first month of their employment. This could be done in a one-on-one meeting with the Vice President or an Associate Vice President of Student Affairs or as a part of a larger program for multiple new professionals depending on the time of year. These sessions should talk about the current organizational culture, the reasons for that culture, how feedback is given on divisional concerns, how decisions and change occur within the division, and how communication occurs between divisional leaders, supervisors, and new professionals. Chessman (2015) highlighted that “leadership in student affairs has to communicate with staff what they feel is an appropriate ‘level of control’ in...[the]...work environment” (p.101). Buller (2015) provides a framework for teaching about organizational culture: talk about what the divisional members take for granted; how employees solve problems; and what employees rely on to understand their role in the organization. Eckel and Kezar (2003) provide solid evidence for orientation being vital to transformation within universities. In their study of transformational change, they found that there were fifteen supporting strategies, including using effective communication, inviting participation, and providing an opportunity for employees to be able to see how their voices can have influence. Further, they state that transformational change can take more than five years to implement; having new professionals hear this approach to change in the division is helpful as they reflect on how to navigate it.

Provide social opportunities.

Stum (2001) reimagined Maslow’s hierarchy of needs for the needs of an employee within their organization. The third need in the reimagined hierarchy is affiliation, which is defined as “a sense of belonging that includes being ‘in the know’ and ‘part of the team’” (Stum, 2001, p. 7). Further, if a division focuses on this need to belong, they “encourage the individual

to be a strong contributor” (Stum, 2001, p. 7). The orientation of new professionals in Student Affairs should focus on establishing this affiliation within the division and by providing opportunities to connect to the local community.

Mentoring for new professionals.

The research clearly demonstrates that not having a mentor to help guide and support them contributes to concerns with new professional retention (Renn & Hodges, 2007; Renn & Jessup-Anger, 2008; Rosen et al., 1980). According to Collins (2009), new professionals, in the informal stage of the socialization process, encounter the rules and values of the organization that one learns over time. While some of these aspects of culture were hopefully disseminated during their orientation, there are aspects that can be missed. The importance of having a divisional mentor becomes evident as “learning to read the social, cultural, and political dynamics of the organization can be assisted by leaning on the experience of more practiced professionals” (Collins, 2009, p.19).

Train mentors on how to assist new professionals.

While direct supervisors can serve as mentors for new professionals, mentoring can be done by anyone in the division. In order to provide consistent messaging and confidence to those serving as mentors, it is important that the division train new professional mentors. This training should include approaches to mentoring, common new professional concerns, divisional culture and how to navigate it, and resources for new professionals as they work through transition to the organization and profession.

Provide time for direct supervisors to engage in good supervision of new professionals.

While this study did not provide evidence of a suggested supervisory style to use for the retention of new professionals, the direct supervisor role is central to providing an environment that encourages commitment to remaining in the field. The importance of supervisor accessibility (Shupp and Arminio, 2012) and the need for supervisory support (Cilente et al. 2006) exist in the literature. New professionals identified support from their supervisor as necessary for success; in

addition, the lack of support from the immediate supervisor was connected to burnout and high attrition (Cilente et al., 2006). Creating this environment takes time, which many mid-level professionals who serve as these direct supervisors often are not given in the field. Therefore, providing time to direct supervisors needs to be a commitment for divisional leaders.

Create environments that promote feedback and set clear expectations.

The need for positive and constructive feedback and the setting of clear expectations and goals for their position was established (Rosen et al., 1980; Rosser, 2004; Rosser and Javinar, 2009); direct supervisors should implement these elements during training and orientation of the new professional to the department. Establishing how feedback will work by reviewing the performance evaluation alongside the job description provides an opportunity to discuss feedback more broadly as well. In addition to providing the new employee information on how the supervisor will provide feedback, the supervisor should also provide information on how they will receive feedback on their own performance from the employee. When discussing expectations of the position, the supervisor should expand the discussion beyond the tasks and talk about departmental expectations that may include interactions with colleagues, commitments outside of the office, and relationships with campus partners.

Create professional development plans.

As previously discussed, lack of professional development is a concern for new professionals (Marshall et al., 2016; Silver & Jakeman, 2014). Shupp and Arminio established a need for making professional development a topic within the context of new professionals' supervisory relationships. Collins (2009) emphasized that new professionals are not ready to take responsibility for their own professional development until they reach the personal stage of the socialization process. Given this context, direct supervisors of new professionals should have conversations often with their new professionals about their growth in their positions and the field. Utilizing a strategic approach of at minimum annually developing a professional development plan with their employee provides an approach to meeting this need. The

professional competencies created by a task force from ACPA and NASPA for the field (2010), which can be found online, provide a framework for creating this plan.

Create divisional focus for professional development of staff.

Stum (2001), in his reimagined Maslow's hierarchy of needs for an employee within their organization included growth as the fourth need, which is defined as opportunities for employees "to change, learn, and have new experiences on the job" (p. 7). For new professionals to be successful at fulfilling their needs for professional development, the divisional leadership must devote financial resources and opportunities for learning to the entire division to demonstrate its importance. In addition, the division can provide opportunities for cross-training of employees within the division itself so that new professionals can learn skill sets that will provide them future opportunities for moving to various roles within the field.

Implement job satisfaction surveys to capture needs of the division.

In order to understand the specific needs of their own division of Student Affairs, divisional leadership should implement job satisfaction surveys every other year and provide an opportunity for new professionals to discuss concerns. In addition, divisional leadership should review exit survey findings from new professionals and pay close attention to their reasons for leaving the university, division, or field. This insight will provide opportunities for future divisional efforts in the area of retention of new professionals.

Addressing issues of general well-being.

New professionals encounter stressful situations with students while also going through their own transition. Research demonstrated that job stress, role stress, burnout, and work-life balance are all issues that lead to new professional attrition (Buchanon, 2012; Frank, 2013; Marshall et al., 2016; Mullen et al., 2018; Silver & Jakeman, 2014; Ward, 1995). These various types of stress-related issues lead to concerns with general well-being; Chessman (2015) demonstrated that general well-being is linked to an employee's quality of life.

The current study found that as general well-being increased for a new professional, the odds of them intending to leave decreased. Therefore, direct supervisors and divisional leaders should focus on increasing the well-being of their new professionals in order to combat the problem of attrition. The following are suggestions for how the university can impact the problem of new professional attrition as it relates to general well-being.

Encourage an environment of wellness.

Stum (2001), in the reimagining of Maslow's hierarchy of needs for the work environment, included work/life harmony at the top of the pyramid. Further, he stated that the motivators for this area were leaders recognizing the need for balance, team members offering personal support, and employees being viewed as a person in addition to their job. In this context and with the finding in the current study, direct supervisors and divisional leaders need to model and encourage wellness through their approach to the amount of work done by employees. First, leadership needs to model and encourage employees in the division to use their vacation days. Supervisors can help new professionals plan for some vacation days as well as encourage the use of these days to rest during stressful times of work. Second, leaders should encourage flexible work schedules for new professionals who are often programming and working with students outside of normal business hours. Third, leaders need to model and encourage an appropriate amount of work hours and timing of work. For instance, it would be expected in the field that some weeks may require more than forty hours of work, but a supervisor or divisional leader working eighty hours in a week would not be modeling appropriate work to new professionals. Further, a leader or supervisor sending an email requesting tasks of new professionals at midnight may communicate an inappropriate expectation.

Leadership can also model the importance of wellness in the environmental cues of divisional programming. First, create periodic support groups at the departmental or divisional level to encourage employees to discuss the stress associated with their work in a manner that does not identify needs of specific students on campus. Have the support group overseen by a

therapist from the university's counseling center in case individual follow up becomes necessary. Second, allow space at divisional, departmental, and unit level meetings for employees to reflect on, and discuss as desired, their current stressors and the support they need. Third, focus on the needs of employees in the same way as the needs of students. For instance, if something is not a student crisis, encourage employees not to respond to student inquiries during their non-work hours. This not only provides good developmental learning for students but demonstrates to staff that their well-being is important as well.

Provide professional development and resources.

In addition to creating a culture that encourages wellness, provide wellness as a focus in divisional and departmental professional development and resources provided. Chessman (2015) recommended that leadership encourage healthy living in their employees through resources on campus including access to recreational centers, meditation, and other avenues that encourage a focus on employees' diet, exercise, and sleep. Beyond physical health, leaders in Student Affairs should recognize the importance of providing for the mental health needs of their staff. In fact, Volkwein and Zhou (2003) found that managers in Student Affairs had the highest level of job stress when compared with other university divisions. Stoves (2014), in his qualitative study of Student Affairs professionals, discussed that job stress can manifest in Student Affairs professionals as compassion fatigue, which is in response to their work with students; the impacts of this were issues with sleep, maintaining focus, and inability to relax. Further, the study found that there was a "necessity to find a positive support network where [they] could talk about their issue" (Stoves, 2014, p.262). Student Affairs divisions put much thought and resource into student mental health needs but often do not focus on how front-line staff working with those concerns have similar needs.

Addressing issues of level of control at work.

As previously stated, this study demonstrated that as a new professional's level of control at work increases, their odds of intending to leave the field increases. Some possible reasons for

this as supported by previous research were a disconnect in level of responsibility when paired with compensation (Buchanan, 2012; Marshall et al., 2016; Rosser & Javinar, 2003; Silver & Jakeman, 2014), lack of job opportunities to transition to within the university or field (Frank, 2013; Marshall et al., 2016; Rosser & Javinar, 2003), lack of support for the stress associated with entry-level jobs (Buchanan, 2012; Frank, 2013; Marshall et al., 2016; Mullen et al., 2018; Scheuermann & Ellett, 2007; Silver & Jakeman, 2014; Ward, 1995), and lack of understanding how their voice translates into action at the divisional level (Cilente et al., 2006; Frank, 2013; Renn & Hodges, 2007). The following represent ways that supervisors and divisional leaders can impact these areas.

Address salary and job opportunity concerns.

Direct supervisors and divisional leaders should find ways to tell the story of Student Affairs work through data collection, quantitative and qualitative, in ways that will assist with the addition of more positions and improved salaries. The addition of positions could assist with easing the stress levels of those in entry-level positions while also providing mobility within the division. Improved salaries will demonstrate the value of the profession and work to employees, which is known to be a reason for departure from the field (Cilente et al., 2006; Frank, 2013).

Address the concern of “other duties as assigned”.

Almost every job description in the Student Affairs field has a section that says the employee is responsible for “other duties as assigned.” This is one way that Student Affairs may provide new professionals with too much control, leading to them being overwhelmed and ultimately intending to leave the field. While the original intention of this addition to the job description may have been to address unforeseen concerns that arise, it is often used to give additional tasks to employees that those in middle and upper management are not able to do. While these additional duties are often presented as the opportunity to learn a new skill, some employees in the field, including new professionals, may see these tasks simply as extra work given to them by leaders in the division. The point, though, is that this is a divisional concern in

which all levels are being asked to do more with less time. New professionals, being newer to the career, have the ability to experience this overwhelming amount of work, pair it with their knowledge of the salary concerns in the field, and make decisions to vacate.

Chessman (2015) discussed the important role of divisional leaders in implementing strategies that promote healthy lifestyles of Student Affairs employees. It is vital for divisional leaders to ensure that all employees in the division have time to complete their necessary work but also have time to devote to other areas of life. Leaders need to be strategic in their use of “other duties as assigned” by eliminating divisional efforts that are not fruitful to the mission of the university or division. An example of this occurs with a common practice in Student Affairs of having each unit represented on every divisional committee; if certain units are best suited for accomplishing the goals of a particular divisional committee, then strategic leaders should only have those members on those committees. This provides time for individuals in other units to represent the division in other more productive ways.

Implications for Practice: National Organizations in Student Affairs

The following are suggestions for how national organizations in the field can impact the problem of new professional attrition as it relates to the work-related quality of life findings.

Generally, it is important for NASPA and ACPA, and other more specialized national organizations, to think about the needs of new professionals in the field. More specifically, these organizations need to break out the needs of new professionals from those of graduate students. Often these two groups are placed together in knowledge communities, programming needs, and programming tracks. While there are similarities in these groups, it is important that new professionals be valued for their actual role in the field. Suggestions related to concerns with job and career satisfaction, general well-being, and control at work are provided next.

Addressing issues of job and career satisfaction.

Providing career programming that is supportive of new professionals at the national level would assist supervisors and divisional leaders in implementing these needs on their

campuses. Providing webinars and national level programs on topics of obtaining a career mentor, creating a professional development plan, and understanding how to hear and use feedback would be ideal areas for assisting with attrition. In addition, providing new professional programs annually that directly relate to their needs in the ACPA/NASPA competency areas (2010) would be helpful. Lastly, providing programs to mid-level and divisional leaders on working with new professionals, creating effective orientations for new professionals, and becoming a career mentor would facilitate these relationships occurring at the campus level in ways that benefit the entire profession.

Addressing issues of general well-being.

National organizations need to reflect on the well-being concerns of all levels of the profession. Implementing programming that targets the various levels (graduate student, new professional, mid-level, divisional leadership) on this topic is vital to influencing this need at the campus level. In addition, national organizations should reflect on the ways they model and promote a focus on well-being in their work as well; there should be a focus on how staff and volunteers within these organizations implement wellness techniques. Learning this information from national programming and modeling should translate into practical implementation at the campus level. This focus on health, mental health, and other areas of well-being for professionals in the field will ultimately assist the field in providing response to student needs in this area as well.

Addressing issues of level of control at work.

In addition to the programs mentioned in the job and career satisfaction and general well-being areas, national organizations should provide learning opportunities for all levels of staff, including new professionals, on organizational culture, theory and decision-making. In addition, providing programs for mid-level and divisional leadership on how to use assessment and research effectively to tell the story of their division would be helpful. This learning would help

leaders in making the case for increased compensation and addition of necessary positions at the campus level.

Implications for Further Research

The current study represents a first inquiry into the three levels of potential influence on new professional attrition: new professionals, direct supervisors, and divisional leadership. Replication of the findings related to the significance found for work-related quality of life, especially for the factors of job and career satisfaction, general well-being, and control at work is advisable. While the current study did not find significance for the direct supervisory or divisional level for the implementation of synergistic supervision and executive servant leadership styles' impact on new professional attrition, replication is still recommended. Since prior studies have demonstrated a relationship between attrition and the use of synergistic supervision (Tull, 2004; 2006; Jubert, 2016), it is important to reinvestigate it as a potential predictor of intention to leave. In addition, the influence of the use of an executive servant leadership style by divisional leaders should be reinvestigated. The current study's limitations regarding the representativeness of the participant sample, as previously discussed, may have masked the importance of these two potential predictors.

In the current study, the findings showed that the style utilized by the direct supervisors and the divisional leaders was not as important as the environments they create and influence they provide at the campus level. However, it is important to continue to study how leadership style, including but not limited to executive servant, may be connected to the concern of new professional attrition. A study that merely looks solely at the divisional leadership level and its influence on the intention of new professionals to remain in or leave the field would be helpful. Samad et al. (2015) called for additional research in this area and the current study provides only one attempt at meeting this call.

A significant predictor that emerged in two of the models currently studied that new professionals working more than forty hours per week, when compared to their colleagues

working forty hours or less in a week, is worth further study. If research was able to determine a tipping point for how many hours are too many when it comes to intention to leave the field, then divisional leaders and supervisors could implement better planning for how to meet the needs of new professionals in this area.

The current work with supervisors should be broadened beyond their style of supervision to see how their own well-being and stress may be a factor in how they are perceived by new professionals they supervise. For example, if a relationship is found between supervisors of new professionals who have higher stress or lower well-being scores and lower retention rates of their supervisees in the field, then our understanding of the importance of providing stress reduction and other strategies for increasing well-being at all levels of Student Affairs would be supported.

Lastly, since there is evidence that the sample in the current study may have misrepresented the true population of those intending to leave the field, it is important to work on replication with strategies implemented to address those concerns. While typically national samples are most sought out for Student Affairs studies, this may be a topic where working through national organizations such as NASPA and ACPA to directly survey new professionals is not advisable. Instead, working with national organizations to communicate with divisional leadership at various campuses who could provide emails for their new professionals to the researcher, which can then be used to disseminate the survey may be advisable. This method may allow the survey to be received by those who intend to leave the field but are not a member of a national organization. Another possibility might be to work directly with various Student Affairs graduate programs nationally to obtain contact information for those who graduated within the past five years from their programs and then send the survey to them.

Summary

This chapter summarized the major findings of the current study regarding the importance of new professionals' quality of work life in understanding attrition. Specifically, the influence of job and career satisfaction, general well-being, and control at work were discussed as

significant predictors of the intention of new professionals to leave the field. Further, while the current study did not find statistical significance of supervisory and leadership styles as predictors of new professionals' intent to leave the field, the work-related quality of life finding provides opportunities for leaders to make direct impacts on attrition. The influence of leaders, according to the current study, may not be found in a direct path through style but rather in the impact those leaders have on job and career satisfaction, general well-being, and control at work for new professionals. Therefore, practical suggestions were provided for graduate programs, direct supervisors, divisional leaders, and national organizations for how to influence the areas of new professionals' quality of work life that matter to attrition.

It is well established that Student Affairs has a concern with new professional attrition (Bender, 1980; Lorden, 1998; Renn & Hodges, 2007; Marshall et al., 2016). The impact of the voluntary turnover of new professionals in the field is devastating to Student Affairs divisions' finances, productivity, organizational stability, team disruption, and innovation. New professional attrition was established as a concern forty years ago (Bender, 1980); the time has come for Student Affairs to implement change to address the problem. The current study established that Student Affairs leaders have the influence needed to make those changes, especially as it relates to new professionals' work-related quality of life. The field cannot withstand another forty years of the problem; the time has come for leadership to implement change.

Appendix A: Email to ACPA New Professionals with Survey Link

SUBJECT: Opportunity to Participate in Research Study

FROM: ACPA

Dear ACPA Member:

I am pleased to invite you, as a new professional in Student Affairs, to participate in a survey to provide your insight to our field. This study is being done to examine the relationship between your perceptions, as a new professional, of your work-related quality of life, your direct supervisor's style, and your divisional leaders' style in determining whether or not you intend to remain in the field of Student Affairs. This study will contribute to the completion of my dissertation. *As a current new professional in Student Affairs, your insights are vital and valuable.* Please note: Individual survey responses will be anonymous.

I recognize that your time is limited; so, in appreciation of your efforts, I will be offering you the opportunity to enter a drawing for two, randomly selected participants to win **a \$50 Amazon gift card.**

You can access the survey by clicking on the link below. The survey begins with an informed consent form. After reviewing the informed consent form, you can proceed to the survey by clicking the arrow at the bottom right.

http://jmu.co1.qualtrics.com/jfe/form/SV_0iBrmBWV1yLC1LL

Thank you for your help and insight!

Wendy Lushbaugh, James Madison University

Appendix B: Email to NASPA New Professional and Graduate Students Knowledge Community
with Survey Link

SUBJECT: Opportunity to Participate in Research Study

FROM: NASPA New Professional and Graduate Students Knowledge Community

Dear NASPA New Professional and Graduate Students KC Member:

I am pleased to invite you, as a new professional in Student Affairs, to participate in a survey to provide your insight to our field. This study is being done to examine the relationship between your perceptions, as a new professional, of your work-related quality of life, your direct supervisor's style, and your divisional leaders' style in determining whether or not you intend to remain in the field of Student Affairs. This study will contribute to the completion of my dissertation. *As a current new professional in Student Affairs, your insights are vital and valuable.* Please note: Individual survey responses will be anonymous.

I recognize that your time is limited; so, in appreciation of your efforts, I will be offering you the opportunity to enter a drawing for two, randomly selected participants to win **a \$50 Amazon gift card.**

You can access the survey by clicking on the link below. The survey begins with an informed consent form. After reviewing the informed consent form, you can proceed to the survey by clicking the arrow at the bottom right.

http://jmu.co1.qualtrics.com/jfe/form/SV_0iBrmBWV1yLC1LL

Thank you for your help and insight!

Wendy Lushbaugh, James Madison University

Appendix C—Full Survey to be Deployed

Q1

Identification of Investigators & Purpose of Study

You are being asked to participate in a research study conducted by Wendy Lushbaugh from James Madison University. The purpose of this study is to examine the relationship between your perceptions, as a new professional, of your work-related quality of life, your direct supervisor's style, and your divisional leaders' style in determining whether or not you intend to remain in the field of Student Affairs. This study will contribute to the researcher's completion of her dissertation.

Research Procedures

This study consists of an online survey that will be administered to individual participants through email using Qualtrics. You will be asked to provide answers to a series of questions related to your perceptions as a new professional in Student Affairs. Of note, this survey is being distributed to new professionals who are members of NASPA and ACPA. If you are a member of both organizations, you will only need to take the survey once.

Time Required

Participation in this study will require approximately 10 minutes of your time.

Risks

The investigator does not perceive more than minimal risks from your involvement in this study (that is, no risks beyond the risks associated with everyday life).

Benefits

Potential benefits from participation in this study include a better understanding of the reasons for new professional attrition in the field of Student Affairs.

Confidentiality

The results of this research will be presented for the researcher's dissertation defense and may be presented at a conference. While individual responses are obtained and recorded anonymously

and kept in the strictest confidence, aggregate data will be presented representing averages or generalizations about the responses as a whole. No identifiable information will be collected from the participant and no identifiable responses will be presented in the final form of this study. All data will be stored in a secure location accessible only to the researcher. The researcher retains the right to use and publish non-identifiable data. An agreement was made with an author of one of the instruments in this study to provide the raw data collected from that instrument to the author; this data will be provided in a non-identifiable format with solely the responses to that instrument. At the end of the study and all presentations that may result from the study, all records will be destroyed.

Participation & Withdrawal

Your participation is entirely voluntary. You are free to choose not to participate. Should you choose to participate, you can withdraw at any time without consequences of any kind. However, once your responses have been submitted and anonymously recorded you will not be able to withdraw from the study.

Questions about the Study

If you have questions or concerns during the time of your participation in this study, or after its completion or you would like to receive a copy of the final aggregate results of this study, please contact:

Wendy Lushbaugh

Strategic Leadership Studies

James Madison University

lushbaw@jmu.edu

Dr. Ben Selznick

Strategic Leadership Studies

James Madison University

Telephone: (540) 568-7179

selznibs@jmu.edu

Questions about Your Rights as a Research Subject

Dr. Taimi Castle

Chair, Institutional Review Board

James Madison University

(540) 568-5929

castletl@jmu.edu

Giving of Consent

I have read this cover letter and I understand what is being requested of me as a participant in this study. I freely consent to participate. I have been given satisfactory answers to my questions. I certify that I am at least 18 years of age. I understand that by clicking the button below I am consenting to participate in this research.

This study has been approved by the IRB, protocol #20-1477.

-----PAGE BREAK-----

Q2 Thank you for taking the time to take this survey. Please carefully read the instructions for each question and provide an honest response for how you feel. There are no right or wrong answers.

Q3 The following scale is a measure of your attitudes to the factors that influence your experience at work. Please do not take too long on each question; we want your first reaction. For each item choose the response that reflects the extent to which you agree with the statement. Respond using the following scale:

A = “Strongly Disagree” B = “Disagree” C = “Neutral” D = “Agree”

E = “Strongly Agree”

1. I have a clear set of goals and aims to enable me to do my job.
2. I feel able to voice opinions and influence changes in my area of work.
3. I have the opportunity to use my abilities at work.
4. I feel well at the moment.
5. My employer provides adequate facilities and flexibility for me to fit work in around my family life.
6. My current working hours/patterns suit my personal circumstances.
7. I often feel under pressure at work.
8. When I have done a good job it is acknowledged by my line manager.
9. Recently, I have been feeling unhappy and depressed.
10. I am satisfied with my life.
11. I am encouraged to develop new skills.
12. I am involved in decisions that affect me in my own area of work.

-----PAGE BREAK-----

Q4 The following scale is a measure of your attitudes to the factors that influence your experience at work. Please do not take too long on each question; we want your first reaction. For each item choose the response that reflects the extent to which you agree with the statement. Respond using the following scale:

A = “Strongly Disagree” B = “Disagree” C = “Neutral” D = “Agree”

E = “Strongly Agree”

1. My employer provides me with what I need to do my job effectively.
2. My line manager actively promotes flexible working hours/patterns.
3. In most ways my life is close to ideal.
4. I work in a safe environment.
5. Generally things work out well for me.
6. I am satisfied with the career opportunities available for me here.
7. I often feel excessive levels of stress at work.
8. I am satisfied with the training I receive in order to perform my present job.
9. Recently, I have been feeling reasonably happy all things considered.
10. The working conditions are satisfactory.
11. I am involved in decisions that affect members of the public in my own area of work.
12. I am satisfied with the overall quality of my working life.

-----PAGE BREAK-----

Q5 For each item choose the response that most closely reflects your experience with your current supervisor. Respond using the following scale:

A = “Never (almost never)” B = “Seldom” C = “Sometimes” D = “Often”

E = “Always (almost always)”

1. My supervisor includes me in a significant way when making decisions that affect my area of responsibilities.

2. My supervisor works with me to gather the information needed to make decisions rather than simply providing me the information he/she feels is important.
3. My supervisor criticizes staff members in public.
4. My supervisor makes certain that I am fully knowledgeable about the goals of the division and institution.
5. My supervisor willingly listens to whatever is on my mind, whether it is personal or professional.
6. My supervisor shows interests in promoting my professional or career advancement.
7. My supervisor is personally offended if I question the wisdom of his/her decisions.
8. My supervisor shows that she/he cares about me as a person.
9. My supervisor speaks up for my unit within the institution.
10. My supervisor expects me to fit in with the accepted ways of doing things, in other words, “don’t rock the boat.”
11. My supervisor has favorites on the staff.

-----PAGE BREAK-----

Q6 For each item choose the response that most closely reflects your experience with your current supervisor. Respond using the following scale:

A = “Never (almost never)” B = “Seldom” C = “Sometimes” D = “Often”

E = “Always (almost always)”

1. My supervisor breaks confidences.
2. My supervisor takes negative evaluations of programs or staff and uses them to make improvements.
3. When faced with a conflict between an external constituent (for example, parent or donor) and staff members, my supervisor supports external constituents even if they are wrong.

4. My supervisor is open and honest with me about my strengths and weaknesses.
5. If I'm not careful, my supervisor may allow things that aren't my fault to be blamed on me.
6. My supervisor rewards teamwork.
7. When the system gets in the way of accomplishing our goals, my supervisor helps me to devise ways to overcome barriers.
8. My supervisor looks for me to make a mistake.
9. My supervisor and I develop yearly professional development plans that address my weaknesses or blind spots.
10. When problem solving, my supervisor expects staff to present and advocate differing points of view.
11. In conflicts with staff members, my supervisor takes students' sides (even when they are wrong).

-----PAGE BREAK-----

Q7 Please respond to the following statements regarding your perceptions of the Student Affairs divisional leadership at your current institution. If you have no direct experience with this person(s), you may consider organizational policies, practices, or public communications as evidence of their values and beliefs. If you are not currently employed, please consider the Student Affairs divisional leadership at your most recent institution. Respond using the following scale:

A = "Strongly Disagree" B = "Disagree" C = "Agree" D = "Strongly Agree"

1. The Student Affairs divisional leader(s) at my institution considers the effects of organizational decisions on the community.
2. The Student Affairs divisional leader(s) at my institution recognizes when employee morale is low without asking.

3. The Student Affairs divisional leader(s) at my institution looks for ways to make others successful.
4. The Student Affairs divisional leader(s) at my institution sacrifices personal benefit to meet employee needs.
5. The Student Affairs divisional leader(s) at my institution encourages debate of their ideas.
6. The Student Affairs divisional leader(s) at my institution serves others willingly with no expectation of reward.
7. The Student Affairs divisional leader(s) at my institution inspires employee trust.
8. The Student Affairs divisional leader(s) at my institution invites constructive criticism.
9. The Student Affairs divisional leader(s) at my institution nurtures employee leadership potential.
10. The Student Affairs divisional leader(s) at my institution refuses to use manipulation or deceit to achieve their goals.
11. The Student Affairs divisional leader(s) at my institution encourages a spirit of cooperation among employees.
12. The Student Affairs divisional leader(s) at my institution inspires organizational commitment.
13. The Student Affairs divisional leader(s) at my institution places interests of others before self-interest.

-----PAGE BREAK-----

Q8 Please respond to the following statements regarding your perceptions of the Student Affairs divisional leadership at your current institution. If you have no direct experience with this person(s), you may consider organizational policies, practices, or public communications as

evidence of their values and beliefs. If you are not currently employed, please consider the Student Affairs divisional leadership at your most recent institution. Respond using the following scale:

A = “Strongly Disagree” B = “Disagree” C = “Agree” D = “Strongly Agree”

1. The Student Affairs divisional leader(s) at my institution treats all employees with dignity and respect.
2. The Student Affairs divisional leader(s) at my institution displays interest in learning from employees, regardless of their level in the organization.
3. The Student Affairs divisional leader(s) at my institution ensures greatest decision-making control given to employees most affected by decision.
4. The Student Affairs divisional leader(s) at my institution freely admits their mistakes.
5. The Student Affairs divisional leader(s) at my institution promotes transparency and honesty throughout the organization.
6. The Student Affairs divisional leader(s) at my institution listens carefully to others.
7. The Student Affairs divisional leader(s) at my institution values integrity more than profit or personal gain.
8. The Student Affairs divisional leader(s) at my institution prefers serving others to being served by others.
9. The Student Affairs divisional leader(s) at my institution believes our organization has a duty to improve the community in which it operates.
10. The Student Affairs divisional leader(s) at my institution values diversity and individual differences in the organization.
11. The Student Affairs divisional leader(s) at my institution welcomes the ideas and input from employees at all levels of the organization.
12. The Student Affairs divisional leader(s) at my institution models the behavior they expect from others in the organization.

-----PAGE BREAK-----

Q9 At this time, do you intend to stay in or leave the field of Student Affairs?

- A. Intend to stay in the field
- B. Intend to leave the field

Q10 I identify as:

- A. Female
- B. Male
- C. Transgender
- D. Prefer not to answer
- E. Other, please specify:
 - a. (textbox to fill in)

Q11 I identify as:

- A. Bisexual
- B. Gay
- C. Heterosexual
- D. Lesbian
- E. Queer
- F. Prefer not to answer
- G. Another sexual orientation; please specify
 - a. (textbox to fill in)

Q12 My age is:

- A. 25 or younger
- B. 26-29

- C. 30-37
- D. 38 or older

Q13 My race/ethnicity is:

- A. American Indian or Alaskan Native
- B. Asian or Pacific Islander
- C. Black or African American
- D. Hispanic or Latino/Latina
- E. White/Caucasian
- F. Prefer not to answer
- G. Other, please specify
 - a. (textbox to fill in)

Q14 My highest level of education attained is:

- A. High School diploma or equivalent
- B. AA
- C. Bachelor's
- D. Master's
- E. Doctorate

-----PAGE BREAK-----

Q15 Which of the following best describes your current employment and/or education status?

- A. Full-time Graduate student (with or without a graduate employment position)
- B. Full-time Student Affairs employee
- C. Full-time Student Affairs employee and part-time Graduate student
- D. Part-time Student Affairs employee and part-time Graduate student
- E. Other, please specify

a. (textbox to fill in)

Q16 Please slide the scale below to indicate the number of years you have worked in Student Affairs.

Slider for open ended answer

Q17 Did you work in a career field other than Student Affairs prior to your current position in Student Affairs?

A. Yes

B. No

Q18 How long have you been in your current Student Affairs position?

A. < 1 year

B. 1 year

C. 2 years

D. 3 years

E. 4 years

F. 5 years

G. >5 years

-----PAGE BREAK-----

Q19 The geographic location in the United States of the institution I currently work in is:

A. Northeast

B. Midwest

C. South

D. West

E. Alaska/Hawaii

F. Outside of United States

Q20 The size of the institution I currently work in is:

- A. 0—3000
- B. 3001-8000
- C. 8001-15000
- D. 15001-25000
- E. 25001 or more

Q21 The type of institution I currently work in is:

- A. Public,4-year, no affiliation
- B. Private, 4-year, no affiliation
- C. Religious Affiliated
- D. For Profit
- E. Community College
- F. Other, please specify
 - a. (textbox to fill in)

Q22 Please slide the scale below to indicate the average amount of hours you work per week.

Slider for open ended answer

Q23 The functional area in Student Affairs that describes my primary function in my current position is:

- A. Residence Life
- B. Career Development
- C. Academic Advising
- D. Student Health

- E. Disability Services
- F. Student Conduct
- G. Student Programming
- H. Fraternity & Sorority Life
- I. Orientation
- J. Multicultural Center
- K. Other, please specify
 - a. (textbox to fill in)

Q24 As stated in the Informed Consent information you reviewed prior to taking this survey, the survey is being deployed to members of both NASPA and ACPA. Please indicate below that you have taken this survey only once.

- A. Yes, I have only taken this survey once.
- B. No, I realize now that I have taken this survey more than once.

-----PAGE BREAK-----

Q25 Thank you so much for taking the time to participate in this survey! If you would like to be entered in a drawing for one of the two Amazon \$50 gift cards, please indicate this below to be taken to another survey to enter you into this drawing.

- A. Yes, I would like to be entered in the drawing.
- B. No, I would not like to be entered in the drawing.

If they answer yes, then they will get an additional question:

Q26 Please enter your email address below to be entered in the drawing for one of the two Amazon \$50 gift cards.

Q27 Thank you for your participation. Have a good day!

Appendix D: Participant Sample Full Characteristics

Individual Characteristics	Frequency	Institutional Characteristics	Frequency
Gender		Type of Institution	
Female	123	Public, 4 yr., no affiliation	121
Male	49	Private, 4 yr., no affiliation	39
Transgender	2	Religious affiliation	19
Prefer not to answer	3	Community College	5
Agender	1	Other	1
Genderqueer	1		
Intersex/Demi-girl	1		
Non-binary	3		
Non-binary Trans	1		
Woman	1		
Sexual Orientation		Size of Institution	
Heterosexual	112	0-3000	25
Gay	24	3001-8000	29
Bisexual	21	8001-15000	29
Queer	18	15001-25000	43
Lesbian	1	25001 or more	59
Prefer not to answer	5		
Asexual	1		
Asexual, Aromantic	1		
Pansexual	2		
Race/Ethnicity		Geographic Location of Institution	
White/Caucasian	121	Northeast	55
Hispanic or Latino/Latina	18	Midwest	48
Black or African American	17	West	41
Asian or Pacific Islander	15	South	40
Prefer not to answer	2	Alaska/Hawaii	1
Biracial	1		
Biracial, Asian/White	2		
Black and Asian	1		
Black/Latinx	1		
Haitian American	1		
Latinx/Hispanic	1		
Middle Eastern	1		
Arab/Swana/Mena	1		
Multiracial	1		
Multiracial, Black/White	1		
Multi, Asian/Black/White	1		
Age			
25 or younger	76		
26-29	80		
30-37	25		
38 or older	4		
Highest Education Attained			
AA	1		
Bachelor's	45		
Master's	136		

Doctorate	3		
SA Functional Area			
Residence Life	49		
Career Development	9		
Academic Advising	25		
Student Health	3		
Disability Services	2		
Student Conduct	6		
Student Programming	32		
Fraternity & Sorority Life	6		
Orientation	5		
Multicultural Center	20		
Academic Development & Support Services	1		
Academic Resources	1		
Advancement fundraising for Student Experience	1		
Administration	2		
Assessment & Accreditation	1		
Continuing Education	1		
International Education	1		
Leadership Education	5		
Student Success	2		
University Recreation	1		
Title IX	1		
Student Services	1		
Student Union	1		
Student Government	1		
Student Equity Programs	1		
Registrar	1		
Off Campus Student Services	1		
Student Success & Retention	2		
Enrollment Management	1		
Education Research	1		
Diversity, Equity & Inclusion	1		
Number Years in Student Affairs			
Less than a Year	3		
1 Year	22		
2 Years	44		
3 Years	40		
4 Years	41		
5 Years	35		

Notes: N = 185

Appendix E: Work-Related Quality of Life Scale

Directions: This scale is a measure of your attitudes to the factors that influence your experience at work. Please do not take too long over each question; we want your first reaction not a long drawn out thought process. For each item choose the response that reflects the extent to which you agree with the statement. Respond using the following scale: A = Strongly Disagree B =

Disagree C = Neutral D = Agree E = Strongly Agree

1. I have a clear set of goals and aims to enable me to do my job.
2. I feel able to voice opinions and influence changes in my area of work.
3. I have the opportunity to use my abilities at work.
4. I feel well at the moment.
5. My employer provides adequate facilities and flexibility for me to fit work in around my family life.
6. My current working hours/patterns suit my personal circumstances.
7. I often feel under pressure at work. (*reverse score*)
8. When I have done a good job it is acknowledged by my line manager.
9. Recently, I have been feeling unhappy and depressed. (*reverse score*)
10. I am satisfied with my life.
11. I am encouraged to develop new skills.
12. I am involved in decisions that affect me in my own area of work.
13. My employer provides me with what I need to do my job effectively.
14. My line manager actively promotes flexible working hours/patterns.
15. In most ways my life is close to ideal.
16. I work in a safe environment.
17. Generally things work out well for me.
18. I am satisfied with the career opportunities available for me here.
19. I often feel excessive levels of stress at work. (*reverse score*)

- 20. I am satisfied with the training I receive in order to perform my present job.
- 21. Recently, I have been feeling reasonably happy all things considered.
- 22. The working conditions are satisfactory.
- 23. I am involved in decisions that affect members of the public in my own area of work.
- 24. I am satisfied with the overall quality of my working life.

Factor Breakdown by Items:

Factor 1: Job and Career Satisfaction (JCS) – Items 1, 3, 8, 11, 18, 20

Factor 2: Home-Work Interface (HWI) – Items 5, 6, 14

Factor 3: Stress at Work (SAW) – Items 7, 19

Factor 4: Control at Work (CAW) – Items 2, 12, 23

Factor 5: Working Conditions (WCS) – Items 13, 16, 22

Factor 6: General Well-being (GWB) – Items 4, 9, 10, 15, 17, 21

Appendix F: Synergistic Supervision Scale

Directions: For each item choose the response that most closely reflects your experience with your current supervisor. Respond using the following scale: A = Never (almost never) B =

Seldom C = Sometimes D = Often E = Always (almost always)

1. My supervisor includes me in a significant way when making decisions that affect my area of responsibilities.
2. My supervisor works with me to gather the information needed to make decisions rather than simply providing me the information he/she feels is important.
3. My supervisor criticizes staff members in public. (*reverse key*)
4. My supervisor makes certain that I am fully knowledgeable about the goals of the division and institution.
5. My supervisor willingly listens to whatever is on my mind, whether it is personal or professional.
6. My supervisor shows interests in promoting my professional or career advancement.
7. My supervisor is personally offended if I question the wisdom of his/her decisions. (*reverse key*)
8. My supervisor shows that she/he cares about me as a person.
9. My supervisor speaks up for my unit within the institution.
10. My supervisor expects me to fit in with the accepted ways of doing things, in other words, "don't rock the boat." (*reverse key*)
11. My supervisor has favorites on the staff. (*reverse key*)
12. My supervisor breaks confidences. (*reverse key*)
13. My supervisor takes negative evaluations of programs or staff and uses them to make improvements.

14. When faced with a conflict between an external constituent (for example, parent or donor) and staff members, my supervisor supports external constituents even if they are wrong. (*reverse key*)
15. My supervisor is open and honest with me about my strengths and weaknesses.
16. If I'm not careful, my supervisor may allow things that aren't my fault to be blamed on me. (*reverse key*)
17. My supervisor rewards teamwork.
18. When the system gets in the way of accomplishing our goals, my supervisor helps me to devise ways to overcome barriers.
19. My supervisor looks for me to make a mistake. (*reverse key*)
20. My supervisor and I develop yearly professional development plans that address my weaknesses or blind spots.
21. When problem solving, my supervisor expects staff to present and advocate differing points of view.
22. In conflicts with staff members, my supervisor takes students' sides (even when they are wrong). (*reverse key*)

Appendix G: Executive Servant Leadership Scale (ESLS)

Please respond to the following statements regarding your perceptions of the Student Affairs divisional leadership at your institution. If you have no direct experience with this person(s), you may consider organizational policies, practices, or public communications as evidence of their values and beliefs. If you are not currently employed, please consider the Student Affairs divisional leadership at your most recent institution. Respond using the following scale: A = Strongly Disagree B = Disagree C = Agree D = Strongly Agree

The Student Affairs divisional leader(s) at my institution...

1. Considers the effects of organizational decisions on the community.
2. Recognizes when employee morale is low without asking.
3. Looks for ways to make others successful.
4. Sacrifices personal benefit to meet employee needs.
5. Encourages debate of their ideas.
6. Serves others willingly with no expectation of reward.
7. Inspires employee trust.
8. Invites constructive criticism.
9. Nurtures employee leadership potential.
10. Refuses to use manipulation or deceit to achieve their goals.
11. Encourages a spirit of cooperation among employees.
12. Inspires organizational commitment.
13. Places interests of others before self-interest.
14. Treats all employees with dignity and respect.
15. Displays interest in learning from employees, regardless of their level in the organization.
16. Ensures greatest decision-making control given to employees most affected by decision.
17. Freely admits their mistakes.

18. Promotes transparency and honesty throughout the organization.
19. Listens carefully to others.
20. Values integrity more than profit or personal gain.
21. Prefers serving others to being served by others.
22. Believes our organization has a duty to improve the community in which it operates.
23. Values diversity and individual differences in the organization.
24. Welcomes the ideas and input from employees at all levels of the organization.
25. Models the behavior they expect from others in the organization.

Factor Breakdown by Items:

Factor 1: Interpersonal Support – Items 2, 3, 9, 14, 16, 19

Factor 2: Building Community – Items 1, 11, 12, 22, 23

Factor 3: Altruism – Items 4, 6, 13, 21

Factor 4: Egalitarianism – Items 5, 8, 15, 24

Factor 5: Moral Integrity – Items 7, 10, 17, 18, 20, 25

References

- Allen, D.G., Bryant, P.C., & Vardaman, J.M. (2010). Retaining talent: Replacing misconceptions with evidence-based strategies. *Academy of Management Perspectives*, 24(2), 48-64, DOI: 10.5465/AMP.2010.51827775.
- Altbach, P.G., Gumport, P.J., & Berdahl, R.O. (2011). American higher education in the twenty-first century: Social, political, and economic challenges (3rd ed.). Baltimore, MD: The Johns Hopkins University Press.
- American College Personnel Association (ACPA). (2018). www.myacpa.org/.
- Astin, W. A., & Astin, H. S. (2000). Leadership reconsidered: Engaging higher education in social change. Battle Creek, MI: W. K. Kellogg Foundation.
- Babakus, E., Yavas, U., & Ashill, N.J. (2011). Service worker burnout and turnover intentions: Roles of person-job fit, servant leadership, and customer orientation. *Services Marketing Quarterly*, 32, 17-31.
- Baker, H.A., & McCann, R.M. (2014). Matters of demographic similarity and dissimilarity in supervisor-subordinate relationships and workplace attitudes. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 41, 1-16.
- Bedeian, A.G., Kemery, E.R., & Pizzolatto, A.B. (1991). Career commitment and expected utility of present job as predictors of turnover intentions and turnover behavior. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 39, 331-343.
- Bender, B.E. (1980). Job satisfaction in student affairs. *NASPA Journal*, 18(2), 2-9, <https://doi.org/10.1080/00220973.1980.11071773>.
- Bender, B.E. (2009). Job satisfaction in student affairs. *NASPA Journal*, 46(4), 553-565.
- Berwick, K.R. (1992). Stress among student affairs administrators: The relationship of personal characteristics and organizational variables on work-related stress. *Journal of College Student Development*, 33(1), 11-19.

- Bluedorn, A.C. (1982). A unified model of turnover from organizations. *Human Relations*, 35(2), 135-153.
- Bryant, P.C. & Allen, D.G. (2013). Compensation, benefits, and employee turnover: HR strategies for retaining top talent. *Compensation & Benefits Review*, 45(3), 171-175, DOI: 10.1177/0886368713494342cbr.sagepub.com.
- Buchanan, J. (2012). *Factors that influence attrition of new professionals in student affairs* (Doctoral Dissertation). Retrieved from ERIC. (ED548800).
- Buller, J.L. (2015). *Change leadership in higher education*. Jossey-Bass: San Francisco.
- Burch, M.J., Swails, P., & Mills, R. (2015). Perceptions of administrators' servant leadership qualities at a Christian university: A descriptive study. *Education*, 135(4), 399-404.
- Chessman, H.M. (2015). *Student affairs administrators & well-being: Examining time in field, position level and factors that have the strongest relationship to well-being* (Doctoral Dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest. (ED567973).
- Cilente, K., Henning, G., Skinner Jackson, J., Kennedy, D., & Sloane, T. (2006). Report on the New Professional Needs Study. Washington, DC: American College Personnel Association. Retrieved from ACPA on 3/21/19 through personal communication.
- Collins, D. (2009). The socialization process for new professionals. In Tull, A., Hirt, J.B., & Saunders, S.A. (Eds.), *Becoming socialized in student affairs administration* (p. 3-27). Sterling, VA: Stylus.
- Davis, T.J. & Cooper, D.L. (2017). "People are messy": Complex narratives of supervising new professionals in student affairs. *Journal of Student Affairs Research and Practice*, 54(1), 55-68, DOI: 10.1080/19496591.2016.1219267.
- Day, D. V. & Antonakis, J. (2012). Leadership: Past, Present, and Future. In D. Day & J. Antonakis (Eds.), *The Nature of Leadership, 2nd Edition* (pp. 289-330). Washington, DC: Sage.

DiStefano, C., Zhu, M., & Mindrila, D. (2009). Understanding and using factor scores:

Consideration for the applied researcher. *Practical Assessment, Research & Evaluation*, 14(20), 1-11.

Dulebohn, J.H., Bommer, W.H., Liden, R.C., Brouer, R.L., & Ferris, G.R. (2012). A meta-analysis of antecedents and consequences of leader-member exchange: Integrating the past with an eye toward the future. *Journal of Management*, 38, 1715-1759, DOI: 10.1177/0149206311415280.

Easton, S. A. & Van Laar, D. L. (2012). User manual for the Work-related Quality of Life (WRQoL) scale: A measure of quality of working life. University of Portsmouth: United Kingdom.

Eckel, P.D. & Kezar, A. (2003). Taking the Reins: Institutional transformation in higher education. Rowman & Littlefield Publishers: Lanham, MD.

Edwards, J. A., Van Laar, D., Easton, S. & Kinsman, G. (2009). The work-related quality of life scale for higher education employees. *Quality in Higher Education*, 15(3), 207-219, doi:10.1080/13538320903343057.

Ehrenberg, R., Kasper, H., & Rees, D. (1991). Faculty turnover at American colleges and universities: Analyses of AAUP data. *Economics of Education Review*, 10(2), 99-110.

Evans, N.J. (1988). Attrition of student affairs professionals: A review of the literature. *Journal of College Student Development*, 29(1), 19-24.

Evans, N.J., Forney, D.S., Guido, F.M., Patton, L.D., & Renn, K.A. (2010). Student development in college: Theory, research, and practice (2nd ed.). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Frank, T. (2013). Why do they leave? Departure from the student affairs profession. *ProQuest*, UMI Number: 3585747.

Fosnacht, K., Sarrat, S., Howe, E., & Peck, L.K. (2017). How important are high response rates for college surveys? *The Review of Higher Education*, 40(2), 245-265.

- Gardiner, M. & Tiggemann, M. (1999). Gender differences in leadership style, job stress, and mental health in male- and female-dominated industries. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 72, 301-315.
- Gerda, J.J. (2006). Gathering together: A view of the earliest student affairs professional organizations, *NASPA Journal*, 43(4), 147-163.
- Gerstner, C.R. & Day, D.V. (1997). Meta-analytic review of leader-member exchange theory: Correlates and construct issues. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 82(6), 827-844.
- Graen, G. B. & Uhl-Bien, M. (1995). Relationship-based approach to leadership: Development of leader-member exchange (LMX) theory over 25 years: Applying a multi-level, multi-domain perspective, *Leadership Quarterly*, 6(2), 219-247.
- Haggard, D.L. & Park, H.M. (2018). Perceived supervisor remorse, abusive supervision, and LMX. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 39, 1252-1267, doi: 10.1002/job.2285.
- Harned, P.J. & Murphy, M.C. (1998). Creating a culture of development for the new professional. In W.A. Bryan & R.A. Schwartz (-Eds.), *Strategies for staff development: Personal and professional education in the 21st century* (New Directions for Student Services No. 84, p. 43-53). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Harris, K.J., Harris, R.B., & Eplion, D.M., (2007). Personality, leader-member exchanges, and work outcomes. *Journal of Behavioral & Applied Management*, 8(2), 92-107.
- Harris, K., Hinds, L., Manansingh, S., Rubino, M., & Morote, E.S. (2016). What type of leadership in higher education promotes job satisfaction and increases retention? *Journal for Leadership and Instruction*, 15(1), 27-32.
- Harrison, D., Price, K., & Bell, M. (1998). Beyond relational demography: Time and the effects of surface- and deep-level diversity on work group cohesion. *Academy of Management Journal*, 41, 96-107.

- Jaramillo, F., Grisaffe, D.B., Chonko, L.B., & Roberts, J.A. (2009). Examining the impact of servant leadership on salesperson's turnover intention. *Journal of Personal Selling & Sales Management*, 29(4), 351-365.
- Jeanquart-Barone, S. (1993). Trust differences between supervisors and subordinates: Examining the role of race and gender. *Sex Roles*, 29, 1-11.
- Jha, S. & Jha, S. (2013). Leader-member exchange: A critique of theory & practice. *Journal of Management & Public Policy*, 4(2), 42-53.
- Jo, V. H. (2008). Voluntary turnover and women administrators in higher education. *Higher Education*, 56(5), 565-582, DOI: 10.1007/s10734-008-9111-y.
- Johnsrud, L.K. & Rosser, V.J. (2002). Faculty members' morale and their intent to leave: A multilevel explanation. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 73(4), 518-542.
- Jubert, Jr., S. B. (2016). *The role of supervision in student affairs and its impact on new professionals' persistence in the field, job satisfaction, and professional development*. (Doctoral Dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest. (10117425).
- Lane, T. (2010). *Synergistic supervision and the student affairs mid-level manager: A social exchange perspective*. (Doctoral Dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest. (3488927).
- Lee, T.W. & Mowday, R.T. (1987). Voluntarily leaving an organization: An empirical investigation of Steers and Mowday's model of turnover. *Academy of Management Journal*, 30(4), 721-743.
- Letizia, A. (2018). What Is Servant Leadership? In *Using Servant Leadership: How to Reframe the Core Functions of Higher Education* (pp. 1-24). Newark, New Jersey: Rutgers University Press. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/j.ctt1v2xw3s.4>
- Linden, R. (1985). Female perceptions of female and male managerial behavior. *Sex Roles*, 12(3), 421-432.
- Liden, R.C. & Maslyn, J.M. (1998). Multidimensionality of leader-member exchange: An empirical assessment through scale development. *Journal of Management*, 24(1), 43-72.

- Lindfelt, T., Ip, E.J., Gomez, A., & Barnett, M.J. (2018). The impact of work-life balance on intention to stay in academia: Results from a national survey of pharmacy faculty. *Research in Social and Administrative Pharmacy, 14*, 387-390.
- Long, D. (2012). The foundations of student affairs: A guide to the profession. In L.J. Hinchliffe & M.A. Wong (Eds.), *Environments for student growth and development: Librarians and student affairs in collaboration* (p. 1-39). Chicago: Association of College & Research Libraries, <https://ir.library.illinoisstate.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?referer=https://search.yahoo.com/&httpsredir=1&article=1028&context=fpml>.
- Lorden, L.P. (1998). Attrition in the student affairs profession. *NASPA Journal, 35*(3), 207-216, DOI: 10.2202/1949-6605.1049.
- Manning, K. (2018). *Organizational Theory in Higher Education* (2nd Ed.). Routledge: New York.
- Marshall, S.M., Gardner, M.M., Hughes, C., & Lowery, U. (2016). Attrition from student affairs: Perspectives from those who exited the profession. *Journal of Student Affairs Research and Practice, 53*(2), 146-159, DOI: 10.1080/19496591.2016.1147359.
- Maslyn, J.M. & Uhl-Bien, M. (2001). Leader-member exchange and its dimensions: Effects of self-effort and other's effort on relationship quality. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 86*(4), 697-708.
- Morgan, D. (2015). *An examination of the relationship between perceived level of synergistic supervision received and key job performance indicators within midlevel student affairs administrators*. (Doctoral Dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest. (3706383).
- Mueller, C., Finley, A., Iverson, R., & Price, J. (1999). The effects of group racial composition on job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and career commitment: The case of teachers. *Work and Occupation, 26*(2), 187-219.

Mullen, P.R., Malone, A., Denney, A., & Dietz, S.S. (2018). Job stress, burnout, job satisfaction, and turnover intention among student affairs professionals. *College Student Affairs Journal*, 36(1), 94-108.

National Association of Student Personnel Administrators (NASPA). (2018).

<https://www.naspa.org/>

NASPA & ACPA. (2010). Professional Standards: ACPA/NASPA Professional Competencies.

https://www.naspa.org/images/uploads/main/ACPA_NASPA_Professional_Competencies.pdf

Pittman, E.C. & Foubert, J.D. (2016). Predictors of professional identity development for student affairs professionals. *Journal of Student Affairs Research and Practice*, 53(1), 13-25, DOI: 10.1080/19496591.2016.1087857.

Pundt, A. & Herrmann, F. (2015). Affiliative and aggressive humour in leadership and their relationship to leader-member exchange. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 88, 108-125.

Ragaisis, J. A. (2018). The influence of servant leadership and transformational leadership on faculty job satisfaction and performance in higher education. *ProQuest*, UMI Number: 10826237.

Reed, L.L., Vidaver-Cohen, D., & Colwell, S.R. (2011). A new scale to measure executive servant leadership: Development, analysis, and implications for research. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 101, 415-434, DOI: 10.1007/s10551-010-0729-1.

Renn, K.A. & Hodges, K.A. (2007). The first year on the job: Experiences of new professionals in student affairs. *NASPA Journal*, 44(2), 367-391.

Renn, K.A. & Jessup-Anger, E.R. (2008). Preparing new professionals: Lessons for graduate preparation programs from the national study of new professionals in student affairs. *Journal of College Student Development*, 49(4), 319-335.

- Robinson, J. (2017). Next generation leadership: The changing culture of leadership in the senior student affairs officer (SSAO) position. *College Student Affairs Journal*, 35(2), 70-84.
- Rosen, J., Taube, S.R., & Wadsworth, E.L. (1980). The first professional year. *NASPA Journal*, 17(3), 52-59, DOI: 10.1080/00220973.1980.11071753.
- Rosser, V.J. (2004). A national study on midlevel leaders in higher education: The unsung professionals in the academy. *Higher Education*, 48, 317-337.
- Rosser, V.J. & Javinar, J.M. (2003). Midlevel student affairs leaders' intentions to leave: Examining the quality of their professional and institutional work life. *Journal of College Student Development*, 44(6), 813-830.
- Rosser, V.J. & Javinar, J.M. (2009). Quality of work life: Why socialization matters. In Tull, A., Hirt, J.B., & Saunders, S.A. (Eds.), *Becoming socialized in student affairs administration* (p. 28-42). Sterling, VA: Stylus.
- Samad, A., Reaburn, P., Davis, H., & Ahmed, E. (2015). Towards and understanding of the effect of leadership on employee wellbeing and organizational outcomes in Australian universities. *The Journal of Developing Areas: Special Issue on Sydney Conference in April 2015*, 49(6), 441-448.
- Saunders, S.A. & Cooper, D.L. (2009). The socialization process for new professionals. In Tull, A., Hirt, J.B., & Saunders, S.A. (Eds.), *Becoming socialized in student affairs administration* (p. 109-128). Sterling, VA: Stylus.
- Saunders, S.A., Cooper, D.L., Winston, R.B., & Chernow, E. (2000). Supervising in student affairs: Exploration of the synergistic approach. *Journal of College Student Development*, 41(2), 181-192.
- Scheuermann, T. & Ellett, T. (2007). A 3-D view of recruitment and retention of entry-level housing staff: Déjà vu, deliberation, decisive action. *Journal of College and University Student Housing*, 34(2), 12-19.
- Schuh, J.H. (2002). Lessons from leaders. *NASPA Journal*, 39(3), 204-216.

- Schwartz, R. & Stewart, D-L. (2017). The history of student affairs. In J. H. Schuh, S. R. Jones, & V. Torres (Eds.), *Student services handbook: A handbook for the profession* (6th ed.) (pp. 20-38). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Shi-Tse Wang, E. (2014). The effects of relationship bonds on emotional exhaustion and turnover intentions in frontline employees. *Journal of Services Marketing*, 28(4), 319-330.
<https://doi.org/10.1108/JSM-11-2012-0217>.
- Shupp, M.R., & Arminio, J.L. (2012). Synergistic supervision: A confirmed key to retaining entry-level student affairs professionals. *Journal of Student Affairs Research and Practice*, 49(2), 157-174, DOI: 10.1515/jsarp-2012-6295.
- Silver, B.R. & Jakeman, R.C. (2014). Understanding intent to leave the field: A study of student affairs master's students' career plans. *Journal of Student Affairs Research and Practice*, 51(2), 170-182, DOI: 10.1515/jsarp-2014-0017.
- Somers, M.J. (1995). Organizational commitment, turnover, and absenteeism: An examination of direct and interaction effects. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 16(1), 49-58.
- Spears, L.C. (2004). Practicing servant-leadership. *Leader to Leader*, 34, 7-11, Wiley-Blackwell.
- Stock-Ward, S.R. & Javorek, M.E. (2003). Applying theory to practice: Supervision in student affairs. *NASPA Journal*, 40(3), 77-92, DOI: 10.2202/0027-6014.1257.
- Stoves, D.R. (2014). *Compelled to act: The negotiation of compassion fatigue among student affairs professionals* (Doctoral Dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest. (ED569311).
- Stum, D. L. (2001). Maslow revisited: Building the employee commitment pyramid. *Strategy & Leadership*, 29(4), 4-9.
- Su, R., Tay, L. & Diener, E. (2014). The development and validation of Comprehensive Instrument of Thriving (CIT) and Brief Inventory on Thriving (BIT). *Applied Psychology: Health and Well-Being*, 6(3), 251-279, doi:10.1111/aphw.12027.
- Taub, D.J. & McEwen, M.K. (2006). Decision to enter the profession of student affairs. *Journal of College Student Development*, 47(2), 206-216.

- Thelin, J.R. & Gasman, M. (2017). Historical overview of American higher education. In Schuh, J.H., Jones, S.R., & Torres, V. (Eds.), *Student services handbook: A handbook for the profession* (6th ed.) (pp. 3-19). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Thomas, C.H. & Lankau, M.J. (2009). Preventing burnout: The effects of LMX and mentoring on socialization, role stress, and burnout. *Human Resource Management*, 48(3), 417-432, doi: 10.1002/hrm.20288.
- Tse, H.H.M., Huang, X., & Lam, W. (2013). Why does transformational leadership matter for employee turnover? A multi-foci social exchange perspective. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 24, 763-776.
- Tsui, A., Egan, T., & O'Reilly, C. (1992). Being different: Relational demography and organizational attachment. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 37, 549-579.
- Tull, A. (2006). Synergistic supervision, job satisfaction, and intention to turnover of new professionals in student affairs. *Journal of College Student Development*, 47(4), 465-480.
- Tull, A., Hirt, J.B., & Saunders, S.A. (2009). *Becoming socialized in student affairs administration*. Sterling, VA: Stylus.
- Tull, T.A. (2004). *The relationship between perceived level of synergistic supervision received, job satisfaction, and intention to turnover of new professionals in student affairs administration*. (Doctoral Dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest. (3156251).
- Uhl-Bien, M., Maslyn, J., & Ospina, S. (2012). The Nature of relational leadership: A multitheoretical lens on leadership relationships and processes. In D. Day & J. Antonakis (Eds.), *The Nature of Leadership*, 2nd Edition (pp. 289-330). Washington, DC: Sage.
- Underwood, S.J. & Austin, C.E. (2016). Higher education graduate preparation programs: Characteristics and trends. *Journal of College Student Development*, 57(3), 326-332.
- Van Laar, D. L., Edwards, J. A. & Easton, S. (2007). The work-related quality of life scale for healthcare workers. *Journal of Advanced Nursing*. 60(3), 325–333.

- Varma, A. & Stroh, L.K. (2001). The impact of same-sex LMX dyads on performance evaluations. *Human Resource Management, 40*(4), 309-320.
- Vecchio, R. & Bullis, R. (2001). Moderators of the influence of supervisor-subordinate similarity on subordinate outcomes. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 86*(5), 884-896.
- Volkwein, J.F. & Zhou, Y. (2003). Testing a model of administrative job satisfaction. *Research in Higher Education, 44*(2), 149-171.
- Ward, L. (1995). Role stress and propensity to leave among new student affairs professionals. *NASPA Journal, 33*(1), 35-44, DOI: 10.1080/00220973.1995.11072393.
- Watanabe, M. & Falci, C.D. (2016). A demands and resources approach to understanding faculty turnover intentions due to work-family balance. *Journal of Family Issues, 37*(3), 393-415, DOI: 10.1177/0192513X14530972.
- Winston, R.B. & Creamer, D.G. (1998). Staff supervision and professional development: An integrated approach. In W.A. Bryan & R.A. Schwartz (Eds.), *Strategies for staff development: Personal and professional education in the 21st century* (New Directions for Student Services No. 84, p. 29-42). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Winston, R.B., Torres, V., Carpenter, D.S., McIntire, D.D. & Peterson, B. (2001). Staffing in student affairs: A survey of practices. *College Student Affairs Journal, 21*(1), 7-25.
- Xu, E., Huang, X., Lam, C.K., & Miao, Q. (2012). Abusive supervision and work behaviors: The mediating role of LMX. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 33*, 531-543, doi: 10.1002/job.768.
- Yavas, U., Jha, S., & Babakus, E. (2015). Relative effects of leadership and technology on bank employees' job outcomes. *Services Marketing Quarterly, 36*, 173-187.
- Zaynab, S., Hall, N.C., & Saroyan, A. (2018). Antecedents, correlates, and consequences of faculty burnout. *Educational Research, 60*(2), 131-156, DOI: 10.1080/00131881.2018.1461573.

Zheng, D., Wu, H., Eisenberger, R., Shore, L.M, Tetrick, L.E., & Buffardi, L.C. (2016).

Newcomer leader-member exchange: The contribution of anticipated organizational support. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 89, 834-855.

Zhou, Y. & Volkwein, J.F. (2004). Examining the influences on faculty departure intentions: A comparison of tenured versus non-tenured faculty at research universities using NSPPF-99. *Research in Higher Education*, 45(2), 139-176.